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Abstract

As a social practice, being part of the school band stylizes our lives—individually and collectively. The pedagogical band world, a world made up primarily of school and university wind bands, is in many ways similar to the world of community/civic bands of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Based on an examination of professional discourses, however, I argue that processes of institutionalization have altered the nature of music making via band participation. The pedagogical band world, like other bounded worlds, operates according to what Michel Foucault calls “regimes of truth”—the regulative norms that delimit what can be said and done. The specific ways in which the subject is fashioned, in other words, are a function of the truths we endorse about ourselves and, in the present case, about music making. Studying the discourses in the disciplinary practice of large ensemble (band) music making is of paramount importance for music educators to better understand the effects of disciplinary practices.

Employing a conceptual framework based on the work of Michel Foucault, the following question guided this inquiry: “What ‘regimes of truth’ are fashioned in school music (bands) discourse, how did they come to be, and what are their potential effects
on the subject?" Methods from the field of corpus linguistics were used to concordance the journal of the Canadian Band Association, 1978-2008. Concordance lists were used to introspectively examine each occurrence (approximately 25,000 in total) of a downsampld set of words related to subject formation in order to generate statements making truth claims. While there is no mistaking that a primary goal in music education discourse is to foster a “love of music,” this investigation suggests the kind of musicality fashioned in today’s pedagogical discourse has become a relationship to music (based on the study of music; music as something to know) rather than the kind of relationship fashioned in band participation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which I describe as a relationship with music (music as something to do).
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Chapter 1

The Study

Why Stylizing Lives?

Education invariably involves the presumption that lives are malleable. While nature/nurture debates continue, even the most ardent of those championing some form of biological determinism would be hard-pressed to deny there exists for all of us an underlying suspicion that with a different education we could be different—in some way and to some extent—from ourselves. The thrust of so much of French philosopher Michel Foucault’s work is based, in fact, on trying to demonstrate this very point: we can be different from ourselves. Our formal educational system is constructed to “stylize”—or as Foucault might say, “discipline”—pupils with such a high degree of conformity (standardized curricula, standardized methods, standardized tests) that the resultant uniformity leads us to believe that who we should become is based on the naturalness of who we really are or should be. This study, following Foucault, is based on a rejection of, or at least a challenge to, some of the “grand narratives”—what Foucault calls ‘regimes of truth’—that position education as the unproblematic development of potentialities that are presented as universally human. We
may not be able to change everything about ourselves, but education, as part of the socialization process, is ultimately about the way we choose to stylize lives rather than the realization of something called human nature. To the extent we resist normative influences, this stylization can be considered what Foucault calls “an exercise in freedom.”

This dissertation is about school bands.¹ Or rather, it is about the learning of music assumed or claimed to occur in school bands and how music is said to be educative for people. As is the case with many research problems, mine stems from personal experience. Although I feel mostly positive about my teaching experience as a school band director, I did experience frustrations any time I attempted to ‘push the boundaries’ in any way.² The disciplinary practices of school bands seemed to exert such a firm rein (and reign) over what was and was not permissible. Perhaps the height of my feelings of frustration came when I was told by an eminent jazz musician and adjudicator it was too bad I had not supplied a score for a piece the band members had created (entirely on their own) for the jazz festival. What possible difference, I was left wondering, could the score make—especially at a jazz festival? Could the performance of the band not be evaluated in the absence of a score? More importantly, what sort of

¹ I consider bands to be wind and percussion ensembles, such as concert bands, wind ensembles, symphonic bands, and so on.
² I do not wish to mislead; I was no radical. Most of what I did as a music teacher would likely be described by most as quite conservative.
message is communicated when students are led to believe that the primary purpose of music making is to correctly reproduce musical notation?

Although this study examines the practices of school bands and the instrumental music education profession, my object of concern is the individual (or as I will discuss it, ‘the subject’) and the kind of musical relationship fashioned in and through participation in school bands. As a social practice, being part of the school band stylizes lives—individually and collectively. The band uniform, for example, with its military ancestry, is a powerful symbol of what school bands are said to be about. For some, bands in uniform are a symbol of egalitarian democracy with all members working together in peace and harmony to bring about a collective goal.³ For others, bands in uniform are a symbol of a dictatorship where assimilated, docile workers do the bidding of the master. This study interrogates the possible incommensurability between what is said and done in this form of school music, and what is really being said and really being done. That is, while there is no mistaking that a primary goal in music education discourse is to foster a ‘love of music,’⁴ my research suggests the kind of relationship

3 In the dramatic words of one writer in the Canadian Band Journal, “the school band or orchestra is a powerful metaphor for civilization itself” (7:3, 8).

4 It should be noted that ‘loving music’ implies that students should come to love music in the way we, the teachers, do. As I articulate in Chapter Six, one author questions how “several hundred thousand young high school musicians can annually prepare and perform music in our contest events and still not be ‘turned on’ to music?” (Canadian Band Journal 13:2, 30)—by
fashioned in the pedagogical discourse has become a relationship to music (based on the study of music; music as something to know) rather than the kind of relationship fashioned in band participation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—something I describe as a relationship with music (music as something to do).

To be clear, I am not saying I am going to speak the truth about what is really going on in school bands. Rather, I have produced a reading of the texts based on the theoretical stance that discourse, defined at this juncture as what is said and done, does not just reflect reality, it participates in its construction. As Patricia Lather asserts, “Whatever ‘the real’ is, it is discursive” (1991, 25). If this is so, studying the discourses in the disciplinary practice of large ensemble (band) music making is of paramount importance for music educators to better understand the effects of disciplinary practices. While music education may claim to know much about the effectiveness of various aspects of music teaching and learning, there has been little research to my knowledge examining the truth that our language and practices serve to construct for the students and those in the music education profession involved with school bands. In Foucault’s words: “People know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don’t know is what what they do does” (qtd. in May 2006, which the author means these students do not regularly attend classical music concerts.)
In this study I offer a provocative philosophical reading of the journal of the Canadian Band Association and its associated texts that is intended to problematize unquestioned assumptions about the intersection of music making and the human subject, assumptions I ultimately contend militate against lifelong (or lifespan) music making.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

This study deals primarily with the problems of disciplinary practices and subject formation in instrumental music education. Owing to a personal involvement in and concern for instrumental music education in Canada at the junior and secondary school levels, I have focused my analysis on the discourses in the journal of the Canadian Band Association. The following question has guided this inquiry: "What 'regimes of truth’ are fashioned in school music (bands) discourse, how did they come to be, and what are their potential effects on the subject?"

As alluded to above, Foucault’s phrase, ‘regimes of truth,’ describes the regulative norms that delimit what can be said and done. These norms occur on many levels, but I am most interested in those norms associated

---

5 This famous quote is from Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982), *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. I had based an argument for this thesis upon it long before discovering Haussila’s (2002) article, “Of knowing what what we do does,” which articulates viewpoints similar in many respects to those in this study.
with the discipline of music education, specifically that of instrumental music in schools. I use the term “fashioned” for two reasons. Most obviously, I am asserting that truth is a social construction and not a foundational aspect of reality. As well, I am suggesting that living, as I am conceiving of it, is not about an unfolding inevitability, but is an intentional making in the way one fashions clothing and other artistic objects. The metaphor is intentionally complicated, however, since one also stylizes one’s appearance through the use of such objects, introducing problems of interiority/exteriority, the question of who we ‘really are’ (do we have a foundational substance or not?), and the ethical issue of who we want to or should be. For me, all of these issues are exemplified in Foucault’s notion of the “art (or aesthetics) of existence,” whereby living is viewed as an ethical problem involving the subject as both a locus of experience and a subjected being whose choices can never be wholly autonomous. The specific ways in which the subject is ‘fashioned,’ in other words, are a function of the truths we endorse about ourselves and, in the present case, about music making.

**NEED FOR THE STUDY**

**Practices In Music Education**

“The rehearsal model” is the most prominent model of education in music... Conceptually, music education is dominated by orchestra, choir, and band. (Bartel 2001, 16)
The development of the child as musician is described as a process whereby an autonomous individual engages with the phenomenon of Western music as it is presented in institutional Western music education practices. (Barrett 2006, 183)

I contend music education is rooted in modernist assumptions about the human subject, and that these assumptions influence what we do and why we do it. These assumptions are problematic insofar as they limit who we think we are and who we might become. I mean this both in terms of who we are and who we might become in music, and also in terms of how our sense of identity is inseparable from the social practices with which we engage (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). I offer here a very limited account of some of the modernist undercurrents in music education. They are not intended to be exhaustive, but rather are presented as brief examples to illustrate two points about the intersection of music education and ‘the subject.’ One is the idea that practices in the professional field of music education have been significantly influenced by psychological (humanistic) theories of development. The second is that education unavoidably involves content, and this content is a reflection of the idealized modernist subject.

---

6 The admittedly broad and vague term "Western music" (sometimes Western European music) will be used in this study to refer to the kind of music typically associated with traditional music education practices in North America.
Both Cox (2006) and Walker (2006) provide examples of how early practices in music education were influenced by racial recapitulation theories: “the somewhat poetic idea, which certainly has biological analogy, that each child...passes through the same general stages that the race has passed through in its rise from savagery to civilisation” (Cleverley and Phillips, qtd. in Cox, 406-07). Racial recapitulation theories, one recalls, were used for many colonialist purposes, not the least of which was to position the values of Whites as stemming from a superior, more advanced stage of development than other races and thereby rationalize colonialism as a form of benevolence (see, for e.g., McClintock 1995). It is not surprising, then, to find racial recapitulation theories attractive to those in music education who could then better rationalize the use of Western European music as the basis for music instruction. According to Cox, the child study movement of the early twentieth century was significantly influenced by such racial recapitulation theories, particularly as espoused by the psychologist, G. Stanley Hall. Hall, in fact, wrote the foreword to American music educator Satis Coleman’s Creative Music for Children: A Plan of Training Based on the Natural Evolution of Music Including the Making and Playing of Instruments Dancing-Singing-Poetry (1922), in which Coleman wrote, “Being little savages, they can understand savage music. I shall find the child’s own savage level, and lift him [sic] gradually up to higher forms...
The natural evolution of music shall be my guide in leading the child from the simple to the complex” (qtd. in Cox 2006, 407).

Walker (2006) similarly points to the influence of recapitulation theories on the pedagogical approaches of Carl Orff and Dorothee Gunter: “Gunter and Orff believed that children should learn simple repetitive patterns first because, as primitives in their stage of development, they naturally take to primitive music because it was [sic] repetitive and simple. They then progress to more complex music as they develop physically and psychologically, especially cognitively” (Walker 2006, 457). In contradistinction to recapitulation theories and their influence on music pedagogy, Walker cites the examples of the Kaulong of Papua New Guinea and the Ituri Pymgie of central Africa, who do not have a separate category of music for children. Instead, children in these cultures are inducted directly into their society’s adult music. This, claims Walker, “indicates a clear difference from Western practices in attitudes to musical development. In the West, musical development is thought by many to be evident in discrete stages of cognitive and affective development matched by incremental progressions from simple to complex musical activities, eventually leading to adult music” (ibid., 457-58).

One need only look at any beginning band method book or provincial elementary music curriculum for further evidence of the continued belief

_________________________

7 For more on stage theories in music education, see Koopman (1995).
children should begin at a ‘savage level’ and progress incrementally towards ‘higher forms.’ One might also look at the influence and continued use of psychology-influenced tests of musical aptitude.\(^8\) Testing in music, claims Boyle (1992), offers “objective bases for instructional, curriculum, and program changes that take into account students’ individual differences” (qtd. in Reynolds and Hyun 2004, 18). These theories claim to be value-neutral in spite of their obvious normativity; witness the admonishment that “researchers and teachers would do well to achieve consensus about music constructs” such as talent, ability, musicality, and aptitude (Reynolds and Hyun, 18; emph. added). And yet as Cox points out, “we now comprehend that music does not simply progress from the simple to the complex (Blacking, 1987)... [T]here is a danger in equating the natural with the socially limited: the potentialities of human nature become ignored” (2006, 410).

My second point is that the content of education is normative, exposing particular values. The endorsement of stage theories is consistent with philosophy that positions the humanist subject of the Enlightenment—the autonomous individual—as the teleological basis of education (see, for e.g., Hirst and Peters 1970; Marshall 1996). That is, there is an idealized finished product (the autonomous agent) that education is to bring about through the natural, and incremental, process of development. By

\(^8\) See www.sc.edu/library/music/kits.html, accessed May 2, 2007, for a summary of such tests.
constructing stages or categories of such constructs as talent, ability, or musicality hierarchically, it is possible to measure, rank, and compare, as well as evaluate according to the ideal, which in music education almost always means the professional standards of music making in the Western tradition. Music education practices predicated on stage theories can be viewed as an example of, as I explain more fully in Chapter Two, what Foucault calls “discipline,” which normalizes while simultaneously individualizing.

Broadly speaking, then, curriculum and instruction in liberal democracies is premised on the ideal of the autonomous individual. Levinson (1999), in fact, argues that not just autonomy, but the modern institution of the school is “derived from” liberal political theory (7; see also: Peters 1996, 40-41). “Education,” she writes, “lies at the heart of the liberal project; it is upon the realization of liberal educational goals that success of liberalism itself depends” (5; see also: Marshall 1996). “Not only is the production of autonomous pupils an ideal which is fully consistent with liberal-democratic society,” claims Indabawa (1997), “but failure to grant pupils’ autonomy in that context stands as a negation of democracy and democratic values” (193). In music education, the continued emphasis on staff notation provides a small example of how curricular content is

---

9 See, for example, Bonnet and Cuypers (2003); Callan (1988); Devine and Irwin (2005); Indabawa (1997); Levinson (1999); Marshall (1996); Olssen (2005); Smith (1997); Wringe (1997).
connected to particular views of musical autonomy and is reflective of a particular value orientation. Mills and McPherson (2006, 156) point to how the use of staff notation is linked to assumptions about musical literacy and autonomy, even though staff notation has very limited application for students in their out-of-school music making (see also: Regelski 1998, 14). That is, it is assumed that the ability to decipher staff notation or, rarely, write music using staff notation is superior to the ability to copy the music of others by ear, or create one’s own music by ear. Such assumptions do not just point to a different set of musical skills, but rest upon fundamentally different conceptions about the kinds of beings we are and the uses to which music should be put.

Practices in music education continue to emphasize staff notation (Mills and McPherson 2006), traditional orchestral instruments (Regelski 1998, 14), and music as autonomous object (Barrett 2006; Regelski 1998, 8-19). Such practices inevitably lead to the production of one kind of musical subject rather than another. Music education is currently based on what music is rather than what it does (Barrett 2006; Regelski 1998). This conceptualization positions music as something to know (or even know  

10 The assumption here is that the out-of-school music making of students tends toward what Lucy Green (2001) and others refer to as informal music making—the kinds often associated with “garage bands.” Somewhat surprisingly, however, McPherson and Davidson (2006), in the same volume as Mills and McPherson (2006), write about how students from the age of ten onwards “may be motivated to learn by ear rather than a desire to become musically literate” (347), exposing a normative belief that musical literacy is determined by knowing how to read music.
about) rather than as something with which to engage or use. This is in stark contrast to cultures emphasizing the uses of music in daily life, where a knowledge of “how to harness” music’s powers is considered to be “an important part of common sense” (DeNora 2000, ix). As I demonstrate in this investigation, it is also in stark contrast to the way early bands—those of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—approached music. For those in early civic bands, music was an activity, not an object of study. Unencumbered by the expectations of schooling where all subject matter must lead incrementally towards the ideal of autonomy, members of early bands were free to do music for the sheer enjoyment it afforded. Consequently, engaging in “banding,” as I argue in Chapters Four through Six, resulted in a very different kind of musicality than that fashioned by ‘bands-as-music education’ today.

**Becoming the Knowing Musical Subject**

With the publication of his book, *A Philosophy of Music Education* in 1970, which espoused the concept of “music education as aesthetic education,” Bennett Reimer (1970; 1989; 2003) established himself as the dominant voice in music education philosophy in North America. Paramount for Reimer’s philosophical position is that “the nature and value of music education are determined primarily by the nature and value of music.” His
philosophy of music education is largely appreciation-based, and promotes a Susanne Langer- and Leonard Meyer-influenced theory of musical meaning that considers education in music to be about the “education of feeling” (Reimer 2003, 72).11 Reimer claims his philosophy “will explain the foundational dimensions of music on which these claims [that music is a way of knowing, a mode of cognition] can be built” (ibid., 5). According to Reimer, “aesthetic education in music attempts to enhance learnings related to the distinctive capacity of musical sounds... to create and share meanings only sounds structured to do so can yield” (ibid., 11). Therefore, “the primary mission of music education is to make musical values widely and deeply available” (ibid., ix). For Reimer, value and meaning are placed within musical sounds rather than within people. Moreover, these sounds are knowable; there is truth to be found within them, and this truth is universal and timeless (there is a nature and value of all music; there are “foundational dimensions”). The goal, through the “education of feeling,” is to become a ‘knowing subject’—an individual who, through music education, becomes more human as a result of their musical experience. An ethical, interpersonal component does not seem to be present. I consider Reimer’s philosophy to be instrumental insofar as it promotes the idea that while performance programs may serve as the basis of instruction, ongoing

11 This is obviously a reductive account. As well, it should be noted in Reimer’s (2003) most recent edition the emphasis on listening/appreciation has softened somewhat.
participation beyond the school years is not the primary goal. Instead, some form of edification is claimed to result from an education in music, after which time engagement in the form of making (production) becomes incidental.

In *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education*, David Elliott (1995) presents an alternative account of music education philosophy emphasizing the active nature of music making. Elliott too bases his philosophical position on the ‘nature and value [Elliott uses ‘significance’] of music.’ While he claims his *praxial* philosophy is very different from that of aesthetic education, Elliott’s position shares much of the same philosophical ground when it comes to the utility of music for people. “All forms of music making,” he writes, “involve a multidimensional form of thinking that is also a unique source of one of the most important kinds of knowledge human beings can gain” (1995, 33; emph. added). For Elliott, performance is the path to the educative goods of music: “self-growth, self-knowledge, musical enjoyment, and self-esteem” (ibid., 297). None of these “educative goods,” however, are presented in social terms.¹² The ethical imperative in Elliott’s account is strictly personal, if not outright egocentric. ‘Musicing’—Elliott’s contraction of ‘music making’ (ibid., 40)—is something done ‘for its own

---

¹² Patricia O’Toole argues for an expanded concept of musicing (one closer to Small’s musicking) with greater emphasis on the social aspects of music making—ones often dismissed under the banner of “nonmusical” concerns. See “Why Don’t I Feel Included in These Musics, or Matters” in David Elliott (ed.), *Praxial Music Education*, pp. 297-307 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).
sake’—“for the sake of the self” (ibid., 118; orig. emph.). Elliott’s ‘sake of self’ is in fact closer to an Enlightenment ideal of self-love. Modern notions of self-growth, writes Olssen, are connected to individualism, “rather than linked, as [they were] in antiquity, to the care for others, involving necessary sacrifice of the self” (2006, 171). Through our enjoyable engagement with music (“Knowledge is the key to enjoyment and control,” claims Elliott (1995, 117)), we open the possibility for attaining a ‘flow’ experience (which is implied as being somehow different from Reimer’s ‘aesthetic experience’). Through this special feeling individuals apparently grow and become, as in Reimer’s philosophical account, more human.

Much has been written comparing these two supposedly “rival” philosophies (see, for e.g., Gould 2004; Koopman 1998; Lamb 1994; Mark 1982; Määttänen 2002; McCarthy and Goble 2002; Spychiger 1995; Westerlund 2003). For my part, I do not see as many theoretical differences between these two positions as the antagonistic tone of the philosophies’ authors toward each other would seem to suggest. I see Reimer’s consistent references to the importance of professional cohesion (e.g., 2003, 1-2) as an admission that ‘music education as aesthetic education’ is more about advocacy for school music than a philosophical account of it.¹³ Music Matters seems to me to read as an argument for performance rather than listening.

¹³ In the Preface to his second edition, Reimer describes aesthetic education as the “bedrock upon which our self-concept as a profession rests” (1989, xi).
(the perceived emphasis of aesthetic education) as the appropriate medium for school music instruction. Although Elliott offers a thorough philosophical explication of musical performance, it is ultimately unclear in his account why the performance of music deserves a place in the compulsory schooling curriculum since he does not offer a sufficient philosophy of society or general education (see Jorgensen 1995). Despite the different weightings of making and perceiving, the focus of each rests squarely on personal knowledge.\(^{14}\)

I have tried to briefly outline some of the primary features of Reimer’s and Elliott’s philosophies to show how, despite their apparent differences, they both view music as a way of knowing rather than as a way of living. This is critically important point for two aspects related to the humanist subject and musical engagement. First, I suggest conceiving of music as a way of knowing is entirely consistent with the Enlightenment humanist view of the individual as a rational, knowing self. The crucial twist I observe, however, is that rather than compete with the ideal of the (male) rational self (counterposed to the female emotional self), theories of aesthetic education attempt to capitalize on the Enlightenment subject by arguing the rational self is incomplete without the romantically-inspired ‘feelingful’ self. Put differently, the life of feeling possesses an inherent rationality that needs to be learned through involvement with the arts. Just witness, for example,\(^{14}\)

\(^{14}\) As I argue in Chapter Six, this is consistent with institutional expectations that education be about knowledge, especially of a lasting nature.
Harry Broudy’s (1972) well-known phrase, “enlightened cherishing.” By being better able to know the life of feeling, individuals can become more human and know more truth about the world.

Second, knowing is, in and of itself, inert.¹⁵ That is, knowing can exist in stasis. There is no imperative to engage, and while a counter argument can be made (and likely would be made by Reimer and Elliott) that knowing creates the desire for more knowledge, their focus on knowing-through-music appears entirely rooted in the individual and the quest for Truth (or “Enlightenment”), something entirely consistent with the autonomous, unencumbered individual as presented in liberal political thought.¹⁶ The focus of music education is on the individual becoming an autonomous, knowing subject, rather than an ethical subject that considers the various uses and purposes to which music and human action can be put. The result, I contend, is there is no reason or compulsion for people to continue to engage in lifelong music making, because once the subject knows the truth the educational task is complete. That is, just knowing the truth (or perhaps in this case, the Truth), in the form of apprehending certain special qualities in music or music making does not provide, in and of itself, the imperative

---

¹⁵ I need to qualify my point since Foucault’s Nietzschean-inspired idea of the ‘will to knowledge’ or ‘will to truth’ obviously implies momentum and direction. Furthermore, Foucault has written that knowledge is used “for cutting” (NGH, 380). [See list of Foucault Abbreviations]

¹⁶ Karl Marx noted this autonomous, ‘egoistic man’ was “an individual withdrawn behind his private interests and whims and separated from the community” (qtd. in Peters and Burbules 2004, 40).
for repeatedly engaging with music in the way repeated engagement with physical activity is commonly accepted as contributing to one’s physical (and perhaps mental) health.

**Music Making and Life After Graduation**

Thomas Regelski (1998), pointing to the low number of students who continue to be musically active beyond the formal school years, argues school music programs are ineffective at promoting lifelong engagement with music. Regelski’s argument focuses on both (a) the questionable merit of using traditional orchestra instruments given the unlikelihood they will be used for music making beyond high school graduation, and (b) instructional practices that fail to build the kind of skills (e.g., playing by ear, chamber music making, playing with accompaniment software) necessary for music making beyond high school graduation. One of the central issues here—and in music education generally—centers on the kind of musical engagement people are to have throughout their lives.

Whether school music programs should promote or advance lifelong participation in *active* music making is a normative and political question—one that also begs the question of what, precisely, constitutes active music making. Composing, arranging, songwriting, ‘scratching,’ deejaying, listening, compiling one’s music lists on personal listening devices, listening,
or other activities related to music might all be argued as legitimate forms of, to borrow Christopher Small’s (1998) term, ‘musicking’ (in contrast to Elliott’s more restricted term, ‘musicing’). If rationales for school music are to be viewed non-instrumentally, however, there should be connection between what is done in school and what is done later in life. I am not denying or devaluing other forms of musicking, but if school music takes the form of performance programs, then one should expect students to play or sing beyond high school graduation. My argument is based, in part, on Lave and Wenger (1991), who argue learning that is not about induction into social practices through what they call “legitimate peripheral participation” suffers from distortion in many forms, not the least of which is conceiving of learning in terms of exchange value. Music education proponents who argue music learning is best done through performance even though performance is not the intended outcome are guilty of this kind of distortion. That is, students become the object of “didactic caretakers” rather than co-participating subjects in a “real” human practice (112).

If musical learning is not to suffer the distortions of exchange value, then a more overt connection must exist between school music and life after

\[17\]

As will become clear in Chapters Four through Six, music education advocacy arguments have suffered and continue to suffer from the tension existing between the knowledge expectations of schooling (i.e., that schooling prepare students with knowledge of a lasting nature)—the kinds of expectations the philosophies of Reimer and Elliott attempt to address—and the active, performative, social, and most importantly, ephemeral nature of music making.
graduation. My contention, however, is that irrespective of the argument of
whether or not music education should promote lifelong participation in
music (regardless of form), present philosophical beliefs in music education
militate against lifelong music making (e.g., playing or singing) since they
are based on the Enlightenment conceptualization of ‘Man’ as the
unencumbered knower, and this knower has no need for music once the
stage of autonomy has been reached. Knowing (rather than doing) music is
conceptualized as something central to the well-rounded Western Mind (see
Chapter Six). One of the hypotheses guiding the need for this study is that
education in liberal democracies, based on the ideal of the modernist
humanist subject of the Enlightenment (the “autonomous individual”),
militates against lifelong music making (or “lifespan engagement,” as Myers
(2008) puts it) in music. Because school music teaching/learning practices
emphasize music as something to know (aiding in our “autonomy,”
humanness, and well-roundedness) rather than something to use or do, an
instrumentalist logic renders the doing of music irrelevant once requisite
knowledge has been attained.

In addition to the argument that consistency should exist between the
purported benefits of music education and what is actually done in school
music, my position is that lifelong participation in active music making in a
recreational sense is a fundamentally good thing—for individuals and
society. Active engagement in music is, to use Regelski’s words, “time well
spent,” or “good time” (1998, 21-22). This admittedly normative assertion is based primarily on three things: (a) my own experience as a classroom music teacher for fourteen years; (b) philosophical and advocacy arguments for the value of music education; and (c) preliminary readings of the literature on liberalism (e.g., Levinson 1999; Callan and White 2003), educational philosophy (e.g., Blake 2003; Kohli 1995), poststructuralism (e.g., Cherryholmes 1988), postcolonialism (e.g., Willinsky 1998), leisure (e.g., Stebbins 1998), and quality-of-life (e.g., McGillivary 2007; Rapley 2003). My assertion is also based on my reading of Foucault’s *The Care of the Self*, from which I struck on the idea of music teaching and learning being based on a medical rather than a pedagogical model—something that emphasizes the non-instrumental aspect of musical engagement. My initial aforementioned readings have raised questions in my mind regarding the way in which education functions in liberal democracies (instrumentally towards autonomy), the way colonial practices operate (imposition of the “dominant mode,” as Edward Said puts it¹⁸), the way language operates (to create reality), and the ways in which people can be said to be happy, fulfilled, or live a “meaningful” life (see Hatch et al. 2007). I suspect recreational music makers do not volitionally engage in the activity as a

---

source of knowledge, as proffered by both Reimer and Elliott, but out of a sense of what Foucault describes as the Greek ethic of “care of the self.”

Summary

Research is commonly thought to arise from hunches, suspicions, and tentative hypotheses. Mine is that fifty plus years of large ensemble music making in Canadian schools has not led to an appreciable increase in the making of music in everyday life. I am not suggesting music making is the best or only form of musical engagement, nor am I denying the indisputable fact music consumption appears to be at an all-time historical high. I am only asserting my suspicion it is a distinct possibility the practices of music education in school might be functioning in ways militating against lifelong music making by fashioning a specific kind of musicality. I further suspect the aims and orientations of school music are an outgrowth of educational practices in liberal democracies, where the presumed logical outcome is the autonomous individual, whose completeness (or assumed completeness) is predicated on the very removal of the imperative of need or compulsion: an

---

19 I am alluding here to Foucault’s description of ‘care of the self’ as an ethical mode of existence. Foucault writes that ‘care of the self’ “came to constitute a social practice, giving rise to relationships between individuals, to exchanges and communications, and at times even to institutions” (CS, 45).
autonomous being has no need for ritualistic activities, such as music, or ethical obligations.

**RATIONALES**

**Why ‘the Subject’?**

Derrida states: “I believe that at a certain level both of experience and of philosophical and scientific discourse, one cannot get along without the notion of the subject. It is a question of knowing where it comes from and how it functions” (qtd. in Peters and Burbules 2004, 67). The subject has fascinated philosophers from the early Greeks to the present (Martin and Barresi 2006). Although often taken for granted in day-to-day living, how we conceptualize our ‘selves’ and sociality has dramatic consequences for our material existence (Olssen 2006; Rose 1998). As Foucault shows in *The Care of the Self*, Western existence has become largely premised on the Delphic precept *gnothi sauton*, or ‘know thyself.’ This precept has served as the basis of the ‘knowing’ humanist subject that philosophers such as Kant and Hegel helped transform into the “autonomous individual” of the Enlightenment (Atkins 2005). The autonomous individual has, in turn, formed the basis of philosophy of education in liberal democracies (Callan 1988; Levinson 1999; Marshall 1996; Hirst and Peters 1970). The goals of
education, under liberalism, proceed instrumentally towards autonomy. The importance of public education to the production of selves is evidenced in the degree to which people have historically fought over its control (Lawr and Gidney 1973). This, Carlson (1998) points out, is because how the subject is conceptualized fundamentally determines who and what we become (198).

Thanks to postmodern scholarship challenging traditional modernist discourses, increasing attention is being paid within the field of education to the question of the ‘subject.’ Gert Biesta, for example, presents a cogent summary of the problem. In brief, education is viewed as an asymmetrical social relationship: “a relationship between someone who already is a subject (the educator) and someone who still has to become a subject (the child)” (1998, 1-2). Viewed in this way, education is an instrumental means of bringing about subjectivity—something Biesta calls ‘education as manipulation.’ Biesta provides a thorough explanation of how certain modernist views of education and the subject operate, dispelling the notion an absolute subject “precedes, constitutes, and determines intersubjectivity” (ibid., 12). He argues instead for ‘pedagogy without humanism,’ something he believes is possible through new forms of subjectivity—forms that eschew individuality based on a “deep truth of what it is to be human” (ibid., 13).

20 Biesta cites Kant’s essay, *Uber Padagogik*: “Man [sic] can only become man through education. Everything he is, he is because of what education has made him to be” (1998, 3).
One of the problems with ‘deep truths,’ is they invariably aspire to the autonomous individual of the Enlightenment, an individual that, again, can only be brought about through the instrumental activity of education. Biesta asks of this notion: What is the point at which the child becomes a “real human being?...Who designs the entrance exam for humanity?” (ibid., 11).

Without knowledge of how discourse constructs subjectivities, the music education profession risks perpetuating the belief current practices are inevitable or the logical result of universal truths about human beings and/or about music, rather than the historical outcome of many chance contingencies. By examining specific, secondary instrumental discursive and non-discursive practices within music education, I interrogate ways in which school bands and music education help to fashion particular subjectivities, and speculate on how these impact on lifelong participation in music. I also show how music education might be said to contribute to a sense of who we are (or who we think we are), how we live our lives, and how we might conceive our lives differently.

Why Foucault?

I would like my books to be a kind of tool-box which others can rummage through to find a tool which they can use.

---

21 Biesta notes Foucault does not object to the ethos of Enlightenment, with its emphasis on a critical ‘ontology of ourselves.’ Foucault’s objection is to the belief that such a project can be based on deep truth (1998, 8-9).
however they wish in their own area... I would like the little volume that I want to write on disciplinary systems to be useful to an educator, a warden, a magistrate, a conscientious objector. I don’t write for an audience, I write for users, not readers.

—Foucault

“There has been,” write Baker and Heyning, “an enormous proliferation and swarming around the name Foucault across multiple sites of production” (2004, 6). Foucault has inspired scholars in a diverse range of fields, including an entire cadre of academics devoted to the study of Foucault. As Baker and Heyning note, a “virtual cottage industry has grown up around Foucault’s name on the internet” (ibid., 8). In addition to countless internet sites on a variety of topics, there are discussion groups (e.g. foucault.info/Foucault-L), websites (e.g. michel-foucault.com), blogs (e.g. foucaultblog.wordpress.com), a journal (Foucault Studies), annual “Foucault Circle” conferences (including the first Foucault Circle of Canada Conference, March 14, 2008), Foucault archives (http://foucault.info), physical sites (see Baker and Heyning 2004, 10), and even playful online trading cards (www.theorycards.org.uk/card03.htm). Given the connection between education and questions of who we are or who might become, it is hardly surprising the ‘Foucault effect’ has found a warm reception within

23 Baker and Heyning are not just spouting hyperbole. They thoroughly substantiate their claim with what I have found to be the most comprehensive review (as of this writing) of Foucaultian scholarship.
certain constituencies in education (see, for e.g., Ball 1990; Peters and Burbules 2004; Scheurich and Mackenzie 2005). As Tina Besley suggests, Foucault highlights the ways in which “one can question the discourse of disciplines and institutions and their practices” (2002, 3). My hope is this piece of research might contribute to the beginnings of Foucaultian scholarship in music education, a field currently not represented in the ‘cadre of academics’ studying Foucault.

Elizabeth St. Pierre cautions it is dangerous to read Foucault carelessly (2004, 325). Bryan Palmer laments, for example, that Foucault is the most referred to and pirated, but least read contemporary thinker (ctd. in Prado 2000, vii). For this study I have read six of Foucault’s eight major books, as well as many important articles. I have relied heavily on several secondary sources at times, in part because I do not presume to be a Foucaultian authority and it seems prudent, when dealing with a thinker as sophisticated as Foucault to utilize the thinking of people who are authorities, and in part because my goal is to utilize Foucault’s thinking, not his actual works. As suggested in the epigram above, I simply wish to use many of the conceptual tools Foucault offers in order to examine selected discourses in music education in a way I do not believe has been done to date, in order to

24 Note there is a ‘Foucault and Education’ Special Interest Group within the American Educational Research Association.
25 Foucault writes that ‘everything is dangerous’ (GE, 256), as almost everyone who writes about Foucault is wont to point out. [See list of Foucault Abbreviations]
offer provocative insights for reconceptualizing how we do music education, particularly in schools. “At some point, the Foucault police will come after us,” warns St. Pierre. “When they do, we should be able to explain the enabling conditions of our Foucault, our desires in putting him to work, and the effects of our projects on real people” (2004, 328; orig. emph.). I am hopeful my use of Foucault will satisfy specialists and generalist alike.

Foucault’s insight, described by C.G. Prado (quoting Rorty), was the realization “that anything could be made to look good or bad, important or unimportant, useful or useless, by being redescribed.” The point here is that we learned how to change and manipulate the language we use to articulate even the most fundamental ideas. By adopting new idioms, coining more inclusive/exclusive neologisms, shifting emphases, and altering nuances, we can enhance or impugn ideas without raising issues of truth. In other words, the glimpsed potency of redescription developed until it “became possible, toward the end of the nineteenth century, to . . . juggle several descriptions . . . without asking which one was right.” It became possible “to see redescription as a tool rather than a claim to have discovered essence.” (2000, 47-48)

My aim in this study is to offer an account that provokes different kinds of thinking about music education by describing—or perhaps redescribing—what I see in the discursive and nondiscursive practices of band participation. At one point Foucault wrote that his aim was “to show people that they are much freer than they feel, that people accept as truth, as evidence, some themes which have been built up at a certain moment during history, and that this so-called evidence can be criticized and
destroyed” (TS, 10). Modifying and adapting this idea to music education is what I hope to accomplish.

Importantly, Foucault does not impose a prescribed path, nor does he subscribe to revisionist history. His is largely a descriptive project intent on demonstrating how the ‘real’ world is not as natural or universal as it sometimes appears. Foucault simply seeks to demonstrate that our lived world is not an inevitability. His work exemplifies a historical approach to the problems of today he terms “the history of the present” (DP, 31). My conclusions are offered as particular readings intended to challenge the assumed objectivity that often occurs within music education. I acknowledge, however, that what I offer will necessarily be no better or no worse than what I challenge.

Why Discourse?

Researchers in education who call their ad hoc attempts to make sense of dialogue “discourse analysis,” are not only bad scholars: they are giving education a bad name. (Schoenfeld 1999, qtd. in Flinders and Richardson 2002, 1168)

---

26 See list of Foucault Abbreviations.
27 As Foucault himself writes, “the only valid tribute to thought such as Nietzsche’s is precisely to use it, to deform it, to make it groan and protest. And if commentators then say that I am being faithful or unfaithful to Nietzsche, that is of absolutely no interest” (qtd. in St. Pierre 2004, 326).
28 About genealogy, Prado writes: “[This] means that if [Foucault] is right, what he offers is on a par with what he rejects” (2000, 46).
Although Lee Bartel (2006, 343-44) identifies seven trends in “data acquisition and knowledge development” in academic research in education, such as epistemological complexity, data complexity, and analytical complexity, evidence of what Bartel describes is difficult to find in music education research literature. Music education research remains conservative, and largely rooted in traditional positivist-empirical research paradigms (see Heller and O’Connor 2006; Asmus and Radocy 2006; Bresler and Stake 2006; Flinders and Richardson 2002). If this study were positioned in the fields of education (notwithstanding the quotation above), literary studies, cultural studies, or dozens of other scholarly fields, a defense of the decision to study discourses would probably be unnecessary. In many fields other than music education, ‘making sense of dialogue’ is far from a clear-cut matter.\textsuperscript{29} Skepticism over the transparency of texts and the accepted ‘real’ world, Allan Luke (1995, 7) points out, was central to Foucault’s work.

The connection between language and meaning is complex. For some, meaning is contained solely in the words themselves, whereas for others meaning is inseparable from context. That is, meaning is carried in language (the things we say) \textit{and} in the things we do and produce (the things we can see). Gilles Deleuze (1988) refers to these aspects as the ‘sayable’ and the

\textsuperscript{29} I am using dialogue in a broad sense. Schoenfeld, in the epigram, may be interpreting it more narrowly.
visible.’ The sayable and visible are also spoken about in terms of discursive and non-discursive practices (which should not be confused with discursive formations; see Chapter Two). It is important to note, however, a distinction between the discursive and non-discursive is not always possible. “When one discusses a practice, one need not draw sharp distinctions between the discursive and non-discursive elements, because at the level of a practice they are entwined...[T]hey bleed into each other” (May 2006, 92). Practices, in other words, create forms of knowledge that we articulate in language. This process works in the reverse as well. As Cleo Cherryholmes explains, “we continually project what we say and write onto the nondiscursive world around us” (1988, 9). The distinction between the sayable and the visible blurs further when introducing the concept of discourse. The Oxford English Dictionary defines discourse as somewhat similar to a formal conversation, usually on a particular matter: “(1) written or spoken communication or debate; (2) a formal discussion of a topic in speech or writing” (OED online). Indeed, Cherryholmes calls discourse “a more or less orderly exchange of ideas” (1988, 9).

The term “discourse” has become, at least within certain disciplinary fields, something of a catchall phrase referring not just to the exchange of ideas in language, but to the ideas and values embedded within them (e.g., Bernstein 1990; de Saussure 2007), the processes of interaction (e.g., Bernstein 1990; Partington 2006), and the systems of thought that delimit
what can and cannot be said (Foucault, AK). That is, there is usually an agreement that discourse conveys “more than the utterances composing it” (de Saussure 2007, 188). Any given discourse is connected with other discourses that precede it and surround it. When these discourses begin, to borrow a Foucaultian term, to coagulate, they create commonly accepted meanings, often expressed as beliefs, truths, or ideology. James Gee prefers to distinguish ‘discourse’ as “language in use” from ‘Discourse,’ which he claims “is a distinctive way to use language integrated with ‘other stuff’ so as to enact a particular type of (however negotiable and contestable) socially situated identity (type of person)” (2003, 46). With respect to Foucault’s use of discourse, Veyne goes further, suggesting discourse does not refer to what is said (1997, 146), but instead to the invisible determining force behind it. That is, “discourse refers to what was really said, unbeknownst to the speakers” by a limiting, preconceptual “incongruous grammar” (ibid., 157).

For some, the increasing scope of the word discourse is problematic. Keith Sawyer (2002), for example, discusses the “competing usages” of ‘discourse.’ Sawyer situates his discussion within the larger framework of the human sciences. He argues contemporary usages have conflated ‘discourse’ well beyond its original meaning. In the ‘standard usage’ of the 1940s, for
example, discourse referred to a “unit of language larger than a sentence,” whereas today its usage often goes well beyond just language (2002, 434). It is not just the conflation of discourse beyond language that Sawyer finds troubling. His objection lies in the way the broader usage of the term has been inappropriately attributed to Foucault, partly out of academic carelessness, and partly out of an attempt to capitalize on the cache of the name Foucault. “Referencing Foucault,” he writes, “has become an academic emblem of affiliation, indexing a certain intellectual stance” (ibid., 450).

Sawyer’s article provides a cogent analysis of both Foucault’s usage of discourse, and the alternative usages of French structuralism, Althusser’s Marxism, and Lacan’s psychoanalysis that have influenced contemporary application. According to Sawyer, Foucault’s original use of discourse must be understood in the context of 1960s’ French structuralism, particularly that of Saussure (ibid., 439). Although Foucault sought to distance himself from

30 And discourse analysis is the study of these sequences of sentences (Sawyer 2002, 434).
31 Sawyer’s point is well-taken, but he does gloss over the fact Foucault himself admits to have “used and abused in many different senses” the word discourse (AK, 120). The Archaeology of Knowledge is filled with many comments where Foucault seems to admit to imprecise word usage. To cite but one example: “Instead of gradually reducing the rather fluctuating meaning of the word ‘discourse,’ I believe that I have in fact added to its meanings: treating it sometimes as the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a certain number of statements; and have I not allowed this same word ‘discourse,’ which should have served as a boundary around the term ‘statement,’ to vary as I shifted my analysis or its point of application, as the statement faded from view?” (AK, 90).
structuralism (publicly proclaiming himself not a structuralist), Sawyer shows that Foucault’s archaeological work is clearly structuralist. But where Saussure is concerned with signifier and signified, Foucault is concerned only with a structuralism of practice (ibid., 440).

Sawyer speculates that the broader use of discourse stems from the connection Althusser makes between it and ideology (ibid., 442). He also suggests Lacan’s use of discourse—where the world is structured like language and that individuals are therefore structured through language—resonated strongly with British social theorists of the 1970s and with poststructural theorists positing a ‘social construction of the self’ (ibid., 449). On this view, “subjectivity...is always discursive” (Weedon, qtd. in ibid., 449). The utilization of the term discourse, argues Sawyer, has occurred due to reservations about language and its associations with structuralism (ibid.).

In spite of Sawyer’s desire to use the term discourse restrictively, I will use the term discourse in its broader, more commonly used sense, intending the word as encompassing both discursive and non-discursive practices. When I specifically intend to distinguish discursive from non-discursive practices I will use these terms, although at times I will also speak of

---

32 Structuralism was an attempt to "evacuate the concept of the event...In that sense, I don't see who could be more of an antistructuralist than myself" (TP, 115).
33 Sawyer is not alone. Other commentators concur that Foucault’s archaeological work bears the marks of structuralism (see Chapter Two).
discourses and practices (as the sayable and the visible). I will use the singular (discourse) in connection with general discursive and non-discursive disciplinary practices, and the plural (discourses) in connection with smaller conversations (almost always discursive in these cases) within the discourse. I will avoid the use of ‘Discourse,’ since to me it seems redundant. I will refer, for example, to the CBJ/CW discourses (the various conversations within the journal), but also to the discourse of CBJ/CW (the “big picture” of language and practices that delimit what can and cannot be said).

This study is all about discourses. It is about how what we say and do helps to construct what we consider “real,” and contributes to how we choose to live our lives. More specifically, this study is aimed at addressing the problem of how what is said and done in music education serves to fashion lives and influence a particular modality of living. I am not claiming to offer privileged insights into these practices, although I do hope to “make sense” of at least some of them in the way that, for example, Foucault went about making sense of the Truth about sexuality in The History of Sexuality. Admittedly, to suggest our sense of musicality is rooted in discourse may strike some as pretending that people do not engage in real music making. Foucault’s colleague, Paul Veyne, however, chastises those who fail to grasp Foucault’s intellectual insights in studying discourse. He points out, for example, “the fact that sexuality is based on discourse and practice” does not mean that Foucault is claiming, as some would have it, that sex organs
do not exist (1997, 170). Similarly, my research is an attempt to show that the teaching and learning of music is more than just the teaching and learning of music. By claiming that discourse is constitutive of ‘the real’ I am not suggesting music and music making do not exist (or that they are merely secondary effects).

I would not describe my efforts at discourse analysis as “ad hoc,” although my efforts do not fall neatly into well-established methodologies. In conducting my analysis I came to better understand the concerns of Flinders and Richardson, in that there are few established and accepted procedures in discourse analysis safeguarding against lapsing into unrestrained relativistic subjectivism, something Gee points out is problematic in education, where discourse analysis “sometimes means no more than anecdotal reflections on written or oral texts...[or] proselytizing for one's own politics in the absence of any close study of oral or written language” (2003, 20).\textsuperscript{34} My efforts at “discourse analysis” have, as explained in Chapter Three, borrowed from the field of corpus assisted discourse studies in order to provide for a more systematic examination of the journal discourses and, as articulated in Chapter Two, have relied heavily on the work of Michel Foucault, upon which I have constructed my theoretical and methodological frameworks. Following Foucault, I contend that disciplinary discourses help

\textsuperscript{34} For an example of this, see Sim (2002). Although a substantial piece of research in its own right, Sim’s study of discourse is considerably different from what I have undertaken here.
to construct who and what we are and how we live our lives. Studying these discourses is a valid and necessary exercise that allows music educators to question and examine the taken for granted, common sense, and the obvious. In order to avoid the criticism above of “giving education a bad name,” this study utilizes methodological and conceptual tools that, I believe, allow for a different reading of disciplinary practices. While Foucault does not claim to offer (although some critics think he does) some sort of omniscient hermeneutic, his work demonstrates there are different ways of showing how things came to be the way they are. In the words of Veyne, “a humanist is someone who interrogates people and texts at the level of what they are saying, or rather does not even suspect that there could be any other level” (1997, 177).

**Why the Canadian Band Association?**

Although the boundaries of music education are open to contestation, I will consider the term as I defined it earlier: the profession that has developed since the Second World War involved with all aspects of the teaching and learning of music in schools, including the preparation of music teachers. Music education is conceptually dominated by the large ensemble paradigm: choirs, orchestras, and bands. This is not surprising, given that music teacher education/training programs in Canadian universities are
almost exclusively based on elementary-choral-instrumental streaming models that take place in schools (departments, faculties, etc.) of music. Entrance into music teacher education is based almost exclusively on a performance audition, which is almost always done on traditional orchestral (string-wind-percussion) instruments, piano, or voice, and almost always involves repertoire from the Western classical tradition. Students then proceed to participate in large ensemble music making (choirs-orchestras-bands) while at university schools of music where the teacher education curriculum is designed with many ‘method’ classes preparing students for their future roles as either elementary, choir, or instrumental teachers. While there may be exceptions to this general process, they are most certainly few and far between. As a result, future music teachers are more than likely to be, at the secondary level, choir or band (or, much less frequently, orchestra) directors who fill teaching jobs in schools where choirs-orchestras-bands exist.

Concert bands are, at present, the predominant medium for music instruction in Canadian schools at the secondary level. Due to the provincial nature of education in Canada, specific participation rates are difficult if not impossible to determine. Nevertheless, anecdotal evidence provides a compelling argument that instrumental music activity in the form of large ensembles continues to be the music education offering of choice for most

---

See Nettl (1995) for a descriptive example of a similar norm in large university schools of music in the United States.
schools. That bands outnumber choirs in schools is, again, difficult to establish definitively given the lack of national figures, but anecdotal evidence supports that bands are the most common ensemble in schools. For example, the Canadian Band Association, whose members are overwhelmingly school band directors, has a membership of approximately 1400-1500. The Association of Canadian Choral Directors, whose members are a combination of school, church, community, college and professional choir directors, has a membership of approximately 600. These numbers only provide a rough estimate, of course, since membership is voluntary. Still, my own experience as a school music teacher bears out that bands outnumber choirs in the schools by a fair margin. Even in the Toronto

---

36 This association’s name has recently changed to Association of Canadian Choral Communities.
37 To clarify: professional affiliations in Canada do not command as much compulsion to join as MENC does for music educators in the United States, where membership is required for participation in MENC events. Participation in such events is often a requirement, either formally or informally, of employment as a music teacher. Due to the provincial nature of music education in Canada, it is not uncommon for the primary identification of music teachers to be with their provincial rather than national association, one that is more often than not discipline-specific (e.g., Manitoba Band Association, Manitoba Choral Association, etc.). The Ontario Music Educators’ Association, owing to its long and distinct history emerging out of the “music section” of the Ontario Educational Association (Brault 1977), is a more diverse group of music educators, including elementary, choral, and band specialists than are the provincial MEAs of the prairie provinces, which are primarily choral and elementary teachers. The history of the Canadian Music Educators’ Association demonstrates the challenges faced by Canadian music educators desiring a national organization akin to MENC in the United States. The CMEA continues to be an organization made up primarily (but by no means exclusively) of choral and elementary music educators (Diana Brault, former CMEA secretary, personal communication; Betty Hanley, CMEA membership coordinator, personal communication; see also: Brault 1977).
District School Board, the largest and most ethnically diverse in Canada—one where there is likeliest to be greater diversity in music education offerings, concert bands are the most common music course offering listed.\textsuperscript{38} Regardless of the reasons for the predominance of bands in schools, they are, for better or worse, what music education \textit{is} to the majority of students in Canadian secondary schools.

The long-standing mission of the Canadian Band Association is: “To promote and develop the musical, educational and cultural values of band and band music in Canada.” As several historical articles point out (e.g., regular features in the \textit{Canadian Band Journal} vol. 12-18; \textit{Canadian Winds} 1/1, 31; 5/1, 5-7),\textsuperscript{39} while the CBA continues to include community and military bands (from the organization’s days as the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association), it is today an organization made up primarily of school band directors. The CBA, then, is the major professional association for school instrumental music teachers in Canada.\textsuperscript{40} As such, the CBA and its journal represent the discourse of the profession of instrumental music teachers in schools. Studying the discourse of the CBA therefore provides a window into

\textsuperscript{38} Information available online through the TDSB website: tdsb.ca.
\textsuperscript{39} See Chapter Three for an explanation of \textit{CBJ/CW} journal citations used in this study.
\textsuperscript{40} Again: membership is voluntary. An argument could be made that CBA membership is the sign of a committed professional music educator and not entirely representative. Another argument is that CBA membership is a sign of endorsing the values of bands, or perhaps ‘bands as music education.’
the world of Canadian school band activity, and hence, a window into the largest facet of music education delivery in Canada.

The *Canadian Band Journal (CBJ)* was the official publication of the Canadian Band Association\(^{41}\) from 1977-2001.\(^{42}\) The *CBJ* was succeeded by the present journal of the CBA, *Canadian Winds*, after the editor of the *CBJ*, Keith Mann, died in 2001.\(^{43}\) The *CBJ* served as the ‘professional voice’ for band directors—community and military, but primarily school—across Canada. Largely non-academic in tone, this non-peer-reviewed, practitioner-oriented publication was clearly aimed at school teachers. Authors were mostly university professors from Canada and the United States involved with music teacher training and conducting large ensembles, but the journal

\(^{41}\) Originally the Canadian Band Directors’ Association (1969-1983). I am relying on the dates of CBA Executive Director, Ken Epp, in *CW* 5/1, 5, plus his personal communication to me based on his examination of CBA minutes from 1969; Allan Calvert lists the CBDA from 1973 in *CW* 1/1, 31, as does the online *Canadian Encyclopedia of Music in Canada*. I suspect the uncertainty may be due to the distinction between when the decision was made and when the change was made in some way official. Prior to 1969/1973, the organization was known as the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association (1931-1968).

\(^{42}\) Originally the *Canadian Band Directors’ Journal*, the name changed in 1984.

\(^{43}\) Mann was the sole editor of the *CBJ*. Given the circulation, which apparently ranged anywhere up to approximately 3500 (ctd. in *CBJ* vol. 12), and the twenty-five year time span, Mann’s influence on the world of Canadian bands was no doubt extensive.
included a range of articles, including ones written by school teachers and occasional reprints from newspapers, magazines, and other journals.\textsuperscript{44} 

\textit{Canadian Winds} continues as the journal of the CBA. Predictably perhaps, the look and the tone of the journal have changed under the direction of new editors.\textsuperscript{45} As my analysis in Chapters Four through Six demonstrates, however, the discourse, with a few exceptions, has not changed in any significant way. A concordance comparison (see Chapter Three) indicates a remarkable consistency in the discourse in terms of word frequency. If anything, \textit{CW} represents a convergence and coalescence in the discourse, with fewer authors (total=62 for 108 articles) addressing a narrower range of issues, indicative perhaps of either a “maturing” of the field or attempts of editors to “police” the boundaries of what counts in the world of school bands.\textsuperscript{46}

Why study the discourse of the CBA? I have three reasons. In addition to the first reason, articulated above, that the CBA and its journal represent the largest facet of music education delivery in Canadian secondary schools,\textsuperscript{44} It is worth mentioning that Peters and Burbules suggest Foucault has been influential in expanding the scope of “what counts as the analysis of discourse in educational texts” (2004, 56-57). Legitimate discourse for study is not restricted to scholarly writings, but rather includes a range of texts, including advertising, policy documents, etc.\textsuperscript{45} Founding editors were Denise Grant and Tim Maloney. In 2/2 Maloney is listed as editor with Daniel Doyon and Fraser Linklater listed as associate editors. In vol. 4, Linklater is the sole associated editor; in vol. 5 Jade Piche joins him.\textsuperscript{46} Of 62 authors, 10 appear three or more times in \textit{CW}. Note: Appendix A shows 64 authors. Two articles were co-authored by individuals also appearing as sole authors, hence the discrepancy.
the second is that widespread school band activity across Canada is still a relatively young phenomenon and hence one where values have not necessarily become calcified. Taken together, *CBJ/CW* represents over thirty years of professional discourse in the world of instrumental music teaching in Canadian schools. In a historical sense, the CBA is both a very old and a very young association. As the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association, formed in 1931, it is concurrent with developments in school bands in the United States. As the Canadian Band Directors’ Association/Canadian Band Association (1969/1984), however, it is a nascent organization. Studying the journal discourse represents an excellent opportunity to examine the effects of power and contestation as various constituencies assert disciplinary claims.

Finally, I have a personal interest in school bands and music education. My own life as a school band student, university band member, and band director, is concurrent with the age of the CBDA/CBA. I have been a CBA member for over twenty years, and worked as a band director for fourteen. From an ethnographic/sociological point of view, I am most certainly an “insider,” which both illuminates and biases my reading of the discourses in various ways. On the other hand, I have consistently endeavoured to “make the familiar strange,” and believe my *insider-ness* has strengthened my ability to meaningfully *read* the texts in ways that outweigh the disadvantages of researcher bias. I have attempted to keep my
Foucaultian distance by refusing to consider authorial motive or intention, but have used my intimate knowledge of many (if not most) of the authors to account for subject position when examining and evaluating statements. My personal interest, then, can be viewed as strength and weakness, and while my reading in Chapters Four through Six may be viewed by some within the school band world as a negative reading of school band practices, my investigation has in fact been guided by a commitment to and passion for school music and my belief that dogmatism and ideology are the antithesis of education and what Foucault calls ‘the art of existence.’ I share with Foucault a desire to bring about change, although I also share with Foucault a reluctance to stipulate exactly what that change should be.

**PURPOSE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

**Bias, Impetus, Interests**

As alluded to in the previous section, my interest in this study is guided by a personal interest in what school bands do. It is also guided by a concern for what schooling does. I share with Foucault an apprehension about disciplinary effects. I also share certain affinities with critical theorists and pedagogues a suspicion about the aims and effects of formal education. For example, while concerns for curricular reform are often presented in the
most altruistic sense by those who care about student learning and achievement, I remain unconvinced such policies are ultimately advanced out of concern for individuals. Rather, I view such concerns as yet another example of social control and population management, where neo-liberal interests for global competitiveness and worker productivity are the guiding force. Therefore, I consistently find myself asking: who benefits and who does not in these discourses?

My personal interest in this study, then, is guided by what Foucault calls a ‘critical ontology of ourselves’ aimed at furthering the practice of freedom (see Chapter Two). That is, while my reading of the discourses is a form of social critique, its emancipatory interest is not one of escape. Foucault rejected the Marxist paradigm of oppressor/oppressed. One does not, in Foucaultian terms, escape power; one participates in it. And although social practices are by definition normative, one must never let this normativity unwittingly control our lives. To the extent those in the band world refuse to engage in a reflexive questioning of certain ‘regimes of

---

47 See, for example, *The History of Sexuality*, where Foucault adduces population management as a motivating factor behind Victorian sexual mores. See also, Curtis (1988), who argues how schooling in Canada West (Ontario) was viewed as a tool for the control of subjectivity.

48 Many of these arguments can be found in the work of James Marshall (e.g., 1996) and Michael Peters (e.g., 1996). See also: Andreas Fejes and Kathy Nicoll (eds.), *Foucault and Lifelong Learning: Governing the Subject* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

49 Where I diverge from Critical Theory is that I do not share a similar commitment to emancipation through resistance to so-called oppressors. In a Foucaultian sense, there is not some kind of freedom to escape (or be emancipated) to.
truth,’ we risk perpetuating the diminution of freedom. What we do becomes, in the words of Roberta Lamb, “untheorized practice” (qtd. in Bowman 2001, 12).

**Delimitations**

I am primarily concerned with instrumental (band) music teaching and learning as it occurs in schools. My analysis may apply, in whole or in part, to other music teaching and learning contexts, but I do not consider them in my examination, nor am I claiming to speak about or for them. Due to the similarity between disciplinary practices in instrumental music education in Canada and the United States (e.g., similar repertoire and performance expectations), I believe much of my analysis applies to a North American context, but it should be clear that the focus of my examination is on Canadian discourses.⁵⁰ Due to my unfamiliarity with practices in Quebec, my

---

⁵⁰ As my analysis in Chapters Four through Six shows, the discourse of the *CBJ* included numerous American authors and there is a greater sense of homogeneity between the two countries (e.g., numerous references to CBA executive members attending meetings of the North American Band Directors Coordinating Council, and articles featuring Phi Beta Mu: the International Bandmasters’ Fraternity; see also, for e.g., “The United States and Canada: Our Common Language of Music” in *CBJ* 11:2, 15-17), whereas in *CW* there is an explicit emphasis on such things as Canadian repertoire (and no references at all to the North American Band Directors Coordinating Council or Phi Beta Mu). I could identify only three non-Canadian contributors to *CW*, 2002-2008 (Canadian defined as born in or working in Canada).
discussion of the Canadian context should be considered restricted to Anglophone Canada.

**ORGANIZATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY**

In Chapter Two I provide a thorough discussion of Foucaultian concepts and methods. These serve as the conceptual framework for methods and analyses used in the dissertation. Chapter Three provides a background on discourse analysis, including a brief discussion of the emerging field of corpus-assisted discourse studies. I also describe all of the analytic processes followed in the study.

My overall goal in Chapters Four through Six is to address the research question, with the aim of demonstrating how specific disciplinary discourses serve to construct the subject. Towards this end, I undertake an analysis of the journal of the Canadian Band Association (1977-2008). The model for my investigation is the work of Michel Foucault, described in Chapter Two, which demonstrates, among other things, how sets of “statements” constitute objects and subjects. Specifically, I employ a combination of archaeology and genealogy in order to describe the ‘regimes of truth’ present in the discourse (Chapter Four), along with an explanation of how these ‘regimes of truth’ have come to be (Chapters Five and Six). Included in my analyses are aspects of instrumental teaching/learning that go beyond
simply the discourses of the journal of the CBA, although I make no claim to
be comprehensive in this regard. I examine ancillary sources as they pertain
to the CBA journal discourses. For example, I examine a great deal of
historical literature on concert bands and music education in order to better
contextualize many discussions of bands as they occur in the journal.

In Chapter Seven I provide final thoughts on the study, including an
overview of what I consider to be my ‘Foucaultian’ reading of the discourse,
some observations on the CBA journals, a brief discussion of the issue of
‘silence’ in interpretation, a recognition of my motives for conducting this
study, and some implication for the music education profession.
Chapter 2

The Foucaultian Conceptual Framework

Scheurich and McKenzie claim Foucaultian scholarship in education tends to engage at only “a fairly superficial level,” ‘cherry picking’ ideas without regard to the larger context in which they are used (2005, 859). While I have endeavoured to avoid a superficial engagement, I do not believe anything like an authentic Foucaultian study exists. Nor do I imagine attempting such a thing is in keeping with the spirit of Foucault. Instead, I have used a Foucaultian lens to study and interpret the CBJ/CW discourses. Although Chapter Three offers a thorough discussion of how I conducted the study, it does not fully explain the conceptual apparatus that undergirded my day-to-day interpretive decisions. This rather detailed conceptual framework is intended to help the reader make better sense of the analysis discussed in Chapters Four through Six.

In this chapter I present an explication of Foucaultian concepts and methods that have informed my investigation. I begin with a brief overview of Foucault’s large body of work. Following this I discuss several concepts for which Foucault is well-known, and which have greatly influenced the present study. I provide in the subsequent three sections some background on
Foucault’s three investigative periods: archaeology, genealogy, and ethics. I conclude with a brief summary.

**FOUCAULT’S OEUVRE**

Do not ask me who I am and do not ask me to remain the same: leave it to our bureaucrats and our police to see that our papers are in order. At least spare us their morality when we write.

—The Archaeology of Knowledge, 19

I don’t feel that it is necessary to know exactly what I am. The main interest in life and work is to become someone else that you were not in the beginning. If you knew when you began a book what you would say at the end, do you think that you would have the courage to write it? What is true for writing and for a love relationship is true also for life. The game is worthwhile insofar as we don’t know what will be the end.

—Technologies of the Self, 9

Foucault’s corpus is made up of three periods emphasizing three distinct areas of concern: archaeology (concerned with knowledge), genealogy (concerned with power), and ethics (concerned with the self). Deleuze suggests these three concerns—“knowledge, power and self—are irreducible, yet constantly imply one another,” and that Foucault’s work establishes these three areas as ontological and historical; “they do not set universal conditions” (1988, 114). Despite these recognizable periodizations,

51 To which is sometimes added a fourth: governmentality (concerned with governing oneself and others).
however, Foucault’s work is in many ways full of contradictions. Indeed, Foucault’s work has been described as “ad hoc, fragmentary and incomplete” (Gutting 2005, 2). Prado writes, for example: “There is no single work that adequately represents the complex, variegated, and evolutionary totality of Foucault’s philosophical vision,” (2000, 3).\(^52\) Moreover, Foucault’s investigations do not attempt to develop a coherent theory or method (Gutting 2005, 2), and attempts to harmonize his works necessarily distort (ibid., 3). Foucault himself often presented his scholarship as more linear and connected than it really was (Prado, 58). As Prado explains:

Foucault had a “revisionist” view of his own work and tended to retrospectively see more coherence and progressive development in it than it actually exhibits. His view of his work as incrementally developmental was in sharp contrast to his often speaking of having changed his mind and of later works superseding earlier ones: “To write a book is . . . to abolish the preceding one...” The upshot is that, aside from the complexity of his primary writings and whatever problems they may raise, Foucault’s secondary writings and interviews, taken together with his primary writings, support too many diverse interpretations. (12)\(^53\)

Part of the difficulty surrounding Foucault’s oeuvre is often attributed to his writing itself, which, as Baker and Heyning point out, is often

\(^{52}\) All subsequent Prado citations in this chapter are to this work.

\(^{53}\) For example, Foucault commented in 1980: “when I said that the soul was the prison of the body, it was a joke, of course. But the idea was that the body in this kind of discipline is defined and delimited by a kind of relation of the individual to himself” (qtd. in Paras 2006, 109). In a 1982 interview Foucault remarked: “when people say, ‘Well, you thought this a few years ago and now you say something else,’ my answer is...[laughs] ‘Well, do you think I have worked like that all those years to say the same thing and not to be changed?’” (ISR, 131).
considered “difficult to read, puzzling in thought, esoteric, jargonish, ambiguous, and abstract” by both Foucault’s critics and his supporters (2004, 21). His work typically avoids “traditional citation and referencing practices” (Besley 2002, 5). Prado suggests that the real problem lies not with the difficulty of the writing per se, but with what North American scholars may perceive as an unconventional style and approach to doing either history or philosophy. “Foucault’s writings are not difficult in the way that Immanuel Kant’s are difficult. But his mode of expression and his style are unfamiliar enough to North American readers to mislead and even to irritate them, thereby making what is not inherently difficult nonetheless inaccessible” (Prado, 3). Those who come to know his work a little more thoroughly no doubt come to see the apparent inconsistencies in Foucault’s work as simply variations on his fundamental theme of coming to terms with the Nietzschean question: “How did I become what I am and why do I suffer from being what I am?” (ibid., 23). A question such as this cannot be adequately addressed one-dimensionally. As a result, Foucault’s investigations have taken a variety of forms, described variously as philosophical and historical, structuralist and poststructuralist, modern and postmodern, neo-conservative and radical (Smart 1994, 3).

To criticize

\[\text{As Foucault proudly acknowledges: “I think I have in fact been situated in most squares on the political checker board, one after another and sometimes simultaneously: as anarchist, leftist, ostentatious or disguised Marxist, nihilist, explicit or secret anti-Marxist, technocrat in the service of Gaullism, new liberal, etc....I was denounced by the press in Eastern}\]
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Foucault for ‘not staying the same’ is surely to miss one of his main points: normativity is what ultimately keeps people from living freely. And while it is true that Foucault’s oeuvre may resist holistic interpretation in a comprehensive sense, this does not mean, in spite of many apparent contradictions or inconsistencies, one cannot discern several important themes that flow from his investigations.

Despite the fragmentary nature of his oeuvre, Todd May offers five features permeating Foucault’s work: (a) who we are is collective; (b) we are the product of history (it is not a matter of choice); (c) our determination is complex, with many interwoven themes—we are a product of practices; (d) practices aren’t just how we act, but how we go about knowing things; and (e) we can be otherwise, because who we are is the product of chance, not inevitability (2006, 16). These five features have greatly informed my research. While I would not describe this as a historical study, history, as evidenced in Chapters Five and Six, is never far from the surface. I share with Foucault a suspicion of received categories and concepts as naturally occurring. I similarly share a commitment to examining practices as determinants of our subjectivity. Although we are undeniably born with differing capacities and aptitudes, our experience of

European countries for being an accomplice of the dissidents. None of these descriptions is important by itself; taken together, on the other hand, they mean something. And I must admit that I rather like what they mean” (PPP, 383-84).

All subsequent May citations in this chapter are to this work.
the world is undoubtedly influenced by the things we do (e.g., various musical practices) and what we endorse as knowledge. Finally, if our experience of the world is dictated by the practices with which we engage (e.g., participating in bands), then who we are is not inevitable but subject to change.56

One overarching theme I believe percolates throughout Foucault’s body of work is, as May identifies, the question of ‘who are we?’ (ibid., 2), or as Danaher et al. interpret Foucault’s project: “How can we be different from ourselves?” (2000, 10). Foucault addresses this issue primarily with historical methods, though hardly traditional ones.57 And while Foucault has sustained no shortage of criticism of his methods, his historical accuracy, his philosophy,58 and his conclusions during his career and since his death,59 his impact on an incredible range of studies, as diverse as geography and management studies, has led to the unmistakable conclusion that Foucault was, and continues to be viewed as, one of the twentieth century’s more

56 Although focused on individual and not group subjectivity, Malcolm Gladwell’s Outliers: The Story of Success (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2008) provides a fascinating account of how one’s outcome in life is based so little on inherent capacities and so much on chance histories and practices.
57 Gutting places his work in relation to the Annales school, French history, and the “new historians” (2005, 6).
58 Prado cites a paper he suggests typifies the reaction of many analytic philosophers. The paper describes Foucault as not only wrong about nearly everything he did say, but as ultimately having “nothing to say” with respect to “philosophical theories of truth and knowledge” (2).
59 Edward Said, for example, remarked that Foucault drew limitless conclusions from limited French evidence (ctd. in Paras 2006, 13).
important thinkers.\textsuperscript{60} Even Jürgen Habermas, one of Foucault’s staunchest critics called Foucault the contemporary philosopher who has “most lastingly influenced the \textit{Zeitgeist}” (qtd. in Smart 1994, 14).\textsuperscript{61} Foucault’s perceived influence can also be seen in the popularity of the phrase ‘the Foucault effect’ or references to ‘the Foucault turn’ in education (Baker and Heyning 2004).\textsuperscript{62}

Veyne proffers that Foucault’s philosophy is not, as many suggest, one of discourse, but rather one of relations (1997, 177). This Nietzschean aspect to his work continually questions the present through an analysis of the past. This, in Foucault’s eyes, was the proper role of the intellectual. As a “critical interpreter,” Foucault did not attempt to tell the world what was good, but instead offered an analysis that allowed for “refusal, and curiosity, and innovation” and explained “how and why certain things (behavior, phenomena, processes) became a problem” (qtd. in Smart 1994, 13) through an analysis of knowledge and truth, rationality and power, technologies of government and the self (ibid., 3-4). As Gary Gutting

\textsuperscript{60} Prado suggests Foucault was, except in the opinions of analytic philosophers, \textit{the} preeminent thinker at time of his death (1).

\textsuperscript{61} Page numbers are not listed in this particular book chapter. I have calculated the page number by counting backwards from the first listed page: 18.

\textsuperscript{62} Markula and Pringle, for example, call Foucault’s impact on our thinking about ‘who we are’ the “Foucault effect” (2006, 5). This is also the title of a book edited by G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (1991), \textit{The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality: With Two Lectures and an Interview with Michel Foucault}, and one by Brian Trainor and Helen Jeffreys (2003) \textit{The Human Service 'Disciplines' and Social Work: The Foucault Effect}. 
explains, clearly Foucault does imply that there is “something is terribly wrong in the present… His primary goal is not to understand the past but to understand the present; or, to put the point with more nuance, to use an understanding of the past to understand something that is intolerable in the present” (2005, 10). I may stop short of describing current practices in the pedagogical band world as intolerable, however my investigation does strive to employ history to elucidate how present practices came to be.

Despite his impact, Foucault has been the target of many critics who take issue with, among other things, his motives, his methods, and even, at times, his scholarship. Scheurich and McKenzie argue scholars need to take criticisms of Foucault seriously (2005, 860). I agree, but I think when taken as a whole, the overall message in Foucault’s oeuvre tends to undercut so many of the familiar criticisms surrounding identity politics and normativity. What critics often object to is that Foucault appears to advocate change without providing the tools or direction for change. In advocating change without providing normative grounds, I believe Foucault is challenging us to reconsider all that we take to be true in the world. By carefully examining the reasons we give ourselves for our present circumstances and course of action we may begin to question if we are as free as we think we are and

63 Prado notes, however, it is not always obvious what Foucault opposes (17).
64 “I don’t construct my analyses in order to say, ‘This is the way things are, you are trapped.’ I say these things only insofar as I believe it enables us to transform them” (Foucault, qtd. in Scheurich and McKenzie 2005, 860).
what we might have to do in order to experience a more satisfying form of freedom. As Conway writes, “in so far as Foucauldian resistance is meant to investigate the limits of power and truth (and thereby limn the contours of the prevailing games of power and truth), these acts are in fact more thoroughly reasoned than those sanctioned by the dialectic of enlightenment” (1999, 71).

**HISTORY**

[HISTORY] is no longer a question of judging the past in the name of a truth that only we can possess in the present; but risking the destruction of the subject who seeks knowledge [*connaissance*] in the endless deployment of the will to knowledge [*savoir*].

—Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, 388-89

Danaher et al. suggest that the appropriation of history in an effort to rationalize and validate one’s place in the word is common, accepted practice. “Politicians, university lecturers, school teachers, civil servants, business people and artists,” they write, “all trace their beliefs and values and activities back to certain moments in history in order to show their enduring value and universality” (2000, 28). It is hardly surprising then that Foucault, with his “dogged” pursuit of the question of ‘who are we’ (May, 2), took history as the focus for his various investigations. Foucault admits history holds a “privileged position” in his inquiry (WH, 292). His is not
history in its usual sense, however. Foucault is concerned with explaining the present, not the past. He does not seek, however, to practise a Whig-like history that attempts to demonstrate the present as an inexorable result of “progress” (Prado, 42). Instead, Foucault is concerned with thought—particularly how thought has been practised throughout history. According to Gutting, Foucault’s approach to history, usually called a ‘history of the present,’ emphasizes the surpassability of the present. Foucault attempts to show how “the past ordered things quite differently and that the processes leading to our present practices and institutions were by no means inevitable” (Gutting 2005, 10). Our present circumstances are therefore contingent. Understanding the past becomes a mechanism for understanding the possibilities for difference in the present.

**History and Practice: Accounting for Belief**

So it is not enough to say that the subject is constituted in a symbolic system. It is not just in the play of symbols that the subject is constituted. It is constituted in real practices—historically analyzable practices. There is a technology of the constitution of the self which cuts across symbolic systems while using them.

—On the Genealogy of Ethics, 277

65 “In truth, one thing haunts Foucault—thought...He writes a history, but a history of thought as such” (Deleuze 1988, 116).
According to Veyne, ‘ideology’ is, for Foucault, an “ample cloak that dissimulates the crooked and dissimilar contours of the real practices that succeed one another in history” (1997, 156). That is, consciousness does not explain practice (ibid., 164). “Consciousness is not constitutive, but constituted” (ibid., 176). “If a belief accounts for a practice,” writes Veyne, “we still have to explain belief” (ibid., 165). Accordingly, Foucault’s source for the production of truth was practices. Rather than examining the flattened world of ideology, Foucault sought to root out the ‘isms’ (ibid., 172) by concentrating his efforts on what people actually do, leading Veyne to call Foucault the first “completely positivist historian” (ibid., 147). By concentrating on what people do, Foucault structured history according to practices, not ‘centuries’ (ibid., 181). Practices come from history, of course, meaning “every practice depends on all the others and their transformations. Everything is historical, and everything depends on everything else” (ibid., 171).

By drawing attention to this never-ending web of dependencies, Foucault, following Nietzsche, demonstrates how “things” exist only in relation (ibid., 169 n7). That is, objects come into being and take on particular meanings within particular practices. Foucault’s historical work, suggests Veyne, is therefore really about how “things are the objectivizations of determined practices and that [these] determinations

---

66 Hence Olssen’s (2006) labeling of Foucault as a materialist.
must be brought to light” (ibid., 159). Madness, for example, “exists as an
object only in and through a practice, but the practice in question is not in
itself madness” (ibid., 167). By a similar measure, the musical “work” exists
in and through a particular musical practice, but the practice is not one of
musical works. “Musicians” (in the non-professional sense), “composers,”
“conductors,” “performers,” etc., exist only in and through the practice of, to
borrow Christopher Small’s term, ‘musicking.’ Where things potentially go
wrong, Foucault shows, is when we reify objects as naturally occurring (ibid.,
160-61). It is, Veyne reminds us, pear trees that bear pears. We are wrong,
Foucault admonishes, “to assume that we can explain the making by what is
made” (ibid., 161). Foucault writes that our conceptualizations “should not
be founded on a theory of the object—the conceptualized object is not the
single criterion of a good conceptualization. We have to know the historical
conditions that motivate our conceptualization. We need a historical
awareness of our present circumstances” (SP, 327). Thus, we should not
look to the musical work or the categories of ‘musician’ or ‘performer’ to
understand musical practices. These are merely the effects of practice. To
illustrate this further, Veyne points out the eater of meat is only a cannibal
within a specific cultural context; a stone only becomes a keystone with a
particular structure (1997, 168). Similarly, one only becomes a musician (or
performer or composer) within a particular context; a musical selection is
only a work within a specific cultural context. Foucault’s investigations,
therefore, are largely about demonstrating the relations between various practices and their ‘objectifications.’

**Change and the Event**

One of the ways in which Foucault accomplishes the task of showing the relations between practices and objectifications is to focus on ‘change’ and the ‘event.’ This is not done in the traditional sense, however. Rather than highlight the seemingly obvious, such as “a decision, a treaty, a reign, or a battle,” Foucault concentrates on what, in Nietzsche’s terms, is called Entstehung (emergence): “the reversal of a relationship of forces, the usurpation of power, the appropriation of a vocabulary turned against those who had once used it, a domination that grows feeble, poisons itself, grows slack, the entry of a masked ‘other’” (NGH, 380-81). The Canadian Bandmasters’ Association, an organization that at one time was the voice of bands in Canada, for example, was largely superseded in Canada by music educators (“band directors” rather than bandmasters) following the Second World War. In fact, today’s CBA survived only by reinventing itself as the Canadian Band Directors’ Association in 1969/1973. By concentrating on moments of emergence, Foucault is able to further emphasize the inherent violence in the ‘will to knowledge.’ “All knowledge [connaissance],” he

---

67 Note my footnote in Chapter One on the uncertainty of the exact name change date.
writes, “rests upon injustice...[T]he instinct for knowledge is malicious” (NGH, 378). Although the description of “malicious” may appear a little strong, my analysis leaves little doubt the pedagogical band world, with the university band at the pinnacle, has almost entirely supplanted the community band world as the site of “legitimate” band activity.

The connection between knowledge and control is one Foucault developed in his concept of power-knowledge. Basically, Foucault contends that knowledge (as truth or meaning) is a commodity produced and controlled through a process of struggle for domination. In his early investigations the focus was on statements as a nonsubjective form of knowledge exercising control over the allowable and disallowable. “It is a question,” writes Foucault, “of what governs statements, and the way in which they govern each other so as to constitute a set of propositions that are scientifically acceptable and, hence, capable of being verified or falsified by scientific procedures. In short, there is a problem of the regime, the politics of the scientific statement” (TP, 114; orig. emph.). Rather than approach this problem synchronically—as those working in the field of structural linguistics did, for example68—Foucault, with his turn toward genealogy, placed greater emphasis on diachronic analysis and the play of forces that produce knowledge.

68 Foucault’s archaeological method has been criticized by some for this static, structuralist approach.
The problem is at once to distinguish among events, to differentiate the networks and levels to which they belong, and to reconstitute the lines along which they are connected and engender one another. From this follows a refusal of analyses couched in terms of the symbolic field or the domain of signifying structures, and a recourse to analyses in terms of the genealogy of relations of force, strategic developments, and tactics. (TP, 116)

For Foucault, this meant turning away from the model of language and signs (as an example of a static form centered on meaning) and toward analyzing history in terms of contestation: “war and battle. The history that bears and determines us has the form of a war rather than that of a language—relations of power, not relations of meaning” (ibid.).

Foucault’s concern is not just with the emergence of discursive and nondiscursive practices in the sense of their mere appearance, but of how the struggle of the ‘will to knowledge’ creates a true/false division central to Western societies.

What is history, given that there is continually being produced within it a separation of true and false? By that I mean four things. First, in what sense is the production and transformation of the true/false division characteristic and decisive for our historicity? Second, in what specific ways has this relation operated in Western societies, which produce scientific knowledge whose forms are perpetually changing and whose values are posited as universal? Third, what historical knowledge is possible of a history that itself produces the true/false distinction on which such knowledge depends? Fourth, isn’t the most general of political problems the problem of truth? (QM, 233)

That is, the problem of truth—dealt with more fully in the next section—is absolutely central to our understanding of history and ourselves. If history in
fact produces the true/false distinction, then how can one reliably speak of history truthfully? Furthermore, how can this true/false distinction ever be trusted, given that the dividing line between true and false in Western societies has been granted to scientific knowledge—knowledge which, as it were, keeps changing the rules of the game? It is thus not just a problem of a ‘will to [innocent/autonomous] knowledge,’ but of a ‘will to truth’ that is at issue; and if practices (disciplines) produce knowledge, then they produce truth and hence, history (reality). The art/non-art dichotomy provides an example of this true/false distinction. Art music discourse is largely predicated on the position that “great” (read: art) music withstands the “test of time.” While perhaps not an obvious example of scientific knowledge, art music discourse (e.g., Leonard Meyer, Suzanne Langer)\textsuperscript{69} promotes the view that certain music possesses universal, transcendent properties—often ones embodying or expressive of the human condition. These properties (e.g., formal balance, repetition and surprise, tension and release) are presented in scientific, analyzable terms. Music lacking or deficient in these properties is not true music. The result is that music deemed great (or “true music”) by acknowledged musical experts (on the basis of “objective” musical qualities) is perpetuated, creating musical history. One does not study false (non-art)

\textsuperscript{69} These are but two examples. For a more complete, succinct review, see Wayne Bowman, \textit{Philosophical Perspectives on Music} (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1998). I am not trying to overlook differences between various art music perspectives, but I suggest they tend to share a commitment to the idea that art music is special in ways that non-art music is not.
music in music history classes in university schools of music, one only studies true (art) music. Identifying the moments and processes of true/false dichotomies in music is fundamental to identifying the injustices. The ‘regimes of truth’ identified in Chapter Four are examples of the knowledge that has won out. The analyses in Chapter Six help to identify the battles of true and false.

**TRUTH: RATIONALITY, KNOWLEDGE, AND MEANING**

Truth is undoubtedly the sort of error that cannot be refuted because it was hardened into an unalterable form in the long baking process of history.

—Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, 372

‘The subject’ is the central object of Foucault’s work. More precisely, however, it is the production of the subject that concerns Foucault. It is not a matter of determining what the subject *is* in an ontological sense, but, rather, the processes waged in how the subject comes to be. For Foucault, these processes center on issues of truth, rationality, knowledge, and meaning, all of which are embedded in, and the result of, systems of power. As an activist, Foucault saw his role not as “emancipating truth from every system of power...but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time” (Foucault, qtd. in Smart 1994, 7). It is ‘regimes of truth’ that
delimit who we are and what we can become, and it is thus the ‘regimes of truth’ which must be opened up for interrogation in order to create the potential for greater freedom—both in general human terms and in specifically musical terms.

Foucault’s approach to truth is complex. At the risk of obvious reduction, Foucault’s thinking goes something like this: we believe in a distinction between true and false; our belief in the truth limits us; it is necessary, therefore, to examine both what is considered ‘real’ or ‘true,’ and why we hold particular things to be real or true; truth is largely determined by reason/rationality; reason/rationality is based on knowledge which is indissociable from power; certain forms of knowledge thus become privileged sites of truth claims—claims which are held to be universal and transcendent; the way to circumvent ahistorical truth claims is to reject true/false dualisms and instead examine discourses and practices as immanent forms of truth/reality. Prado suggests that to many analytic philosophers, Foucault’s conceptualization of truth appears like “facile modish postmodern relativism” (117). As a defender of Foucault’s views, Prado emphasizes that despite the importance accorded to power and subjectivity in Foucault’s thought, it is the philosophical issue of truth that deserves greatest attention, since truth undergirds all else (ibid.).
Truth

My general theme isn’t society but the discourse of true and false, by which I mean the correlative formation of domains and objects and of the verifiable, falsifiable discourses that bear on them; and it’s not just their formation that interests me, but the effects in the real to which they are linked.
—Questions of Method, 237

Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint...Each society has its “general politics” of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned.
—Foucault (qtd. in May, 40)

Eric Paras draws attention to Foucault’s scholarship on the Roman emperor Septimius Severus. The fitness of Severus’s rule was dependent on the cosmos (astrology). That is, truth was in the stars—outside of oneself—and its revelation was self-evident. There was no interpretation necessary, since meaning was immanent (Paras 2006, 112).70 In The Use of Pleasure and Care of the Self, Foucault demonstrates how the problem of truth changed over time from a belief in a cosmic truth, to a truth based in self-mastery, to a Christian-influenced humanistic truth rooted in interiority: the truth was within and, with guidance, could be coaxed out and deciphered (ibid.). Foucault argues it was the early church leader Tertullian who significantly influenced this ‘inward turn:’ “Thereafter,” writes Paras,

70 All subsequent Paras citations in this chapter are to this work.
“Christian thought started along a new path: one in which the soul must turn within, must constitute itself as the protagonist of a procedure in which it will constantly be an object of knowledge...For the entire West, a complex history of relations between subjectivity and truth was initiated” (119). This connection between subjectivity and truth, Foucault argues, is our legacy. The only thing that has changed over time has been the hermeneutic means. In the Renaissance, interpretation occurred through a divine code (word of God). In the Classical age, scientific reason provided categories for ordering and explaining the world. Finally, in modern times ‘Man’ has become the ‘measure of all things’ (Danaher et al. 2000, 119-20). As I argue in Chapters Four through Six, music as art constitutes the connection between subjectivity and truth in music. That is, the discourse promotes the view that all people are inherently musical. With the aid of the conductor, students can be led to the truth about music and their musical selves. On this the discourse is unequivocal: truth exists in music; the role of music education is to evince this truth.\(^7\)

Much of our contemporary understanding of truth can be traced to Plato’s depiction of Being in terms of “the original and the simulacrum”—the true and the false (Paras, 65). Viewing the world in this way results in a

\(^7\) Reimer, for example, claims that “musical meanings incorporate within them a variety of universal/cultural/individual meanings” and that gaining these “special meanings requires direct experience with musical sounds, deepened and expanded by skills, knowledge, understandings, attitudes, and sensitivities education can cultivate” (2003, 11).
suspicion of appearances and a belief in concealed truth. Such a conception of the world is clearly evident in phenomenologist thought, where truth and meaning are “absolute and essential,” and merely require a “knowing human subject’ to bring them to light” (ibid., 6). Art music discourse promotes the view that the composer’s intention represents truth. The musical score, as a representation (simulacra), is an imperfect version of the truth. The conductor’s role, as the ‘knowing subject,’ is to bring the truth, as best she or he can, to students. Foucault, however, argues against this original/simulacrum view. Truth and hidden meanings are not the privilege of autonomous subjects, since depth (truth) is illusionary. There is no ‘real;’ everything is simulacra. This is what leads Veyne, in summarizing Foucault, to write: “At every moment, the world is what it is: the fact that its practices and objects are exceptional, that they are surrounded by emptiness [sic], does not mean that they are surrounded by some truth which no one has grasped to date” (1997, 176). And, as Dreyfus and Rabinow write: “the world is not a play which simply masks a truer reality that exists behind the scenes. It is as it appears” (qtd. in Paras, 179 n60). This is, I believe, what Deleuze means when he suggests “there are things outside of knowledge, but not behind knowledge” (1988, 51). Foucault’s goal then, Veyne insists, was not to contrast reality and appearance, but to try and restore reality to its proper immanence (1997, 182). Although anathema to art music and
music education discourse, the implication of this view is that music does not possess “special meanings” which music education is to elucidate.

Immanence, for Foucault, was a matter of connecting the sayable and the visible—a matter of describing discourse and practice rather than the depth of underlying realities. That is, he presents knowledge [savoir] as something primary and on the surface rather than a rational effect of existence. In so doing, he decenters the subject by denying the intentionality so central to the Cartesian and phenomenal subject. In the words of Deleuze:

seeing and speaking means knowing [savoir], but we do not see what we speak about, nor do we speak about what we see; and when we see a pipe we shall always say (in one way or another): ‘this is not a pipe,’ as though intentionality denied itself, and collapsed into itself. Everything is knowledge, and this is the first reason why there is no ‘savage experience’: there is nothing beneath or prior to knowledge. But knowledge is irreducibly double, since it involves speaking and seeing, language and light, which is the reason why there is no intentionality. (1988, 109)

Foucault’s views on truth must be understood, then, as a reaction against Sartre’s existentialism that posited a particular freedom accorded by and to consciousness. Contra Sartre, Foucault argued there was no need to explain discourse by recourse to different levels of explanation (Paras, 44). As Foucault states, “the dimension of discourse is all there is” (qtd. in Paras, 37). Accordingly, then, the composer’s intention really explains nothing.

---

72 Compare to Sartre’s ‘existence precedes essence,’ for example.
73 Deleuze is referring here to Foucault’s essay on Rene Margate’s painting, ‘This is not a pipe,’ which casts doubts on truth claims.
about the truth in music, since the composer is only operating according to the ‘system’ of art music. As I suggest in Chapter Four, while the discourse promotes the view that understanding the composer’s intention is necessary to discover the truth in music, the importance accorded to intent is better understood as an act of power. The actual meaning in any given piece of music is the effect of the art music discourse. Meaning, in Foucaultian terms, is the effect of a system of meanings linking the sayable and the visible.

“Before all human existence, all human thought,” writes Foucault, “there must already be a knowledge, a system, that we are rediscovering” (qtd. in ibid.). Thus, for Deleuze, one of Foucault’s greatest accomplishments was “the conversion of phenomenology to epistemology” (1988, 109).

An extremely thorough account of truth in Foucault’s work is provided by Prado, who insists Foucault does not offer a theory of truth, but instead provides five distinct ‘notions of truth’: criterial, constructivist, perspectivist, experiential, and tacit-realist (118)—all of which, he points out, are “wholly contextual” (133). Critics err, says Prado, when they attempt cross-contextual comparisons. The matter of truth in Foucault’s work is often complicated, however, by Foucault’s own terminology, which Prado claims is often inconsistent, such as when he conflates linguistic truths and extra-linguistic states (ibid.). Although all five notions of truth are worth noting, the first three of these have direct bearing for this study. “The criterial use of truth,” Prado writes, “has to do with what counts as true in a disciplined
or learned discourse or, more broadly, in a given society” (119). It is closely related to the constructivist notion of truth, which is about “how what is true in a social or learned discourse comes to be so” (ibid.). Truth, it is argued, is produced through power relations. Truth is, therefore, “relative to social and learned discourses” (ibid.). If this is so, then each society produces its own specific regime of truth (criterial: what—e.g., Chapter Four) in its own distinct way (constructivist: how—e.g., Chapters Five and Six).

For Foucault, criterial truth is nothing more than “the correctness of certain discursive acts in a given discourse” (Prado, 121). This does not depend on the opposition between real and non-real, but upon the rules of the game, in the way that, for example, various pieces on a chess board can make particular moves at any given point in time. The game, in Foucault’s case, is described as “discourse”—considered as things both said and done. “[A] discourse’s truths are moves that are sanctioned by a discourse’s mechanisms for distinguishing truth and falsity and that conform to its expert judgments. What makes some moves right and others wrong is the sum total of contributing actions that shape a discourse’s content. It is also the codification of some right moves as disciplinary principles” (ibid.). For example, it is simply against the ‘rules of the game,’ for example, to perform “pop” music at a competitive band festival. The discourse of music festivals says that only certain kinds of music—music deemed to be “of the highest quality”—are appropriate for performance. This raises the constructivist truth
notion of why individual discourse-participants believe in the truths of a particular discourse. How, Prado asks, “do discourse-participants come to hold power-produced truths instead of merely accepting them as one might adopt conventions for prudential reasons?” (121). The answer, Prado suggests, is that discourse is transparent to participants, acting as a kind of “physical environment” (122). “Only a very few—the Darwins and the Freuds,” he writes, “play a role in the initial development of discourses” (ibid.). Foucault deals with the problem of why people accept discourse as objective truth rather than simply the beliefs of others by introducing his perspectivist notion of truth.

Although a somewhat nuanced point, it is important to understand that Foucault’s perspectivist notion of truth does not propose discourse as the imposition of belief. This, argues Prado, would be to view power as some sort of distortion of the real. Power-produced truths are separable from the beliefs of individuals. That is, statements appearing in CBJ/CW are valid (or true) insofar as they appear under the guise of authority. They represent recognizable, acceptable viewpoints. This does not mean, however, that every discourse participant agrees with all statements that appear. People are free to disagree (although they may face sanctions according to the constructivist and criterial nature of truth), but their source of disagreement is not a substance but discourse itself. There is something to interpret and form perspectives about, but it is not a real, noumenal world, but the world
of discourse—a world in which, through discipline that imposes forms of constraint, particular subjectivities are formed (Prado, 128). Musical practices employing the standards and expectations of art music condition musical subjectivities in particular ways, but it is important to recognize art music is not a real thing. This is an excellent example of what Veyne means when he says words deceive by making us believe in the existence of things. It is the world of discourse (the sayable and the visible) that creates “art music.” Without the concert hall and the belief that the music is capable of embodying specific syntactical and semantic elements expressive of beauty and “the human condition,” there is only music (or, taken farther, only sound).

Truth, then, represents an important, if not easily explained, aspect of Foucault’s work. Fundamentally, Foucault is not concerned with truth as a relation or a property, but with how true and truth function in various contexts, and how they “come to work as they do in those contexts” (Prado, 139). Despite the attention often given to power in Foucault’s overall conceptualization, Prado argues Foucault only introduces power to counter “the structuralists’ view of discourse as unilaterally determining practice” (138). Foucault’s central concern is to oppose the view of truth as sameness between “what is said and what there is” (ibid.). Nature is not granted a priority over language, since “discourse determines what nature is…Foucault severs the connection between thought and language, on the one hand, and
the disposition of the world, on the other” (ibid.). For many, writes Prado, this inevitably casts Foucault in the eyes of many as an extreme relativist, since the idea that truth is “how things are is too deeply ingrained in our intellectual tradition” (139). The idea that something like a descriptive sentence could somehow be true and not be connected to ‘how things are’ is simply too extreme for many to bear. Prado, however, argues Foucault’s five notions of truth, taken together, have “commendatory force” in that they continually ask the question, “why truth?” Similarly, my concern in Chapters Four through Six lies not so much with what is or is not true in music education through bands, but with the question of how discourse participants continue to believe various things to be true about music and about bands and why they place so much emphasis on the importance of certain truths (e.g., the use of “quality” repertoire).

**Rationality (reason)**

‘The ‘Enlightenment,’ which discovered the liberties, also invented the disciplines.
—*Discipline and Punish*, 222

I think the word ‘rationalization’ is dangerous. What we have to do is analyze specific rationalities rather than always invoking the progress of rationalization in general.
—*The Subject and Power*, 329

Ahistorical conception of rationality is the most fundamental presupposition Foucault challenges.
(Prado 2000, 19)
Issues of truth are inseparable from issues of rationality. Foucault’s views on reason are highly contentious. Books such as *Madness and Civilization*, *The Birth of the Clinic*, *The Order of Things*, *Discipline and Punish*, and *The History of Sexuality* are really about demonstrating how “reason’s own history reveals that it ‘was born...from chance’” (Prado, 34). As I argue in this study, the discourse supports the view that musical understanding and pedagogical band practices are rooted in reason: the way things are is the rational result of something like “best practice.” That is, reasonable people (musicians, conductors, music teachers) all agree that how things are currently done (or at least the ideal aspired towards) most likely represents the best way to do music education. My analysis challenges this accepted rationality.74

There are some critics, however, who see Foucault as critiquing rationality—especially rationality as it emerged from the Enlightenment, while relying on that very rationality for his investigations. One cannot, it is argued, use a tool and critique it at the same time. Foucault responded:

I think that the blackmail which has very often been at work in every critique of reason or every critical inquiry into the history of rationality (either you accept rationality or you fall prey to the irrational) operates as though a rational critique of rationality were impossible, or as though rational history of all of the

74 One can take this idea further. Musical performance practices, particularly as they occur in the Western art music tradition, are often considered reasonable insofar as a rendered performance is thought to be musical based on “rational” musical principles.
ramifications and all the bifurcations, a contingent history of reason, were impossible. (qtd. in May, 95)

What Foucault is primarily interested in is how we have been historically determined by the Enlightenment (WE, 313)—an era he claims is defined by “a modification of the preexisting relation linking will, authority, and the use of reason” (ibid., 305). To the extent that Man is representative of a particular ideal—especially one that is so often claimed as universal, Foucault is critical. He is clear, however, that it is not rationality itself that is problematic. One does not have to be for or against the Enlightenment, he says (ibid., 313). What Foucault objects to is the assertion of certain human characteristics as universal rather than historical (ibid., 315). Although his criticisms have been taken as oppositions to rationality in general, Foucault clarifies that his critiques have really been about seeking “the extent to which a type of philosophical interrogation—one that simultaneously problematizes man’s [sic] relation to the present, man’s historical mode of being, and the constitution of the self as an autonomous subject—is rooted in the Enlightenment” (ibid., 312).

Foucault’s critiques, which he has famously described as “critical ontologies of ourselves” are deliberately neither “universal” nor “transcendental” (ibid., 315). Instead, they test the “historico-practical” limits that we, as subjects, may go beyond (ibid., 316). In other words, Foucault is insistent that—in contrast to many Enlightenment views that posit the subject as a universal, rational, knowing being—we must “give up
hope of ever acceding to a point of view that could give us access to any complete and definitive knowledge [connaissance] of what may constitute our historical limits” (ibid.). We are, he insists, “always in the position of beginning again” (ibid., 317). Such a view contrasts with that of the CBJ/CW discourse, which frequently invokes music (specifically art music) as a universal human characteristic—something central to the well-rounded Western mind. As I discuss in Chapter Six, there is in the discourse a belief that musical and artistic knowledge is central to what it means to be human. People, in other words, are thought to not just possess the inherent capability for Enlightenment rationality, but also for Romantic feeling (something possessing its own form of rationality)—the lack of which is said to leave one incomplete as a human being. I have used Foucault’s studies on rationality to rethink discourse on music, art, and beauty.

**Knowledge and Meaning (Practice)**

Knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting.
—Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, 380

To put the matter clearly: my problem is to see how men [sic] govern (themselves and others) by the production of truth (I repeat once again that by production of truth I

---

Note the logic here: humans are inherently musical, and art music is central to the well-rounded mind. Ergo, the Western mind is the most human and Western music is the best expression of what it means to be human.
Knowledge is a theme throughout much of Foucault’s work. It is especially important in his pre-genealogical investigations. In an early (1967) essay, “Nietzsche, Freud, Marx,” Foucault addresses his Nietzschean-inspired perspectivist view of truth/meaning. This view stems from a traditional belief in the connection between interpretation and resemblance. That is, the idea interpretation reflects an objective reality. For Foucault, this is an untenable position, leading him to describe hermeneutics and semiology as “fierce enemies” (NFM, 278). “The death of interpretation,” he writes, “is to believe that there are signs, signs that exist primarily, originally, actually, as coherent, pertinent, and systematic marks” (ibid.).

The significance of Nietzsche, Freud, and Marx, he suggests, is that they made possible a hermeneutic by casting doubt on the transparency of the world (ibid., 272). That they successfully challenged the apparent knowability of the world was due to two historical suspicions about language in Indo-European cultures: first, “language does not mean exactly what it says,” and second, language “exceeds its merely verbal form in some way”

and “there are indeed other things in the world which speak and which are not language” (ibid., 269-70).

Following Nietzsche, Foucault sees signs as interpretations that attempt to cloak themselves: “the sign is already an interpretation that does not appear as such” (ibid., 277). Moreover, signs are not mere innocent, unproblematic representations of a signified. They are the production of vested interests. This, Foucault claims, is what “Nietzsche means when he says that words have always been invented by the ruling classes; they do not denote a signified, they impose an interpretation” (ibid., 276). Interpretations are thus political acts which truths attempt to mask. Any attempt to provide an interpretation is therefore not viewed as a clarification of “a matter to be interpreted, which offers itself passively” (ibid., 275). Instead, “[interpretation] can only seize, and violently, an already-present interpretation, which it must overthrow, upset, shatter with the blows of a hammer” (ibid.; cf. SP, 338.). The process of bringing hammer blows Foucault considers to be never-ending, a cue he draws from Nietzsche, Freud, and Marx and their refusal of beginnings. That is, without a point of origin, interpretations can never be compared against an authentic original, as in the example of Plato’s original and simulacrum provided in the ‘Truth’ section above.

If interpretation can never be completed, this is quite simply because there is nothing to interpret. There is nothing absolutely primary to interpret, for after all everything is already
interpretation, each sign is in itself not the thing that offers itself to interpretation but an interpretation of other signs. (ibid., 275)

Interpretation, then, is not a matter of interpreting “what is in the signified,” but instead a matter of investigating “who posed the interpretation” (ibid., 278). The basis for truth lies, therefore, not in the noumenal world, but in the minds of those who interpret. Foreshadowing his critique of science as the source of truth, Foucault writes: “The basis of interpretation is nothing but the interpreter, and this is perhaps the meaning that Nietzsche gave to the word ’psychology’” (ibid.). My reading of the CBJ/CW discourse has been informed by this perspective. Specifically, I have read all statements with a suspicion of the politics behind various statements. While I have followed Foucault in avoiding citing proper names (the author does not matter), I have in my presentation frequently included an identification of subject position in order to ally statements with potential self-interest (who posed the interpretation). For example, the discourse suggests that honouring the intentions of the composer is paramount to proper performance. History suggests this truth claim is historically grounded (i.e. at one time the composer was, both literally and figuratively anonymous). Why, then, does this interpretation of correct musical performance prevail?
SUBJECTIVITY

It is not power, but the subject, which is the general theme of my research.
—The Subject and Power, 327

We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries.
—The Subject and Power, 336

Foucault’s perspective on ‘the subject’ and on subjectivity has received a great deal of attention in the critical commentary on his work. Although he is often associated with theorizations of power, subjectivity is the real underlying theme in all of Foucault’s work (McLaren 2002, 5; SP, 326). And while Foucault is not the only thinker to suggest the disappearance of the subject, his anti-humanistic stance, which came to prominence in The Order of Things (Paras, 8) and lasted through to his ethical period, whereupon Foucault’s position on the potential for self-constitution softened somewhat, is among the most trenchant and influential (Mansfield 2000). His is a powerful analysis that shows people are not free to do as they wish, but rather, are governed by structures external to themselves (Danaher et al. 2000, 8). As Paras puts it, up until approximately 1980, Foucault’s aim was to “tear the cloak of self-evidence from the autonomous individual and replace it with the dispersion of language, of discourse, and of power” (102).
A central contradiction that informs, surrounds, and, to some, plagues Foucault’s work on the subject is whether the subject can be thought of as an effect or an originating entity. His early structural work appears dismissive of humanist notions of what Paras labels “deep subjectivity” (137)—“a particular (and historically resilient) kind of subjectivity: one that viewed the individual as the secret bearer of his own deep truth” (ibid., 113). Foucault distrusted notions of intersubjectivity that, for him, seemed to naively ignore forces outside of ourselves (ibid., 152). In this sense Foucault’s thinking can be likened to Marx and Freud, who both suggested subjects do not pre-exist the social order and cannot be the source of meaning (Danaher et al. 2000, 122). Towards the end of his career, however, Foucault appeared to many to reverse his position, granting the subject some degree of agency (Paras, 117).

To be clear, Foucault does not reject that we believe we have a ‘true self.’ Instead, he argues the modern self has emerged through “a game of truth, relations of power, and forms of relation to oneself and to others” (qtd. in Danaher et al. 2000, 131). In fact, “the very idea that we have a true self, an identity that persists, is evidence of the continual action upon us of a kind of power that works by documenting, by following longitudinally, by individualizing” (Paras, 79). That is, we possess an individuality imposed on us. It is not that we are unaware of ourselves or our actions, but that we naively believe ourselves to be fully independent authors of our lives. As
Foucault writes: “Each of us has a biography, a past that is continually documented someplace or other...There is always an administrative organism capable of saying at any moment who each of us is” (qtd. in ibid.). In an analogous, albeit smaller sense, the belief in people having a musical self is fashioned through ‘games of truth, relations of power, and relations to ourselves and others.’ The label of musical or musician, for example, is something imposed on us. Our belief in inherent musicality is a mere fiction.\textsuperscript{77}

\textbf{Producing the Subject}

Rather than asking ideal subjects what they may have yielded of themselves or of their powers in order to allow themselves to be subjected, we have to try to find out how relations of subjection can manufacture subjects. —Foucault (qtd. in Veyne 1997, 177)

Discipline ‘makes’ individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise. —\textit{Discipline and Punish}, 170

The ‘disciplinary hypothesis’ of power-knowledge suggests our sense of having a true self is illusionary since it is, in fact, discourses imbricated with

\textsuperscript{77} I am not claiming that music does not exist, of course. Nor am I claiming that people have not engaged in “musical” activities dating back to the earliest moments of human existence. Our belief in inherent musicality, however, is easily comparable to how Foucault demonstrates we believe in inherent sexuality when in fact \textit{sexuality} is the product of discourse/practice.
power-knowledge that create the individual. The “individual does not pre-exist the kind of power that tracks and monitors” (Paras, 11). In “The Subject and Power” Foucault identifies three modes of ‘objectification’ by which people are made subjects: “modes of inquiry that try to give themselves the status of sciences,” dividing practices, and the way humans turn themselves into subjects (SP, 326-27). In *Discipline and Punish* Foucault shows how it is through the disciplines—practices which embody all three modes of objectification—that people are produced as subjects. Described as “the set of techniques in virtue of which systems of power have as their goal and result the singularization of individuals” (Foucault, qtd. in Paras, 78), discipline is a primary determinate of our sense of self. The discipline of music education, for example, helps to determine who is musical and who is not by defining, usually in very specific terms (e.g., curriculum documents) what musicality is.

The sense of self Foucault articulates is not to be confused with earlier conceptions. When Foucault speaks of the soul in *Discipline and Punish* this is not the same soul as described in Christianity or by the ancient Greeks. Prado writes, “the modern self is the ultimate source of action, so is capable of different kinds of behavior. Nothing is set or predetermined by nature or context” (57). Since the self is malleable and can be ascribed differing “beliefs and affective states,” an ethical aspect is introduced. “[I]t is possible and necessary to shape the self through discipline so that it will act
correctly. The best way to achieve this end is to imbue the self with the right sorts of beliefs and affective states” (ibid.). Similarly, music education discourse is replete with examples that spell out the importance of people learning the “right kind” of music. The subject thus becomes an object or target of discipline. The Foucaultian self is not a pre-given entity, but a construct “produced by precisely those techniques that supposedly only shape it” (ibid.).

Prado argues Foucault’s conception of the subject is deliberately ambiguous, involving two separate but related aspects:

The first is that an individual is a subject in the sense of being subject to regulation by other individuals, institutions, and the state. The second aspect is that an individual is a subject in the sense of experiencing subjectivity, of being aware. But being a subject in this second sense is not merely being aware or conscious. It includes having aims, desires, and—most important in the present context—a self-image or sense of who and what one is. Throughout Foucault’s discussions of subjects and subjectivity, particularly in his genealogical works, the notion of “the subject” includes both of these aspects. “Subject” and “subjectivity” are used in ways that are deliberately ambiguous between the subject as a member of a governed society and as a self-aware identity. (56)

The band student, then, is subjected to the expectations and practices of wind band performance, and at the same time experiences music in a very personal way. Foucault’s deliberate ambiguity regarding the subject allows him to reject traditional conceptions of the “autonomous individual” while maintaining the possibility for agency, however limited. The significance of Foucault’s genealogical work in particular lies in how Foucault is able to
demonstrate the rise of a “whole new dimension of personhood” that emerged in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Prado, 57).

This sense of personhood, as Foucault shows in both *Discipline and Punish* and *The History of Sexuality*, is inextricably linked to the body. Margaret McLaren claims that for Foucault the body is more than just “the locus of subjectivity; it is the very condition of subjectivity” (2002, 83). This is due, in the case of *Discipline and Punish*, to “investing of a body with a pattern of subjectivity-determining habits” (Prado, 80). This can be understood in the sense of the subject as ‘subjected,’ as in a body imprinted by the disciplines, and also in the sense of the body as a “subject of experience” (ibid.). As Prado explains further:

What it is to be a power-constructed subject, in the subject-of-experience sense, is for a habit-invested body to adopt a certain perspective on itself and its surroundings. The individual comes to experience the world in a certain way as a result of behaving in certain ways, being categorized in certain ways, and being dealt with in certain ways. A constructed subject then is an experiencing self of a particular sort in that an individual internalizes power-assigned attributes and comes to intend power-imposed actions. (ibid.; orig. emph.)

To be a band student is to experience a specific form of music making imparting very specific dispositions in and towards music. Band students come to understand music making in a very particular way: one must perform one’s part artistically, in tune, in balance, and “in tone” with everyone else, all while following the musical impulses of the conductor. The band student learns to watch and listen in ways very distinct from, for
example, the member of a garage band, where the means of intersubjective musical communication are considerably different (e.g., Green 2001).

In the case of The History of Sexuality, subjectivity is determined by discourse through what Barry Smart calls “games of truth”: by one’s relation to her- or himself (1994, 8). Rabinow and Rose point out these games of truth do not arise is consciousness, but in specific practices: “the places and spaces, the apparatuses, relations, and routines that bind human beings into complex assembles of vision, action, and judgment, whether these be those of domestic existence, sexual relations, labor, or comportment in public places or consumption. Language—even as discourse—is only one of the heterogeneous and localized intellectual and practical techniques, the ‘instruments’ through which human beings constitute themselves” (2003, xxi). Foucault demonstrates how these games of truth have been conditioned by at least three historically different ‘techniques of the self.’ The first, Senecan, involves a process whereby subjects examine how their thoughts fit in with the rules of society; the second, described as early Christian hermeneutics, involves an examination of the connection between inner thoughts and inner impurity; the third, Cartesian, has subjects examining the connection between thoughts and reality (Danaher et al. 2000, 129). All three of these techniques, or technologies, have become part of the natural order, supporting the idea “that we can, by examining our conscience and confessing our thoughts and deeds, find the truth about
ourselves” (ibid.). As supposedly musical beings, we can similarly discover the truth in music and our true musical selves through an examination of beauty existing in great music—something that, according to the discourse, will apparently lead to a fuller experiencing of life.

Instead of beginning with a universal conception of the subject and tracing its historical antecedents, Foucault simply asks how we might better understand our modern form of subjectivity by studying “isolable historical practices” (Paras, 121). As David Owen explains:

This task is carried out by way of historical analyses of the emergence and development of the ‘practical systems’ in and through which we are constituted by others (practices of government) and constitute ourselves (practices of freedom) as beings characterised by particular ‘forms of subjectivity,’ that is, particular ways of reflecting and acting on ourselves and others. Practical systems are analysed in terms of three axes: knowledge, power, ethics. These axes are interwoven in that it makes no sense to think of relations of ethics or of power without reference to some or other system of description and some or other form of reasoning directed to some or other ideal, because these are necessary conditions of agency; while it also makes no sense to think of relations of knowledge without reference to human purposes. (1999, 33)

The three axes Owen discusses above are the axes upon which Foucault oeuvre is built, corresponding generally to his archaeology (knowledge), genealogy (power), and care of the self (ethics) periods. They are the axes leading Deleuze to describe Foucaultian subjectivity in terms of knowledge-being, power-being, and self-being (1988, 114). The concept circumventing the impasse of extreme determinism and linking these three forms of being together Foucault called government. Paras writes, “‘Government’ was not
necessarily anonymous and third-person: unlike ‘power’ and ‘knowledge,’ the word ‘government’ pointed toward and activity that could be exercised by an individual upon himself [sic]. One governed others, but one also governed oneself. As a concept, government was far better suited to discern the role that the individual plays in the formation of his own subjectivity” (114). There are many parallels here with band participation. The band student is a governed individual (by the conductor), but at the same time governs his or herself in attempts to ‘fit in’ with the group’s efforts. At the same time, the band director governs the ensemble but is also governed by discourse. As I summarize in Chapter Seven, although my focus has been squarely on discourse as discursive and non-discursive practices, my analysis in Chapters Four through Six has been structured by Foucault’s axes of knowledge-power-ethics.

**POWER**

Power and ‘power-knowledge’ are arguably the most famous concepts associated with Foucault’s work. Unlike basic liberal theory that situates the state as a central authority (‘power over,’ see May, 81), Foucault proffers a more Nietzschean view of power that comes from below: power is capillary and productive; it creates (May, 81-82); power is also distinguished from violence—the latter compels, whereas the former influences (ibid., 82);
"power is neither force nor capacity nor domination nor authority" (Prado, 68); "[power] is not possessed or exerted by anyone or anything" (ibid.). As a capillary entity, power takes the form of a web of relations, constantly putting various actions into play. Prado suggests Foucaultian power might more properly be thought of as "an environment in which particular acts of domination or coercion occur" (68). Foucault writes in "The Subject and Power" that "what defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action that does not act directly and immediately on others. Instead, it acts upon their actions: an action upon an action, on possible or actual future or present actions" (SP, 340). Power, then, "serves no end, serves no purposes, and has no objectives. Power has direction only in the sense that its component actions are cumulative. Unlike its purposive and directed component actions, power is blind and purposeless" (Prado, 68).

Due to the sophistication, as well as the unconventional nature, of Foucault’s conceptualization of power, it has been open to many misinterpretations. Some, for example, erroneously equate power and knowledge, despite Foucault having gone on record as insisting on the distinction between them:

[W]hen I read—and I know it was being attributed to me—the thesis ‘Knowledge is power’ or ‘Power is knowledge,’ I begin to laugh, since studying their relation is precisely my problem. If

78 The History of Sexuality presents five theses on power: it is not a possession; it is not exterior to other relations; it comes from below; it is intentional and nonsubjective; and it always comes with resistance (HS, 94-95).
they were identical, I would not have to study them and I would be spared a lot of fatigue as a result. The very fact that I pose the question of their relation proves clearly that I do not identify them. (SPS, 455)

While power and knowledge are, in fact, “reciprocally related,” they are not synonymous: “Power is not knowledge nor is knowledge power. Power and knowledge are dual aspects of the comportment-conditioning environment within which individuals act, and so within which subjects are formed and have their being” (Prado, 68). Prado’s description above of power as ‘blind and purposeless’ may be a little misleading, since, if power is productive as Foucault claims, power clearly is useful in some sense. Rather, it is helpful to think of power as an omnipresent energy force, one that can never be owned or possessed by anyone or anything. This latter point is worth bearing in full measure, since the “nonsubjective” nature of power is perhaps its most salient aspect. “Individuals do not have power... [T]hey participate in it” (McLaren 2002, 38). Against the grain of received histories such as that of Green and Vogan (1991) and Mark and Gary (2007), then, my analysis in Chapters Four through Six does not posit power as the actions of, or in the possession of, individuals. Instead, my analysis (especially Chapter Six) points to a non-subjective concept of power where various constituencies (e.g., schools, universities, communities, the ‘band’ world, the

79 “We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it ‘excludes,’ it ‘represses,’ it ‘censors,’ it ‘abstracts,’ it ‘masks,’ it ‘conceals.’ In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production” (DP, 194).
'music education' world) are enmeshed in an interconnected web of both complementary and conflicted needs and interests. Although the power (or power-knowledge) environment is indisputably productive in terms of, for example, the rapid expansion of band programs in schools following the world wars, it is also an environment notable for its profound effects on individuals. Music education as band participation results in a very specific kind of musical individual. And while this might rightly be said about any medium of instruction, the discourse shows little reflexivity on this matter; all music instruction is assumed to be similarly good for people. Discussions of power-related themes are almost entirely non-existent.

How Power-Knowledge Constructs Who and What We Are

The historical moment of the disciplines was the moment when an art of the human body was born, which was directed not only at the growth of its skills, nor at the intensification of its subjection, but at the formation of a relation that in the mechanism itself makes it more obedient as it becomes more useful...Thus discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, ‘docile’ bodies. Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience).

—Discipline and Punish, 138

Besley suggests genealogy alerts us to “the dangers of science” (2002, 15). It is debatable whether or not music education qualifies as a science—in
the Foucaultian sense or otherwise. As I demonstrate with my analysis in Chapter Six, there has definitely been an attempt to codify and standardize musical instruction in ways that can be considered pretensions toward science. In this respect, I have attempted to heed Foucault’s warning that knowledge is used “for cutting” (NGH, 380). There is, in other words, no innocent knowledge; there is only knowledge that wins out and knowledge that loses—the latter of which Foucault refers to as ‘subjugated knowledge.’ These are of two types: one, previous erudite knowledges that have been covered over or forgotten, and two, indigenous, marginalized knowledges. In a limited sense, my analysis strives to demonstrate subjugated knowledge in the band world. Identifying subjugated knowledges, Besley points out, helps to illuminate the conflict and struggle (2002, 17).

This knowledge struggle is described as the ‘will to knowledge.’ If there is a drive ‘to know,’ it follows that the trajectory and momentum of this drive may be subject to change or influence. Positing such a notion challenges accepted truths about an inevitable teleology (evolution and progress) and introduces questions about just what might alter our collective trajectory. Western music is often presented as a form of monolithic truth. Its musical superiority in the world was inescapable. The introduction of ‘the will to knowledge’ emphasizes the contingency of our historical condition. The sophistication of the genealogies, May claims, lies “in carving

Note, for example, how Western music is positioned as the norm by describing non-Western musics as “world music.”
a path between posing an essential ahistorical core of who we are and counting all aspects of our legacy as equally worthy of discussion” (94). That is, Foucault challenges the humanist’s argument that we are the ineluctable result of our inviolable human nature, since directions always involve choices—choices Foucault shows are often contingent upon a number of factors. I contend there is no reason to believe music lies beyond such an examination. Music, as a form of knowledge and as a practice, is exemplary of conflict and struggle. One need look no further than to ask why we have bands in schools rather than some other performance medium. Or, to pose the question somewhat differently: Why do we have bands in schools but one is hard-pressed to find bands on the radio or even the classical concert hall?

Foucault demonstrates historical choices by documenting changes. “Every change is a choice, and excludes other choices” (Paras, 52). What is notable about the genealogies, however, is they argue, echoing Nietzsche, that choices “do not point back to a chooser. There is not necessarily a ‘subject of knowledge’ controlling the trajectory of choices and exclusions, no ‘guiding mind’ who would invent them or found them at a primary level”

---

81 Yes, choirs and orchestras do exist in schools, as do with increasing regularity, “alternative” music options. My point is bands entered schools for a variety of reasons, not the least of which were the efforts of musical product industry. Bands, my research suggests, were not (and are not) unanimously endorsed as a medium for music education.
(ibid.). The *will* and the forces acting against the will are anonymous.\(^8^2\) Although histories of music education frequently highlight the work of individuals, these histories overlook or elide the complexities of the power-knowledge environment that ultimately determine what individuals can and cannot do. There exist, in other words, *systems* of constraint that precede the actions of people. Hence, actions do not act on people, but on other actions. Foucault writes that his aim in the genealogies was to show “how series of discourse are formed, through, in spite of, or with the aid of these systems of constraint: what were the specific norms for each, and what were their conditions of appearance, growth, and variation” (qtd. in May, 63). This succinctly describes what I have done in Chapter Six, where I show how present pedagogical band discourse is not the result of individuals, but of the power-knowledge environment of institutionalization.

As suggested in the epigram, discipline makes bodies more productive as it makes them more compliant. Danaher et al. suggest the rise in ‘docile bodies’ corresponded to the new demands of factory production, where people had to acquire specific skills and endure long, difficult days. They compare this to how an aspiring guitarist (or for purposes here, a band student) might gladly devote hours to practicing in order to “master the discipline” (2000, 51). A docile body, Foucault suggests, is one that can be “used, transformed and improved” (DP, 136)—a description appropriate to

\(^8^2\) Compare to Nietzsche’s *The Genealogy of Morals*, Essay I, section 13.
the school band student. To a certain extent this may be viewed in a positive light insofar as the individual is invested with productive capacities. Undoubtedly, many school band students play their instruments well. As Prado points out, however, Foucault’s interest lies not so much with the normative aspect of whether or not these productive capacities are good or bad, but with how power operates blindly in ways that eliminate the freedom of choice from individuals and determine, without input from individuals, how “certain bodies, certain gestures, certain discourses, certain desires, come to be identified and constituted as individuals” (Foucault, qtd. in Prado, 78). In the case of aspiring music students, then, it is not so much a problem that they devote hours to ‘mastering the discipline,’ but that the desire to do so may stem from forces unbeknownst to them, and that their perceived “success” will likely determine, to an extent, who they are taken to be and how they will be permitted to operate in the world. While most high school band classes are optional subjects, students can hardly be said to be exercising choice in music education when their music options consist of, at most, band or choir (or sometimes orchestra). Moreover, as my analysis shows, students are granted almost no latitude over any aspect of their musical learning within school band programs. The discourse is unequivocal: band students are to be docile bodies *par excellence*. 

98
The Subject and Power: Subjectivation

There are two meanings of the word ‘subject:’ subject to someone else by control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to.
—The Subject and Power, 331

Much has been made of Foucault’s emphasis on power’s subject-defining role. According to Prado, “power is an explanatory concept; it explains how subjectivity is produced and shaped” (79). Due to Foucault’s historicist conception of the subject, we cannot understand the production of subjectivity without power, he claims. That is, in denying the existence of any foundational entity, some explanatory concept must be offered that answers the question of how we have come to be. I have already discussed how Foucault objected to notions of the autonomous subject. What is less clear is how the constituted subject can be said to possess agency that is not some form of false consciousness. As recalled from the ‘Truth’ section, Foucault’s view of reality is not predicated on an interpretation of the noumenal world. That is, there is no essence to know; he rejects the Platonic notion of the original and the simulacrum. Foucault’s subject, then, “presupposes that agents are always also patients” (Conway 1999, 68). Subjects have the ability to participate in their self-constitution, but this participation will always reflect “the implacable influence of normalising disciplines” (ibid.). Conversely, while subjects are ‘rendered docile’ by
disciplines, they can also use the knowledge imprinted in them by these same disciplines in acts of resistance: “they...can turn the productive faculties invested in them against regimes of power that threaten to accede to domination” (ibid., 65). Accordingly, it is not that participants in the pedagogical band world (students and teachers) are unwitting pawns ignorant of their manipulation, and that “the truth will set them free.” Rather, it is important to understand that there is no “escape” necessary or possible (because there is no truth to escape to). Foucaultian subjectivity is always a combination of experiencing the world while simultaneously being subject to the historical forces of the disciplines. Understanding these historical forces, however, opens up the possibility to be different from ourselves.

The important point here is not whether resistance is possible within a Foucaultian framework, but that resistance is something that might be desirable. In other words, there must exist a desire to escape or avoid states of domination; there must exist "something like the feeling of powerlessness”83 (Patton, ctd. in Ashenden and Owen 1999, 15). This implies the capacity for self-interpretation and self-reflection—“a fuller conception of human subjectivity” than often understood in Foucault’s framework (ibid.). In order to challenge prevailing ‘regimes of truth,’ band students and their teachers must be able to recognize the operation of these

83 Powerlessness in this sense referring not to the ability to possess power, but to the more traditional conception of ‘power to.’
regimes and desire to resist them. What is glossed over by some critics, however, is that the limits of our self-interpretation and self-reflection are themselves determined. As Prado points out, “while we can imagine not having certain beliefs and attitudes, or having different beliefs and attitudes, it is more difficult to imagine ourselves as fundamentally other than we are because power produced us differently” (79). That is, the practices of bands create an opaque environment: bands do what they do because that is what bands do.

It is not that the Foucaultian subject lacks agency or the capacity for self-awareness, then, but that this agency is epistemologically dependent. Part of the problem, as suggested in the ‘Truth’ section is that our society is so completely centered on the nature of truth. Subjectivity is, therefore, connected to power-knowledge (truth). “What relation,” asks Foucault, “[exists] between the fact that one is a subject in a relation of power, and a subject by whom, for whom, and through whom the truth is manifest?...Why do we experience a link between the functioning of power and the requirement to ‘tell the truth’ about who we are?” (qtd. in Paras, 115). Why, Foucault asks, is there this “obligation for individuals to make of themselves...essential actors?” (ibid.).

84 Why does the discourse suggest that students will come to know beauty and become more fully human through learning music—and why has society embraced this truth (evidenced in

84 See Butler (2005) for a further elaboration of this question.
support for band programs in schools)? Why, in band participation, do students believe themselves to be a conduit for the production of musical, if not human, truth? And why do so many willingly submit to the intentions of the composer and conductor rather than asserting their own musical conceptions? The salient point—for Foucault and for this study—is to carefully examine how we are formed, both generally as people, and specifically as musical people.

As shown in Chapter Four, the band student is subjected to what Foucault calls in *Discipline and Punish*, ‘the means of correct training.’ Band students accept that their role is to respond efficiently and effectively to the bidding of the conductor, and teachers unquestioningly accept that it is their role to mold the band students accordingly. Band students, the discourse makes clear, are to have no input on how the music is chosen, rehearsed, or performed. Their bodies are ‘useful’ to the degree they execute the musical work. All of this occurs under the guise of truth that is manifested about music and music making. Who the band student becomes in music is dictated by these musical practices. Foucault reverses the received view of the mind ‘owning’ a body, stating the “soul is the prison of the body” (DP, 30).  

---

85 “[The soul] has a reality, it is produced permanently around, on, within the body by the functioning of a power that is exercised on those punished—and, in a more general way, on those one supervises, trains and corrects, over madmen, children at home and at school, the colonized, over those
physiological organ untouched by historical influences, in reality the body is a site of normalization participating in never-ending relations of power. The body is “molded by a great many distinct regimes; it is broken down by the rhythms of work, rest, and holidays [or in music: rehearsals]; it is poisoned by food or values, through eating habits or moral laws; it constructs resistances” (NGH, 380). The genealogies empirically document how, through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, bodies became such a focal point for subject formation in the pursuit of ‘useful bodies.’ The body, writes Foucault, “becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body” (DP, 26). It is the disciplines, he argues, that function “as techniques for making useful individuals” (DP, 211). The disciplines, of course, function not only through material practices, but through establishing ‘regimes of truth’ in the form of expert discourse (Prado, 36). Foucault shows in The History of Sexuality, for example, how ‘scientific’ discourses helped to shape subjectivity through the construction of what we believe to be the truth about our ‘inner nature’ based on practices of the body. Music education discourse similarly shapes our musicality by determining what is true about music, music making, and human nature (e.g., human beings need beauty).

who are stuck at a machine and supervised for the rest of their lives” (DP, 29).
ARCHAEOLOGY

[Archaeology] does not relate analysis to geological excavation. It designates the general theme of a description that questions the already-said at the level of its existence.
—The Archaeology of Knowledge, 148

The archaeologist’s interest...is in disciplinary discourse, in expert pronouncements and idioms.
(Prado 2000, 24)

I turn now to an examination of Foucault’s three methodological periods: archaeology, genealogy, and ethics. It is important to understand the term archaeology in its Foucaultian context. Only vaguely does it resemble the word’s common usage (Scheurich and McKenzie 2005, 845). Although often associated with structuralism, Foucault himself felt his archaeological approach closer to Nietzschean genealogy than “structuralism properly so called” (WH, 294). Archaeology, Foucault’s methodological focus up to approximately 1970, was used in the books Madness and Civilization (1961), The Birth of the Clinic (1963), and The Order of Things (1966). The Archaeology of Knowledge (1969), essentially a treatise on method, has been described as “an exceptional text” (Smart 1994, 5) and an “awkward and brilliant book” (Veyne 1997, 146 n1). According to Paras, Foucault’s final archaeological project, was an attempt to create a new discipline—a “study of the history of the conditions of possibility of ideas” (33). This

86 These are the French publication dates, which I have listed to situate Foucault chronologically.
Discursive Formations

Foucault’s opposition to the “history of ideas” was based on his belief that it involves the use of “magical concepts” (his term) such as influence, crisis, and sudden realization. These, he claims, do not work, since, whenever difficulties present themselves, historians jump from the “statements themselves” to “an explanation by social conditions, mentality, worldview, and so on” (WH, 282-83). In contrast, Foucault played a “systematic game” of describing the connections between statements—“the relations of implications, opposition, [and] exclusion” (ibid., 283). He writes, “it became apparent to me that the domain of statements did obey formal laws [rules], that, for example, one could find a single theoretical model for different epistemological domains; and in this sense one could conclude that there was an autonomy of discourses” (ibid., 284). The autonomy of a discourse, defined by the regularities in “correlations, positions and functionings, [and] transformations” one might find “between objects, types

87 “Mentality or spirit of an age” Foucault sees as the “correlate of consciousness” (AS, 302). “It is necessary,” he says, “to abandon those readymade syntheses, those groupings which are admitted before any examination, those links of which the validity is accepted at the outset” (ibid.). See also: AK, “Introduction.”
of statement, concepts, or thematic choices,” Foucault called a *discursive formation* (AK, 41). Key to understanding the discursive formation is the connection Foucault makes between the visible and the sayable: objects (or things) and the words we use to bring such objects into play. That is, statements do not describe or define objects. Rather, Foucault seeks to dispense with the simple connections so often assumed between words and objects (‘things’). What is of interest is not the lexical organization or the “scansions of a semantic field,” but the rules that allow objects to form within a discourse and “constitute the conditions of their historical appearance” (ibid., 53).

Through the rigorous application of rules, or formative schemata, Foucault felt one could accurately summarize a bounded set of statements: “All the aspects of discourse are thus covered. And when it is possible in a group of statements, to register and describe *one* referential, *one* type of enunciative divergence, *one* theoretical network, *one* field of strategic possibilities, then one can be sure that they belong to what can be called a *discursive formation*. This formation groups together a whole population of statement-events” (AS, 321; orig. emph.). The discursive formation, then, was a descriptive tool that illuminated “relations between the phenomena of enunciation which had hitherto remained in darkness and were not immediately transcribed on the surface of discourses” (ibid.), but, to

88 Note that the French title of *The Order of Things* is *Les Mots et les choses* [*Words and Things*].
reiterate and re-emphasize, these relations did not uncover any hidden meanings. There were no secrets to be found, nor any generalized forms or structures. The system of the four governing rules of the discursive formation Foucault labeled a *positivity*, and was intended to explain not commonalities, but divergences, interstices and distances—"in some sense [the discursive formation’s] blanks rather than its full surfaces" (ibid.).

To clarify, I am not claiming to have dealt with discursive formations in the purest Foucaultian sense. Rather, I have taken the concept of the discursive formation and applied it to my analysis. As I will articulate more fully in Chapter Three, by using techniques adapted from the field of corpus linguistics, I have used computer software to assist with my identification and analysis of statements. The cohesion present in my concordance analysis (see Chapter Three) suggested to me that the *CBJ/CW* corpus constitutes an autonomous discourse (a discursive formation). By subsequently examining statements with respect to the referential (object), subject position, associated field (concepts), and materiality (strategic choices) (see AK, 130), I was able to group statements into the categories found in Chapter Four.

Foucault raises at least three cautions with respect to the discursive formation. First, one must guard against the ‘formalist illusion’ (AS, 330)—a warning that seems somewhat ironic when compared to criticisms of archaeology that raise this very point (see, for e.g., Prado 2000; Paras
2006; May 2006). Second, one need recognize that the individuality of statements does not individuate objects. Rather, it describes the interstices separating objects, what Foucault above calls a ‘referential’ (AS, 313-14). Lastly, one must avoid the “anthropological categories” that might lead to “unreflective unities or syntheses.” The subject or author, for example, is of no relevance to statements (ibid., 310), since (a) the subject is governed by structures (‘systems of enunciability’) that determine what can be said—a historical a priori (AK, 138, 143, 146), and (b) attention to the subject involves inferences about intentionalities (WH, 286). I have heeded these three cautions in my analysis. First, I have not attempted to make formal claims about my categories. Like much qualitative analysis, I worked and re-worked my categories many times. The sections found in Chapter Four, for example, emerged after many months of analysis, but should not be considered the result of formal rules. They are, in effect, arbitrary. Second, I never assumed objects to be coincident with themselves. I continually sought to identify differences in the way various statements used particular terms (e.g., conducting, teacher, music). And third, as I discuss more fully below, I examined statements irrespective of their authors in order to avoid Foucault’s “anthropological categories.”
Discourse, the Analysis of Statements and the Archive

The analysis of statements is a historical exercise, one that shuns interpretation. Foucault claims it is not about what was really said, but rather, it is about the statement’s mode of existence (AK, 123). To be clear, Foucault is alluding to the practice of deciphering hidden meanings. Rendering visible the “immediate transparency” of the statement is archaeology’s goal (ibid., 126). This rendering, however, is inextricably linked with the analysis of the discursive formation: “The analysis of the statement and that of the formation are established correlatively” (ibid., 130). Statements thus belong to discursive formations “as a sentence belongs to a text” (ibid.). Archaeological analysis asks: What are the principles by which ‘signifying groups’ are enunciated and appear? What are the limits that separate what is said from what is not? (ibid., 134). This requires attending to the ‘exteriority’ of the statement, not a presumed interiority that attempts to locate and free the nucleus of a determining subjectivity or ‘cogito’ (ibid., 136-38). A subject—individual, collective, or transcendental—is of no concern. It is potential subject positions effected by the enunciative field that form part of the investigation (ibid., 137). I believe corpus linguistic techniques (see Chapter Three) have been helpful in this regard. By examining the CBJ/CW corpus as a sedimented whole I have been able to consider individual statements in the context of the corpus, not
in relation to what individuals may or may not have said about a particular object. That is, I have not sought to understand the concepts of, for example, conductor or repertoire, but rather, have examined every statement against a given set of words (see Chapter Three). I have not inferred what was really meant by various authors, but have taken all statements at face value, with the one caveat that subject position (school teacher, university professor, composer) was considered, since subject positions are connected with general rewards and punishments.\footnote{For example, it is not surprising that the majority of CBJ/CW authors are university professors, since publishing and recruiting are professional expectations of their positions.}

In Paras’s view, the history of knowledge was not, for the archaeologist, a story of “progress of reason,” or the “recounting of a narrative” where thought made an “impact in the world” (34). In fact, the idea that thought was the possession of an autonomous agent was anathema to Foucault’s archaeological endeavour: “The painful truth that needed to be embraced was that men [sic] were the wholly interchangeable speakers of systems of thought that transcended them. Archaeology did not exist to exalt the voices of those who speak, but to demonstrate that every speaker is a ventriloquist’s dummy” (ibid., 35). Accordingly, Foucault excluded almost all proper names from The Archaeology of Knowledge. I have adopted Foucault’s practice in this study by similarly excluding the names of authors in CBJ/CW. Following Foucault, I proffer that the names of
specific individuals have no bearing on the ‘regimes of truth’ operating in the discourse. If author ‘A’ did not make a particular statement, author ‘B’ would have. The inclusion of proper names serves only to mislead us into thinking statements are the product of autonomous agents rather than the systems of discursivity operating in the pedagogical band world.

**Continuity and Discontinuity**

In view of the complex conceptual apparatus provided in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, it is important to keep in mind Foucault does not claim to construct a theory in the strict sense of the word (AK, 128). Instead what he presents are many guiding analytic principles—principles I have attempted to draw upon in my own analysis. One of these many principles is the notion of continuity and discontinuity. For Foucault, the imposition of continuity in the ‘history of ideas’ is to elide and overlook important discontinuities. The concept of ‘tradition,’ for example,

makes it possible to rethink the dispersion of history in the form of the same; it allows a reduction of the difference proper to every beginning, in order to pursue without discontinuity the endless search for the origin; tradition enables us to isolate the new against a background of permanence, and to transfer its merit to originality, to genius, to the decisions proper to individuals. (ibid., 23)

---

But see page 29, where Foucault implies that, by “dissipating” the “apparent familiarity” of continuities might allow one to make a theory of the exposed groupings, or page 228, where Foucault refers to archaeology as a general theory of productions.
That is, the ‘history of ideas’ attributes a coherence to the discourses it studies (ibid., 167). Foucault suggests that all “ready made synthesis,” such as the book or the *oeuvre*, that “obscure” and prevent proper analysis are suspect: “they must be driven out from the darkness in which they reign” (ibid., 24). He continues, stating, “I shall accept the groupings that history suggests only to subject them at once to interrogation” (ibid., 29).

Somewhat later in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, however, Foucault seemingly softens his approach, saying, “my intention was not to deny all value to these unities or to try to forbid their use; it was to show that they required, in order to be defined exactly, a theoretical elaboration” (ibid., 79).

Continuities, then—provided they are recognized as imposed from without and not inherent in any natural or essential sense—represent a potential starting point from which to develop critical analysis.

Both Mark and Gary (2007) and Green and Vogan (1991) present the history of music education as a narrative, showing the present state of music education to be the result of significant people and events. Significantly, one is led to believe that all people and events shared some form of commitment to a “common cause.” Foucault’s work suggests these kinds of narratives

---

91 In the “Archaeology of Science,” Foucault writes that presumed unities such as “the work of an author, the cohesion of an epoch, or the evolution of a science” were ignored (AS, 311).

92 Green and Vogan write: “the truth is that music education has survived bureaucracies, apathies, and other adversities, primarily because of
are suspect. Accordingly, the very concept of “music education” is suspect because it leads us to believe in the existence of such a thing, when in fact music education is a continuity imposed upon very dissimilar statements and practices. My research suggests music education as conceptualized and practiced by the Canadian art world establishment of Ernest MacMillan and Arnold Walter bears very little in common with the Canadian band world of the first half of the twentieth century. My analysis of statements, then, must be viewed in light of my suspicion of both continuities and discontinuities.

Summary

Foucault no longer referred to ‘archaeology’ after The Archaeology of Knowledge (Paras, 10), causing some commentators, most notably Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow (1982) in Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, to suggest archaeology was inherently unsound as a method—something which resulted in Foucault’s subsequent genealogical direction. The “fatal flaw,” Dreyfus and Rabinow argue, was the failure of archaeology to exercise “phenomenological restraint.” Foucault conflated “regularities that he observed in statements with rules; the difference, of course, is that the former may merely be said to be observable, while the latter govern” (ctd. in Paras, 53). As a result, Foucault “illegitimately outstanding musicians and teachers devoted to a common cause” (1991, xvi).
hypostasized” the observed irregularities of discursive formations into the very conditions of their existence (ibid.). This view of archaeology, however, tends toward the more critical end of the spectrum (see, for example, May 2006; Scheurich and McKenzie 2005). Paras calls Gary Gutting’s (1989) *Michel Foucault’s Archaeology of Scientific Reason* a useful corrective to the popular criticism of Rabinow and Dreyfus (Paras, 166 n13), although this should not be misinterpreted as suggesting Gutting is uncritical of archaeology. While Gutting sees merit in archaeology, he argues its greatest strength—the bracketing or decentering of the subject—is also its primary weakness (2005, 14). Although Foucault no longer practised strict archaeology after *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, it does not necessarily follow that archaeological methods are of little value. The jettisoning of the ‘phenomenological subject,’ as Gutting describes it, allowed Foucault to consider history differently (ibid., 18). Such is, in part, my interest in archaeology. Both Green and Vogan (1991) and Mark and Gary (2007), for example, deal with music education history by largely focusing on the work of significant individuals, leading to the conclusion various historical figures have dictated the course of history. Foucault’s work encourages a reexamination of history that considers the conditions that made particular statements possible at various times. By using corpus linguistics techniques, I have focused solely only on statements themselves, rather than the ‘phenomenological subject.’ Using the statements instead of individuals as a
basis for investigation has allowed me to consider music education as a socially constructed discursive formation rather than a naturally occurring object engaged with by autonomous agents operating in a noumenal world.

May claims “the archaeological works place their accent on what is said at the expense of what is done” (58). For this and other reasons, I have thus felt it necessary to include Foucault’s genealogical approach as well. Music education is an interdisciplinary field, and any analysis of it and its effects will necessarily involve both what is said and what is done. This study has been guided, however, by the suspicion music education has for too long operated on the basis of too many unexamined assumptions, assumptions I have attempted to interrogate with the help of archaeology. As Prado points out, “archaeology goes wrong when it turns into a theory about how things are and pretends to transcend its historical situatedness and to discover hidden determinants underlying phenomena” (27). When archaeology is done well, on the other hand, it is an effective inquiry into the bases for the possibilities of knowledge. “Archaeology is the mapping of the enabling conditions for the production of truth and knowledge. It cannot be a method for discerning objective determinants, such as practice-determining discursive structures, lurking behind the appearances they supposedly produce. To do archaeology is precisely to understand how something like a discursive structure comes to be considered an underlying reality” (Prado, 28). That is, the aim is not to adjudicate “the truth of knowledge-systems’
claims, but to understand how those claims come to be claims” (ibid., 25). It is this aim, particularly in regard to subjectivity, that has guided my analysis of *CBJ/CW*.

**GENEALOGY**

Genealogy is gray, meticulous, a patiently documentary. It operates on a field of entangled and confused parchments, on documents that have been scratched and recopied many times.  
—Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, 369

And this is what I would call genealogy, that is, a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledges, discourses, domains of objects, and so on, without having to make reference to a subject which is either transcendental in relation to the field of events or runs in its empty sameness throughout the course of history.  
—Truth and Power, 118

After 1970, Foucault’s approach to research changed. His subsequent two books, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975) and *The History of Sexuality, Volume One* (1976), have become known for employing an investigative method known as genealogy. Invariably the most frequently cited aspect of Foucault’s work (Paras, 163; Prado, 4; Scheurich and McKenzie 2005, 843), genealogy differs from archaeology in several

---

93 These are the French publication dates. Both books were translated into English in 1977. The original French subtitle of *The History of Sexuality* was *The Will to Knowledge.*
respects, the most notable being Foucault’s shift in emphasis from language to practices. Deleuze sees *The Archaeology of Knowledge* as distinguishing between the discursive and non-discursive, situating the latter negatively in relation to the former (1988, 31), something that changed in Foucault’s genealogical approach: “What *The Archaeology* recognized but still only designated negatively, as non-discursive environments, is given its positive form in *Discipline and Punish*, a form that haunted the whole of Foucault’s work: the form of the visible, as opposed to the form of whatever can be articulated” (ibid., 32). While much has been made of this supposed distinction between the discursive and non-discursive, May suggests in genealogy, the distinction in fact disappears (91). Rather than a sedimented whole (as in archaeology), genealogy treats discourse as a “a series of events,” events that have an impact “in the realm of bodies”—what Paras calls a “materialism of the incorporeal” (67).

**Genealogy as Method**

The introduction of power is a novel and significant component of genealogy, one that was in many respects missing from Foucault’s archaeological work. As previously discussed, Foucault’s conceptualization of

---

94 One notes, however, that power loosely defined was not altogether absent from archaeology insofar as Foucault does include ‘materiality’ as a
of power, and its connection to knowledge, has become one of his most celebrated—if not always well-understood—aspects of his work. And while power is an undeniably critical aspect of genealogy, its long shadow must not prevent attending to Foucault’s larger genealogical purpose: challenging traditional methods, assumptions, and “established conceptions of truth and knowledge” (Prado, 4). The genealogical method, suggests McLaren, “raises questions about how current practices, institutions, and categories came to be the way they are” (2002, 3-4).

In May’s view, Foucaultian genealogy bears some resemblance to how the word is used in connection with familial lineage. “The idea of asking who one is by way of tracing how one has arrived at this point is certainly in accordance with his method,” May writes (63). Indeed, the comparison to a family tree is an apt one, providing one avoids the trappings of centering, of conceptualizing final end points, or of thinking of just one family. The goal in genealogy, as in familial lineage, is not necessarily to identify points of origin or foundational moments. While it might be objected that unlike in families (creationism notwithstanding), all practices inevitably begin somewhere, it is important to note that any identification of origin does not provide “privileged insight into their essential character,” since, in Foucault’s view, practices do not have an essential character (May, 64).

constitutive element of discourse. That is, strategic possibilities are inherent in discursive formations.

95 “[Genealogy] opposes itself to the search for ‘origins’” (NGH, 370).
'regimes of truth’ in school band discourses, then, needs to be understood not as an attempt to identify an unbroken lineage that has resulted in current truth claims, but rather the identification of contributing elements that have combined and recombined in various ways over time. For example, the wind band’s relatively standard instrumentation today is not the result of resolute efforts, but the “accidental” outcome of various constituencies with unrelated, or at best interrelated, interests.

As Prado explains it, genealogy “reconceives intellectual inquiry as a series of diverse practices governed by thoroughly historical standards” (43). What is significant about this is that the “actual workings” of practices are often “masked” from its participants. As a result, “participants see their activities as regulated not by historical standards but by ahistorical principles. They see the fruits of their activities as ongoing discernment of truth and therefore as the acquisition of objective knowledge” (ibid.). This process of knowledge acquisition is viewed as part of an overall project of “discoveries” which must be sorted into “various categories that correspond to and delineate proper subjects of inquiry” (ibid.). “The result,” Prado points out, “is a steadily increasing number of expert disciplines devoted to an equally increasing number of ‘natural’ topics” (ibid.). This is evident in schooling, which treats most curricular areas as naturally occurring, borne out by the phrase “the basics.” It is also evident in universities, institutions often conceptualized in terms of specialized domains devoted to “knowledge
development” or “knowledge acquisition.” The point of genealogical inquiry, Prado suggests, is to demonstrate disciplines in fact “discern nothing, discover nothing” (ibid.). Disciplines construct their own content, which, under the guise of “expertise,” continues to expand its reach, concealing that disciplines, rather than being an outgrowth of objective reality, are in fact “interwoven collections of individual maneuvers that had their beginnings in varying responses to diverse situations” (ibid.). “Expert discourse [thus] provides the medium in which these maneuvers congeal into learned fields and their respective procedures” (ibid.).

Early wind bands, for example, did not conceptualize their practice as the study of music-as-art. As demonstrated in Chapter Six, it was the emergence of the discipline of *music education* that led to the belief music instruction in schools should be about the study of the *music itself*. Music education did not “discover” music-as-art; the profession created it.

The genealogist, then, must attend to how individual maneuvers and diverse situations have, over time, come to construct what are taken by many to be expert disciplines. “Genealogy demands relentless erudition,” writes Foucault (NGH, 370). Identifying “accidental beginnings” requires patience as one ‘sifts through the details’ of “archives, chronicles, diaries, journals, logbooks, letters, memoirs, official records, and registries,” among

---

96 Prado’s use of the word ‘congeal’ is intentional. “Dangerous coagulations,” also the title of the book by Baker and Heyning, is a famous phrase used by Foucault in *Discipline and Punish* (see DP, 143).
other items (Prado, 40). Foucault claims this exercise is descriptive rather than prescriptive, although May considers this to be “a bit disingenuous,” since there are, despite Foucault’s occasional overtures to the contrary, obvious elements of critique within genealogical analysis (65). Prado proffers this is because genealogy depends on the grand narratives of historians to act as a counterpoint: “Genealogy’s unearthing of marginal and neglected items is done to offer alternative accounts to epics that claim to depict underlying continuities” (40). The degree to which Foucault’s genealogies are intended to serve a prescriptive rather than descriptive function thus remains open to debate. What is more certain is that the genealogies are generally regarded as being thoughtful, systematic accounts tracing particular “aspects of who we have come to be” (May, 67; orig. emph.). Such is my goal in this study. While I have not specifically examined diaries, journals, and logbooks, historical accounts furnished in the CBJ/CW corpus have brought to light particular “beginnings” missing from traditional accounts of music education history. For example, nowhere in Green and Vogan (1991) does one find references to the role of the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association in band teacher training in the 1930s.

Foucault’s genealogies, May explains, are about practices, not marriages. Moreover, they are not about a singular practice, but about multiple practices—all of which are bound to the “politics of truth.” Because

97 It is worth noting that Foucault is faulted by a few critics for constructing ‘straw man’ arguments.
practices are social, they “form the collective character of who we are” (May, 92). The intentional double entendre of Foucault’s words, ‘subjugation’ and ‘subjectivation,’ underscores how our subjectivity is conditioned “through the subjection to various practices of power-knowledge” (ibid., 91). To be clear, however, subjects are not just made or constructed via the imposition of practices; subjects are in fact the participants in the very practices which effect normalizing forms of subjectivity (ibid., 83). This, in essence, is what Foucault demonstrates in Discipline and Punish and The History of Sexuality, and what he develops more fully in his concept of bio-power (Smart, 1994, 7). As May summarizes: “by our participating in these practices, we ourselves become embedded in relations of power, even when we resist them. We become what those relations orient us to become, and we pave the way for others to become it as well” (85). Participants in school bands are both subjected to various ‘regimes of truth’ about music and music making, and help to create and sustain these regimes. School band directors are almost without exception individuals who have played in school bands themselves. Due to the rapid escalation of school bands following the World Wars, North America has produced generations of musicians for whom musicality, as my analysis of discourse shows, has a very distinct meaning.

98 There are some difficulties introduced by translating French to English. As an editor’s note points out in The Essential Works of Foucault, Volume Three, the French word assujettissement is sometimes translated as ’subjectivation’ and sometimes as ’subjugation.’ To complicate matters further, ’subjectification,’ the word favoured by Nicolas Rose, also appears at various points.
In a 1980 essay, “Questions of Method,” Foucault provides a somewhat clearer explanation of his entire genealogical method. Described as “eventalization,” two principles are intended. First, an approach that works to ‘breach self-evidence’: “To show that things ‘weren’t as necessary as all that;’ it wasn’t as a matter of course that mad people came to be regarded as mentally ill; it wasn’t self-evident that the only thing to be done with the criminal was to lock him [sic] up; it wasn’t self-evident that the causes of illness were to be sought through the individual examination of bodies; and so on” (QM, 226). Second, eventalization refers to “rediscovering the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, plays of forces, strategies, and so on, that at a given moment establish what subsequently counts as being self-evident, universal, and necessary” (ibid., 226-27). For example, Discipline and Punish is not a study of the practice of penal incarceration as an event, but rather a study of the multiple processes that constitute penal incarceration (ibid., 227). The goal, in other words, is to work in the direction of causal multiplication, not causal reduction. Thus, by “lightening the weight of causality,” eventalization examines events not as a product, but as a process conceptualized as a ‘polyhedron of intelligibility’: “the number of faces is not given in advance and can never properly be taken as finite” (ibid.). Chapters Four through Six show how accepted truths about the teaching and learning of music through band participation are not the inevitable result of “the nature and value of music”
(Reimer 2003; Elliott 1995), but, for example, processes of institutionalization. Rather than accept the traditional narratives of music education, I have endeavoured to ‘breach self-evidence’ by showing how institutional needs (e.g., that of schools and universities) contributed to a suspicion of entertainment in band performance, and a heightened emphasis on the *lasting value of the music itself*.

**Discussion**

If we were to characterize it in two terms, then “archaeology” would be the appropriate methodology of this analysis of local discursivities, and “genealogy” would be the tactics whereby, on the basis of the descriptions of these local discursivities, the subjected knowledges which were thus released would brought into play.

—Two Lectures (qtd. in Scheurich and McKenzie 2005, 849)

Prado claims *Discipline and Punish* and *The History of Sexuality* are Foucault’s most widely read, but most often misunderstood and misused books. The ideas presented by Foucault, he says, “are prone to distortion and hasty appropriation” (4). For Prado, Foucault’s genealogies provide “the most pointed indictments of traditionally conceived truth, knowledge, and rationality. That is where we find the sharpest articulations of the ideas that truth and knowledge are products of power, that the subject is product of disciplinary techniques, and that rationality is itself an historical product”
Genealogy offers a method for examining the connection between the discursive and non-discursive. Whereas archaeology examines knowledge in the form of an archive, genealogy attempts a “history of the present” (DP, 31) by examining the ‘descent and emergence’ of “morals, ideals, metaphysical concepts and all manner of institutions” in order to demonstrate they are not universal or inevitable, but instead are the “products of happenchance meetings of blind forces” (Prado, 38). Genealogy, writes Besley, “seeks to explain present-day cultural phenomena and problems by looking to the past and analyzing how it was derived and constituted historically...It forms a critical ontology of ourselves” (2002, 14). Towards such an end I have at times drawn upon sources outside of CBJ/CW in order to show how present practices are the result of multiple contingencies, and that our current large ensemble model was neither an inevitability nor the result of something like “progress.” Rose points out genealogy does not ask Why? but How? (Rose 1998, 80). By documenting the various moves that have occurred over the past one hundred years or so years, I have tried to show how, against the grain of some of our received grand narratives in music education, we have come to our present understanding of practice by articulating some of the conditions that have made particular practices acceptable at certain moments.

Foucault’s genealogical work has not been without its critics, most notably Jürgen Habermas, who argues Foucault’s genealogical method takes
on both an empirical and a transcendental role. In the former, “power relationships are of interest as conditions for the rise of scientific knowledge and its social effects;” in the latter, “power relationships [are] constitutive conditions for scientific knowledge” (Conway 1999, 62). The resultant totalizing concept of power (Owen 1999, 28) leads Habermas to conclude: “To the extent that it retreats into the reflectionless objectivity of a nonparticipatory, ascetic description of kaleidoscopically changing practices of power, genealogical historiography emerges from its cocoon as precisely the presentistic, relativistic, cryptonormative illusory science that it does not want to be” (qtd. in Conway 1999, 63; orig. emph.).

Similarly, Nancy Fraser concludes that Foucault’s work is “normatively confused” (1992, 231). In her assessment, the attempt to “bracket out” normative assumptions in the analysis of power (ibid., 220-21) is either a theoretical impossibility belied by Foucault’s own normatively-infused language (ibid., 230), or a form of deception, since Foucault refuses to state his normative framework (ibid., 218). The problem, Prado points out, is that Foucault presents his genealogies “as cogent and compelling while claiming

99 The Foucault-Habermas debates have been the subject of much critical writing, highlighting not just differing viewpoints between the thinkers, but very different objects of investigation. See, for example, Samantha Ashenden and David Owen (eds.), Foucault Contra Habermas: Recasting The Dialogue Between Genealogy And Critical Theory (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE, 1999).

100 In Smart’s assessment, Habermas completely misunderstands Foucault’s conception of power. “As such what appears to be refuted in Habermas’s philosophical essay on modernity is not Nietzsche but his shadow, not Foucault merely a caricature” (1994, 11).
that they are historical interpretations” (134). If Foucault is simply offering up a reading, why should we believe his descriptions of penal practices or the control of sexuality “as discernment and exposure of what was really going on” (ibid.)? *Discipline and Punish* and *The History of Sexuality* “do read like corrections of historical distortions rather than as merely intriguing interpretations” (ibid.). It is not just Foucault’s refusal to provide normative grounds that is problematic, then, but the fact Foucault sometimes claims to speak the truth in the process of critiquing it. As I have stated, my analysis in Chapters Four through Six must be considered nothing but a reading; I am not claiming to speak the truth about bands in the twentieth century. I am also not denying the normative assumptions in my work. One of my analytical goals, however, is to expose what I see as the hidden or ignored assumptions currently undergirding practices in the pedagogical band world, and to discern some of the possible causal antecedents for these assumptions.

**Summary**

The disciplines show, first, according to artificially clear and decanted systems, the way in which systems of objective finality and systems of communication and power can be welded together. They also display different models of articulation, sometimes giving preeminence to power relations and obedience (as in those disciplines of a monastic or penitential type), sometimes to goal-directed activities (as in the disciplines of workshops or hospitals),
sometimes to relationships of communication (as in the disciplines of apprenticeship), sometimes also to a saturation of the three types of relationship (as perhaps in military discipline, where a plethora of signs indicates, to the point of redundancy, tightly knit power relations calculated with care to produce a certain number of technical effects).

—The Subject and Power, 339

Scheurich and McKenzie claim that scholars in the United States believe genealogy superior to archaeology. They disagree, and suggest archaeology continues to exist in genealogy, and has merit in and of itself (2005, 849). I am concerned with both the ‘local discursivities’ in CBJ/CW and the field of instrumental music education and the tactics by which these discursivities are brought into play. Considered as a discipline, music education as presented in CBJ/CW displays many aspects presented by Foucault in both Discipline and Punish and The History of Sexuality. Compared to the epigram above, there are elements of obedience, goal-directedness, communication, and, in the case of large ensemble performance, a “saturation” of all three.

“Genealogy,” writes Conway,

is often recommended for its relentless attention to the particular, the immanent, the historical, the empirical, the neglected, the forgotten, the hidden and the excluded... But genealogy should also be recommended for its embedding effects on its practitioners. To undertake a genealogical investigation is also to place oneself within an ongoing tradition and community of mutually elevating criticism... One cannot ‘do’ genealogy in abstraction from other practitioners; genealogy involves a kind of dance, for which willing (if not sympathetic) partners are indispensable. (1999, 82)
It remains to be seen whether there are other ‘sympathetic partners’ in music education research. The profession has remained, for the most part, firmly ensconced in a modernist tradition that subscribes to the humanist subject and beliefs about the autonomy of the individual and the art object. I am hopeful, however, that what I have undertaken here exhibits a sympathetic understanding of the profession.

ETHICS

What strikes me is the fact that, in our society, art has become something that is related only to objects and not to individuals or to life. That art is something which is specialized or done by experts who are artists. But couldn’t everyone’s life become a work of art? Why should the lamp or the house be an art object but not our life?

—On the Genealogy of Ethics, 261

“Choice, freedom, reflection, experience, agency: these were the undisguised hallmarks of Foucault’s last philosophical interventions,” claims Paras (147). His work after 1980 strikes many people as an abrupt departure from his earlier “antisubjectivity” stance. His change in thinking included “the tremendous importance attached to creativity and beauty, the resurrection of the notion of ‘experience,’ and the latitude granted to the individual subject (as opposed to the determinant ‘system’) in the elaboration of selfhood” (ibid., 14). In The History of Sexuality, Volume Two:
The Use of Pleasure (1984) and The History of Sexuality, Volume Three: The Care of the Self (1984), Foucault presents a diverse range of ideas on how the Greeks in the Hellenistic period (UP) and Greco-Roman period (CS) problematized and practised ethical existence. Foucault’s interest in studying ancient modes was driven by his belief traditional morality as obedience to a code of rules was disappearing, and that alternative conceptualizations were needed (Olssen 2006, 168). People need an ethics, observed Foucault, “but they cannot find any other ethics than an ethics founded on so-called scientific knowledge of what the self is, what desire is, what the unconscious is, and so on” (GE, 256). Foucault was struck by the similarity of this problem to the problem of ethics in ancient times. Asked whether he was looking for answers or some sort of alternative in ancient texts, however, Foucault responded: “No! I am not looking for an alternative; you can’t find the solution of a problem in the solution of another problem raised at another moment by other people” (ibid.). What interested Foucault, then, was not so much the pursuit of a solution to current ethical problems, but, as with his earlier genealogical projects, how we have come to be the people we are. In Chapter Six I adopt this ethical concern by framing my analysis in terms of Foucault’s concept of rapport a soi. That is, I present musicality as the kind of ethical musical relationship we have, one that changes from a relationship with music to a relationship to music. In order to better make

101 Again, these are the French publication dates. They were translated into English in 1985 and 1986 respectively.
sense of *rapport a soi*, I have included in this section a discussion of Foucault’s later work, specifically *The Care of the Self*.

**Cultivation Of The Self and The Care Of The Self**

[The ‘art of existence’] emphasizes the importance of developing all the practices and all the exercises by which one can maintain self-control and eventually arrive at a pure enjoyment of oneself... It is the development of an art of existence that revolves around the question of the self, of its dependence and independence, of its universal form [not substance] and of the connection it can and should establish with others, of the procedures by which it exerts its control over itself, and of the way in which it can establish complete supremacy over itself.

*—The Care of the Self, 238-39*

In Foucault’s third (or ethical) period, choice becomes Foucault’s central interest. *The Use of Pleasure* and *The Care of the Self* document the *art of living* (or art of existence), an ethic that undergoes an observable evolution over the centuries. For the ancient Greeks, for example, it is not necessarily wrong to touch boys or to be unfaithful to their wives. They had to avoid doing these things, however, in order to have a good reputation or to prove to themselves they were able to rule others.¹⁰² Actions were a personal choice that one made in order to live a specific kind of life; choices were part of an aesthetic mode that was part of the cultivation of the self.

¹⁰² According to Foucault, ancient Greek homosexual relations were filled with contradictions, a point I will not belabor here.
Foucault notes a mutation in this idea, however: “In late Stoicism, when they start saying, ‘Well, you are obliged to do that because you are a human being,’ something changes. It’s not a problem of choice; you have to do it because you are a rational being” (ibid.). The difference, Foucault points out, is that ancient Greek living was not concerned with the ‘self’ as such. There was no ‘true’ self against which one’s actions were to be measured. Instead, the concern was with life: how to treat one’s life as an object to be attended to or created (ibid., 260).

The phrase, *epimelesthai sautou,* [take care of yourself] first appears in Plato’s *Alcibiades I:* “*Epimelesthai* expresses something much more serious than the simple fact of paying attention,” writes Foucault (TS, 24). Importantly, *epimeleia heautou* [care of the self] does not mean self-attachment or self-fascination. It means “working on” or “being concerned with something...it describes a sort of work, an activity; it implies attention, knowledge, technique” (GE, 269). According to Foucault, the original Greek precept of ‘care of the self’ centered on the issue of freedom and the

---

103 Commenting on criticisms of Foucault’s late work, McLaren writes: “A beautiful life requires ethical work, work on ourselves through practices of the self. Thus, Foucault’s turn to aesthetics is not a retreat from ethics, as critics claim, but an attempt to return to ethics without the baggage of the Modern notion of the true self” (2002, 71).

104 “The idea of the *bios* [life] as a material for an aesthetic piece of art is something that fascinates me” (GE, 260).

105 *Epimeleia heautou* translates roughly as ‘care of the self.’ *Epimelesthai sautou* translates roughly as ‘to be concerned with yourself,’ ‘to take care of yourself,’ or ‘to take pains with oneself.’
avoidance of domination—by others or one’s own unbridled desires (Marshall 1996, 101). In the early classical use of *epimeleia*, it was characterized by dissymmetry and nonreciprocity. You had to master yourself in order to master others (GE, 267). Over time, however, *epimeleia* was placed within an ethical framework that considered one’s responsibilities to others. One had to master yourself because you are rational and related to others who are also rational (ibid.). In either case, however, *epimeleia* was tied to the notion of governance. One had to govern oneself if one wanted to govern others. ‘Care of the self’ “is employed in speaking of the activities of the master of the household, the tasks of the ruler who looks after his subjects, the care that must be given to a sick or wounded patient, or the honors that must be paid to the gods or to the dead” (CS, 50). Although only loosely applicable, to the degree conscientious band directors engage the pedagogical discourse of *CBJ/CW*, one can conceptualize their actions as consistent with ‘care of the self.’ “Good” band directors prepare the score, work on their conducting, and ensure they “master” others in the ensemble in order to ensure the successful fulfillment of the music—all of which should hopefully advance their good standing in the band community. Importantly, they can rationalize their actions on the basis of caring for others.

---

106 Freedom, in this case refers to the avoidance of various forms of enslavement (e.g., to others, to one’s own passions).

107 Self-mastery was necessary if one was to avoid becoming a slave (“of another city, or authority, or of family, friends and colleagues, and of one’s own passions”), was an obligation and an expectation of social existence (Marshall 1996, 101).
Foucault claims ‘knowledge of oneself’ has now become the primary principle operating in the modern world (TS, 22). This guiding force is often attributed to the Delphic principle, *gnothi sauton*, or “Know yourself” (ibid., 19). In the Greco-Roman period, ‘know yourself’ was, in fact, somewhat of a pre-requisite for achieving self-mastery as part of *epimeleia heautou*. Later, however, ‘Know yourself’ was transformed into a humanist precept, common today, of looking for “the truth within” (ibid., 32). Foucault suggests ‘Know yourself’ has overshadowed ‘Take care of yourself’ due to significant changes in moral principles in the Western world. First, our moral code prohibits us from believing “that we should give ourselves more care than anything else in the world.” Christian morality made self-renunciation the “condition of salvation,” and ‘knowing yourself’ was, “paradoxically the way to self-renunciation.” Second, our secular tradition is based upon a respect for external law as the basis for morality. “How then,” asks Foucault, “can respect for the self be the basis for morality?... ‘Know thyself’ has obscured ‘Take care of yourself’ because our morality, a morality of asceticism, insists that the self is that which one can reject” (ibid., 22). Art music and music education discourse is entirely consistent with a ‘know yourself’ precept. Noumenal beauty is assumed to exist in music and in ourselves. Through our self-renunciation (to the music and/or the composer) we can better come to know ourselves and to know beauty. The universal laws of art dictate the
correct engagement with music. It is, quite simply, *verboten* to put ourselves above the music.

As originally presented, then, ‘care of the self’ implied a knowledge of oneself. The questions begged by this thus became: “What should one do with oneself? What work should be carried out on the self? How should one ‘govern oneself’ by performing actions in which one is oneself the objective of those actions, the domain in which they are brought to bear, the instrument they employ, and the subject that acts?” (ST, 87). Three principles characterized early ‘care of the self.’ First, it is never too early or too late. “Attending to oneself is therefore not just a momentary preparation for living; it is a form of living. Alcibiades realized that he must take care of himself if he meant to attend to others. Now it becomes a matter of attending to oneself, for oneself: one should be, for oneself and throughout one’s existence, one’s own object” (HSU, 96). The relationship of self to self is sometimes premised on the jurido-political model (“to be sovereign over oneself”), but it is also represented on a “model of positive enjoyment: to enjoy oneself, to take one’s pleasure with oneself, to delight in the self alone” (ibid.). Note this principle is non-instrumental in nature. Under ‘care of the self’ one would not engage in music as a preparation for knowing the truth, one would engage as a form of living—for the enjoyment it afforded. The second principle was that care was based on pedagogy, although it often stressed a “curative and therapeutic function.” This made it somewhat closer
to a medical than pedagogical model. “Permanent medical care is one of the central features of the care of the self. One must become the doctor of oneself” (TS, 31). And finally, the third principle was that one needed the help of others. “The relation to the self is always considered as needing to rely on the relation to a teacher, to a director, or in any case to another person. Yet this presupposed a growing independence from the love relation” (ibid.). All of these aspects enabled “one to occupy his [sic] rightful position in the city, the community, or interpersonal relationships” (ECS, 287).

‘Care of the self’ involved not just principles, but a specific set of practices, designated by the general term *askesis*, or ‘practices of the self’ (HSU, 99). Although today the principle of medical care might be read as suggesting pathological implications with potentially negative overtones, it is important to note the practice of self-evaluation (being doctor to oneself) was non-juridical in nature. Foucault writes, "The subject’s relation to himself [sic] in this [pedagogical/medical] examination is not established so much in the form of a judicial relationship in which the accused faces the judge; it is more like an act of inspection in which the inspector aims to__________

---

108 I must reiterate: Foucault did not necessarily find the ancient Greeks admirable. While Greece is sometimes lauded as the birthplace of democracy, slavery was a regular part of ancient Greek existence. ‘Care of the self,’ with its emphasis on mastery, contains an overt element of dominance within it. Foucault quotes Plutarch commenting on the slaves having to work the fields: “It was by not taking care of the fields, but of ourselves, that we acquired those fields” (qtd. in HSU, 95). “Attending to oneself,” writes Foucault, “is a privilege; it is the mark of a social superiority, as against those who must attend to others in order to serve them or attend to a trade in order to live” (HS, 95).
evaluate a piece of work, an accomplished task… [T]he examination practised in this manner does not focus, as if in imitation of the judicial procedure, on ‘infractions;’ and it does not lead to a verdict of guilty or to decisions of self-castigation” (CS, 62). That is, the patient (the subject) is not assumed to be sick (or abnormal) in a modern sense, but rather, incomplete. “Self-examination is taking stock. Faults are simply good intentions left undone” (TS, 33). This is important, since a juridical model inscribes a version of “Know thyself” that treats the subject as ‘knowable’ and, therefore, culpable. In a non-juridical model, “it is not real faults for which [the subject] reproaches himself [sic] but rather his lack of success. His errors are of strategy, not of moral character. He wants to make adjustments between what he wanted to do and what he had done and reactivate the rules of conduct, not excavate his guilt” (ibid., 34). For the Greek and Greco-Roman periods, then, ‘practices of the self’ were determined according to pragmatic principles of rightness and appropriateness, rather than appeals to universal standards of deep truth by which fault can be ascertained. Truth had a universal form, not substance. As such, ethics were grounded in situated relationships, not appeals to rationally derived truths.
Three domains of genealogy are possible. First, a historical ontology of ourselves in relation to truth through which we constitute ourselves as subjects of knowledge; second, a historical ontology of ourselves in relation to a field of power through which we constitute ourselves as subjects acting on others; third, a historical ontology in relation to ethics through which we constitute ourselves as moral agents.

—On the Genealogy of Ethics, 262

In the epigram above Foucault articulates, in slightly altered terms, his famous three axes of research: knowledge-power-ethics. Rather than viewing his late investigations as departures from earlier work, Foucault himself preferred to see them as continuations. Indeed, the problems of truth and subjectivity, though framed differently are as prevalent, if not more so, in his final investigations. In his earlier works, Foucault concentrated on what might be termed two forms of morality: the “code that determines which acts are permitted or forbidden and the code that determines the positive or negative value of the different possible behaviors” (GE, 263). In his third period, described briefly above, his focus shifts to rapport a soi: “the kind of relationship you ought to have with yourself...which I call ethics” (ibid.). This relationship, Foucault claims, is “how the individual is supposed to constitute himself [sic] as a moral subject of his own actions” (ibid.). Ancient Greek ethics, according to Foucault, centered on an aesthetics of existence. That is, how to live was a matter of
personal choice (ibid., 260). As I have described above, Foucault shows the predominant mode of human existence in antiquity was predicated upon “the intensity of the relations to self, that is, of the forms in which one is called upon to take oneself as an object of knowledge and a field of action, so as to transform, correct, and purify oneself, and find salvation” (CS, 42). In so doing, individuals treated their lives as something needing to be created, not discovered. This was a process similar to creating a work of art, but a work that was a lifelong endeavour, deserving of ongoing care and attention.

Foucault’s examination of ethical conduct, or the relation of self to self, involves four aspects. First, he questions the ‘ethical substance.’ That is, he asks what part of the subject is involved in the ethical problem (e.g., feelings, behaviour, desire). Second, he examines the way the subject’s questions have been produced. In other words, the mode of subjectivation: “the way in which people are invited or incited to recognize their moral obligations. Is it, for instance, divine law that has been revealed in a text? Is it natural law, a cosmological order, in each case the same for every living being? Is it a rational rule? Is it the attempt to give your existence the most beautiful form possible?” (GE, 264). Third, he looks at the ascetic ‘work’ of ethics (e.g., self-reflection, renunciation). What is the “self-forming activity” he asks (ibid., 265). Finally, he considers the telos (aims, goals): “Which is the kind of being to which we aspire when we behave in a moral way?...[S]hall we become pure, immortal, or free, or masters of ourselves,
and so on? So that’s what I call the telos” (ibid.). In examining these four aspects of *rapport a soi* [relation to oneself], Foucault concludes the art of living changed from what Paras calls an ‘expressive’ mode built on ‘care of the self’ as a life-building exercise to a reflexive mode where ‘care of the self’ is overtaken by ‘know thyself’ as part of the Christian transformation in the Western world. “Life, now lived in and through a filtering set of discursive practices, is flattened down to the ‘true’ words that one must perpetually speak about it” (Paras, 202 n75). I have used *rapport a soi* to frame my analysis in Chapter Six.

**Discussion**

Paras observes that power and knowledge are entirely absent in *The Use of Pleasure* and *Care of the Self* (113). Foucault maintained there was continuity in his work, however. Rather than viewing the problem of governing the subject as one of exteriority (discourse) or discipline, for example, Foucault found that in ancient texts “one could take up the question of governmentality from a different angle: the government of the self by oneself in its articulation with relations with others (such as one finds in pedagogy, behavior counselling, spiritual direction, the prescription of models for living, and so on)” (ST, 88). I have tried to use and adapt Foucault’s ideas on ‘care of the self’ in order to provide a different theoretical
framework to analyze music teaching and learning, especially as such teaching/learning occurs in its institutional contexts. To be clear, I am not proposing ‘care of the self’ should be adopted as a new paradigm for music teaching and learning. Foucault, himself, did not find the ancient Greeks admirable. He found many contradictions, particularly between trying to forge a certain style of existence, and trying to make such a style common to everyone. As he summarizes, “All of antiquity appears to me to have been a ‘profound error’” (qtd. in Rabinow 1997, xxix). What is so compelling to me about Foucault’s examination of ancient modes of existence is how they present ways of theorizing our own existence—an existence so entrenched in a particular kind of rationalist humanism that it is often invisible to us. The purpose of Foucault’s research was not to propose solutions. Rather, he sought to show how through various human practices—psychological, medical, penitential, and educational—a particular “model of humanity” was constructed. This, he says, has now become “normative, self-evident, and is supposed to be universal” (TS, 15). Similarly, the way music education is conceptualized is based on certain assumptions about music and music making that are presented in the discourse as universal and self-evident. It is never disputed that the goal of large ensemble music making is to honour the intentions of the composer. As a result, one’s ethical existence in music is rooted in demonstrating one’s faith towards the composer rather than, for example, oneself or one’s audience.
I have not in my analysis searched for examples of ‘care of the self’ in the ancient Greek sense. Such would be an impossible and questionable pursuit. Rather, I have attempted to identify indications of ‘techniques of the self,’ especially as they relate to Foucault’s notion of ‘governmentality’—how people govern themselves. I have also paid special attention to examples of pastoral power, something Foucault claims turned the culture of the self from the tekhnē tou bio [techniques/practices of living] into epimeleia ton allon—the care of others. This, he notes, was the pastor’s job. The goal of this practice was the care of the soul, not the self (GE, 278). Teacher-student relationships, while not necessarily identical to pastor-parishioner relationships, do have obvious connections with both the ancient practice of ‘care of the self’ and the more modern practice of epimeleia ton allon. As McLaren points out in reference to living an ethical life, one needs “to have close relations with others who will tell you the truth about yourself” (2002, 154).

**FOUCAULT SUMMARY**

My objective...has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects.

—The Subject and Power, 326

McLaren notes that Foucault is significant for his “rejection of universal norms, his suspicion about teleological conceptions of history that imply
progress, his rejection of a notion of subjectivity as unified consciousness, and his rejection of the traditional liberal conception of power that contradicts fundamental tenets of liberalism” (2002, 7). I believe Foucault can be useful, then, since our entire educational system is premised on liberal theory. And while merely contradicting the assumptions and practices of liberal theory is unlikely to bring about massive change (nor should it necessarily prescribe the kind of change), I am hopeful my reading of the CBJ/CW discourses might, at the very least, open up some possibilities for action in music education by accounting for some of the current ‘regimes of truth’ operating in the pedagogical band world.

Foucault’s work is not without its problems, of course. Both archaeology and genealogy have been attacked for their presumed objectivity. By positing genealogy as norm-neutral, for example, there can be no easy answer to the question, “why fight?” (Ashenden and Owen 1999, 7). “If not for the cryptonormativity that informs his genealogical investigations,” Conway writes, “Habermas might ask, why does Foucault side with the prisoners rather than wardens? With psychopaths rather than alienists? With sinners rather than confessors?” (1999, 77). Conway believes Habermas successfully demonstrates that Foucault thinks “within the shadow of humanism” (ibid., 61) in ways that inform Foucault’s “particularly compelling—yet stubbornly vague—political inflections” (ibid., 76). And while Conway concurs, as per Habermas’s objection, that “the game of normativity
is best played in the light of day, illuminated by the afternoon sun of enlightenment” (ibid.), he counters that just because genealogy does not answer the question of ‘why resist?,’ “it does not necessarily follow that any resistance is idle, irrational or unjustifiable” (ibid., 72-73). My own use of Foucault is anything but norm-neutral to be sure. My hope, however, is that my Foucaultian-influenced reading of the discourse can be used by those who seek greater freedom to practise music education in multifaceted ways, free from the domination of disciplinary discourse currently delimiting what does and does not count as music education, especially in the pedagogical band world.
Chapter 3

Methodology

In spite of those who suggest that Foucault’s investigations can be codified (Kendall and Wickham 1999; Shuerich and Mackenzie 2005) into a formalized methodology, Foucault’s methods, as I have articulated them in Chapter Two, defy reduction. Every study undertaken by Foucault was guided by the specific questions under investigation. No two studies are the same. True, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* is an attempt to address critics who remained somewhat mystified by Foucault’s unconventional approaches in his first three books. As I have explained, however, Foucault’s intended methodological treatise can hardly be mistaken for some sort of guidebook on how to conduct an *authentic* archaeology. Instead, Foucault merely lays out in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*—effectively or poorly depending on the critic one chooses to believe—the conceptual tools he used in his early work. Although not nearly explicitly, Foucault, perhaps in anticipation of his critics, devotes a small amount of space in *Discipline and Punish* and *The History of Sexuality, Volume One* explaining his genealogical methods. In a certain respect, it might be appropriate to describe Foucault’s work as a historical analysis of discourses (as ‘Systems of Thought’) rather than an example of “discourse analysis,” since the latter has now come to mean something both
more specific and more multifaceted than Foucault’s investigations. Given the difficulties in articulating the exact procedures by which one might conduct Foucaultian work, I have included in this chapter a brief discussion of discourse analysis in an effort to better situate my investigation. To clarify, while I have employed particular techniques derived from the general field of discourse analysis, my conceptual framework remains decidedly Foucaultian. That is, the way I have “looked” at the data has always been through a lens coloured by Foucault’s articulation of history, truth, power, rationality, and subjectivity.

METHOD

Discourse Analysis

Judging by the number of new books and journals on the topic, interest in studying discourse appears to be increasing.109 “Discourse analysis” (DA) is a broad and flexible term (Graham 2005a, 2) employed by many fields and encompassing many theoretical and methodological positions. Examples include critical discourse analysis, historical discourse analysis, conversational analysis, and content analysis, along with more

recent fields, such as corpus linguistics and corpus-assisted discourse studies. Underlying the interest in studying discourse is the belief that “discourse is an inherent and irreducible element or facet of all social phenomena and all social change” (Fairclough 2007a, 10). That is, discourse is a constitutive element in the social construction of meaning. As discussed in the “Discourse” section in Chapter One, there is not always agreement on the exact scope of the term discourse. More language-oriented fields, such as systemic functional grammar,\textsuperscript{110} embrace a concern for the meaning of smaller linguistic units, whereas more socially holistic fields, such as critical discourse analysis, are concerned with discourse in a more narrative or meta-narrative sense, where discourse refers to “particular and diverse ways of representing the world” (Fairclough 2007b, 33).

As referred to within the broad area of DA, “discourse” usually signifies both writing and speaking (though some draw a distinction). Analyzing discourse therefore requires the concreteness of some form of “text.” Carley calls textual analysis “vital” to research in the social sciences. She lists a variety of techniques for such examination, including computational hermeneutics, concordance analysis, content analysis, conversational analysis, database techniques for conducting ethnographic and qualitative studies, discourse analysis, linguistic content analysis, semantic grammars, protocol analysis, proximity analysis, procedural task analysis, and story

\textsuperscript{110} Sometimes called systemic functional linguistics, this field developed out of the work of Michael Halliday.
processing (1993, 76). Many of these techniques lie outside the interests and research problems in this study, which is concerned with discourse and the production of truth—although I have attempted to become familiar or at least aware of several of these techniques while conducting my analysis.

Rebecca Rogers suggests that although the problem of how learning is mediated through discourse has been an increasingly popular topic in education, educators are usually not trained as linguists (2003, xi). I am not a linguist, and I do not possess sufficient expertise to examine such things as hypotaxis, parataxis, lexical cohesion, collocations, lemma, and other linguistic-based concepts of analysis, nor do I have any interest in approaching my research problem from the perspective of something like Halliday’s SFG theory or John Searle’s speech act theory. As I explain below, however, there are methodological insights in the field of linguistics I have attempted to adapt to the present study. While my theoretical and methodological framework is Foucaultian, I have, in the spirit of including any and all conceptual and methodological tools deemed appropriate for addressing the problem at hand, borrowed as many relevant and appropriate ideas as possible from various research traditions. In this sense I am following in the spirit—though perhaps not the conceptual tradition—of Teun van Dijk, who writes:

I advocate a broad multidisciplinary approach to discourse, which integrates a detailed and explicit study of structures of text and talk with an analysis of their social and cognitive contexts as a basis for problem-oriented critical discourse.
analysis. In such an approach, the study of relevant knowledge, ideologies and other socially shared beliefs is crucial in describing many of the properties and social functions of discourse. In the same way, both these cognitions and the discourses based on them need to be studied in relation to the relevant structures of institutions, groups, power and other aspects of society and culture. (2006, 161)

To clarify, my research problem involves the study of discourse as it relates to both discursive and non-discursive practices. Van Dijk’s cognitive orientation focuses primarily on describing or exposing belief (described as ideology). There are certainly overlaps here, but, as mentioned in Chapter Two, Veyne points out that if belief is said to account for practice, we still need to account for belief. While I have unmistakably included considerable discussion addressing the question of ‘what?’ in my analysis, I have also attempted to address questions of ‘how?’ and ‘why?’—questions best addressed in light of practices. For Gee, examination of practices is the approach to DA most compatible with the study of learning (2003, 38).

Gee borrows, as I have to some degree, from Lave and Wenger’s (1991) concept of situated learning, which considers learning as a change in “socially situated identity” (Gee 2003, 38). Learning is viewed as a process through which people become—at least in part—insiders, outsiders, or marginal with respect to the social groups associated with various practices. Learning is thus something that affects our way in the world. The goal of a discourse analysis of learning therefore “needs to show how a distinctive community of practice is constituted out of specific social practices (across
time and space) and how patterns of participation systematically change across time, both for individuals and the community of practice as a whole (or distinctive parts of it)” (ibid., 39). The present study, examining the learning of music through participation in school bands, is entirely consistent with Gee’s understanding of the value of DA in education:

Schools recruit culturally and historically distinctive social languages, social practices (within which specific situated meanings are formed), and Discourses to form and reform, reward and punish, distinctive kinds of people (i.e., distinctive socially situated identities) with sociopolitical implications that shape our lives and societies. Because discourse analysis...can speak to such matters, it is a potentially powerful tool for research in education. (ibid., 39-40)

I proceed now with a brief overview and description of some of the fields that have helped inform the procedures used in this study.

**Critical Discourse Analysis**

Although Gee (2003) distinguishes critical discourse analysis from CDA, the latter more properly associated, he suggests, with the Hallidayan-influenced work of Norman Fairclough, other authors do not make this distinction, and use the term CDA to refer to a branch of discourse analysis derived from some combination of linguistics and social theory that focuses on relations of power (Powers 2007). Rogers (2003) calls CDA both a theory

---

111 See Gee’s distinction between discourse and Discourse in Chapter One.
112 Michael Halliday is famous for his formulation of systemic-functional grammar.
and a method, although Baker et al. (2008) do not consider CDA as a method or even group of methods, but instead view CDA as an aim that utilizes methods deemed appropriate to the problem. Many CDA practitioners, they point out, go beyond the language within texts and attempt to account for social, political, historical and intertextual contexts (273). This is done from a variety of theoretical perspectives. Within linguistics, these perspectives include systemic–functional grammar, argumentation theory, text linguistics, the Discourse-Historical Approach of Reisigl and Wodak, the socio-cognitive approach of van Dijk, and Lakoff and Johnson’s use of metaphors and metonymy (see Baker et al. 2008, 297-98; Rogers 2003, 2; see Perakyla 2005, 871-72 for a discussion of historical discourse analysis). As a result of its broader concerns with the social ramifications of discourse, CDA often draws on specific approaches or concepts from fields such as anthropology, history, rhetoric, stylistics, conversation analysis, literary studies, cultural studies, semantics, pragmatics, philosophy and sociolinguistics (Baker et al. 2008, 280). Given that CDA views “discursive and linguistic data as a social practice” that both reflects and produces “ideologies” in society, CDA approaches have come to be seen not only as tools, but also as discourse theories (ibid.).

Rogers lists eight principles common to CDA approaches, taken from Fairclough and Wodak: (1) CDA addresses social problems, (2) power relations are discursive, (3) discourse constitutes society and culture, (4)
discourse does ideological work, (5) discourse is historical, (6) a sociocognitive approach is needed to understand how relations between texts and society are mediated, (7) discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory and uses a systematic methodology, and (8) CDA is a socially committed scientific paradigm (2003, 2). Fundamental to the theoretical outlook of CDA is that discourse involves “opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control” (ibid.). That is, language, as theorized from a social constructionist perspective, is constitutive of reality but its effects are not always immediately obvious to its participants. Rogers claims CDA is different from other discourse analysis methods because it not only includes a description and interpretation of discourse, but an explanation of why and how discourses work (ibid.). As Gee explains,

All discourse analysis that intends to make empirical claims is rooted in specific viewpoints about the relationship between form and function in language, although these are rarely spelled out in discourse analytic work in education... Critical discourse analysis (CDA) involves, beyond relating form and function in language, specific empirical analyses of how such form–function correlations themselves correlate with specific social practices that help constitute the very nature of such practices. (2003, 19)

In other words, CDA strives to better understand how power and knowledge are imbedded in the functioning of language (Baker et al. 2008, 280).
Corpus Linguistics

Like CDA, corpus linguistics (CL) also is not usually considered a method, but rather an approach or a collection of methods (Farr 2008, 28; Baker et al. 2008, 273) used in such fields as dialectology, lexicography, sociolinguistics, language materials development, language therapies, speech technology, forensic linguistics, literary studies, language change and evolution and grammar research (Farr 2008, 28). In short, CL is based on the theoretical assumption that a large collection of text is in some way representative of the field from which it is drawn. The collection, or “corpus,” is “a large, principled collection of naturally-occurring texts that is stored in electronic form (accessible on computer). Corpora can include both written and transcribed spoken texts” (Conrad 2002, 76). CL then relies on “computer-assisted techniques” in order to process and analyze corpora. McCarthy (1998) argues that computerized corpora are advantageous in that “they offer the researcher the potential to check whether something observed in everyday language is a one-off occurrence or a feature that is widespread across a broad sample of speakers” (qtd. in Conrad 2002, 77-78).

Computer software now offers the researcher several tools that assist in the analysis of data. One of the most basic functions performs a concordance of the corpus. A concordance is generally defined as an alphabetical list of the words (or concepts) in a text, although in CL a
concordance also usually implies as well a reference to the passage(s) in which they occur (Carley 1993, 108). As O’Keeffe and Farr (2003) explain:

Concordancing is the process of using software to and search for all the occurrences of one word (or phrase) in a corpus. All of the occurrences are presented with the node word/phrase (the one searched for) in the centre of the line, with seven or eight words presented at either side of the node word. Depending on the software, the number of words at either side of the node word or phrase can be adjusted to allow for more context. (393-94)

Lexical analysis software programs, such as Wordsmith Tools, usually allow for the use of tagging for analysis, analyzing collocates (words that occur together) and what is referred to as “keyness”—the statistical measures of the strength of word associations (Conrad 2002, 77).

Although CL is often presented as an objective, empirical approach to the study of language, this strength is also cited as a potential weakness. One of the main criticisms of CL has been that concordance programs only show atomized words or small strings of text (typically 5-10 words to the right or left of the node). As a result, it is thought that analysis cannot go beyond the “clause boundaries” (ibid., 86). As Billig (1989) points out, “this sort of methodology can count words, but it cannot interpret them” (qtd. in Clark 2007, 124). Baker et al. observe, however, that despite the presence of a quantitative emphasis, most CL methods still rely on “considerable human input,” such as the analyzing of concordance lines (2008, 273). And as many who are using CL methods argue, many associations or variable would not be apparent without corpus-based analysis (Conrad 2002, 86).
The use of frequencies and other analyses, for example, “helps pinpoint specific periods for text selection (e.g., through downsampling) or sites of interest” (Baker et al. 2008, 295-96). Corpus-based methods, argues Stefanowitsch (2006), allow for a greater scope of analysis than “introspective/opportunistic approaches” (6), and as a result, have become “the major empirical paradigm in linguistics” (1).

**Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies**

Partington calls Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies (CADS) a “nascent interdisciplinary field” (2006, 267). Due to its recent emergence, few specific methods have achieved canonical status. For Clark, CADS is a dual approach to studying discourse that aims to achieve “an empirical approach to introspection,” one that “permits systematic reference to other more detailed, and less immediately obvious, informational levels and aspects of the discourse which may have remained obscured by the large quantity of data” (2007, 124). A key difference between CL and CADS is that the concerns of corpus linguistics are normally restricted to language, and do not normally account for the social, political, historical and cultural context of the data (Baker et al. 2008, 291). Moreover, there is a greater acknowledgment that words must be examined in context (Koller 2006, 243). In CADS, corpus techniques are “strictly functional to the overall task at hand...[and] take place along more qualitative, in-depth procedures
including intuition, introspection and immersion in a text. Even sheer speculation at times can be fruitful, if open to subsequent verification” (Partington 2006, 299; see also Baker et al. 2008, 275). In this sense Farr draws a distinction between “corpus-driven” and “corpus-based” methods (2008, 29). In the latter, the corpus analysis is intended to reinforce and support theories, ideas and analysis. The present study falls most closely under the rubric of “corpus-assisted” in the sense described by Baker et al.:

In corpus-assisted discourse analysis the researcher is normally required to analyse hundreds of lines of concordance data by hand, in order to identify wider themes or patterns in the corpus which are not so easily spotted via collocation, key word or frequency analysis. The analyst then has to make sense of the linguistic patterns thrown up via the corpus-based processes, usually with reference to one or more theoretical frameworks. (2008, 277)

That is, CBJ/CW was considered a corpus, from which I generated concordance data. To be clear, however, while frequency analysis was a catalyst for categorical analysis in this study, the lines of analyzed data were in the tens of thousands, not hundreds (although this is not exactly comparable, since Baker et al. are referring more properly to linguistic analysis and not an accounting of the social, political, historical, and cultural context of the data as I have done). Furthermore, my research problem is not concerned with making specific empirical claims about language,

---

113 I analyzed occurrences manually, not as concordance strings as generated by a software program like Wordsmith Tools. I therefore took in as much context as was necessary to make sense of each word occurrence.
although at times I claim the concordance results suggest things that are impossible to ignore or would not be readily apparent without their use.

“Interpretation and Overinterpretation”

*Interpretation and Overinterpretation* is the name of a book based on a symposium celebrating the work of writer Umberto Eco. I introduce it here to draw attention to the unavoidable fact that readings can be nothing but interpretations, not empirical descriptions of ‘the real.’

I also introduce this volume to emphasize two central points. One is the distinction between interpretation as social construction versus interpretation as hermeneutics. The second is that interpretation of a text is indissociable from other texts (see intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the following section), and that all interpretation makes necessary assumptions about the reader. Those who object to discourse analysis often raise this second point. That is, in order to make assessments about the effects of a text, the analyst must make certain assumptions about reader reception, and often concomitantly, the intensions of the author. In the absence of some formal theory of reader reception, it is claimed, interpretation is nothing but a kind of subjectivism suggested by the term ‘overinterpretation.’

114 To clarify, this does not mean, as some would have it, that the physical world does not exist. This point is addressed to the social world of meaning. Plants and rocks exist, for example, but their significance or meaning in the world is a social matter.
Gee suggests that interpreting language always involves certain expectations about how language is used. There is, he suggests, “meaning potential” in any given word or language structure (2003, 21). The indeterminacy of language does not mean that words can mean just anything. In reference to a similar issue, Linda Graham argues that it is just not accepted for the phrase ‘the cat on the mat’ to be interpreted as meaning the giraffe is in the spaceship (2005b, 5). To help clarify the issue of meaning potential, Gee distinguishes between ‘utterance-type’ meanings (such as ‘the cat is on that mat’) and ‘situation-specific’ meanings (a house cat or a lion? live animal or stuffed toy?). Failing to distinguish between these two types of meaning is dangerous, he claims, because each involves different validity issues (2003, 25). As I understand these two types of meaning, the former involves primarily linguistic concerns, whereas the latter is opened up for a greater consideration of broader social concerns. Where matters become complicated is when claims are based on these situation-specific interpretations. It is one thing to acknowledge Foucault’s point that the declamation “Dreams fulfill desires” is not the same statement in Plato as in Freud (AK, 116). It is quite another to stipulate exactly what, precisely, the difference is.

I will return to this point below, but first I pose three questions that arise concerning the issue of interpretation. First, why is interpretation a problem? Second, to whom is it a problem? And third, why is interpretation
so often evaluated in terms of accuracy? In an answer to the first question, Stefan Collini, in his introduction to *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, suggests that there remains in our Western history a suspiciousness toward readily apparent meaning: “its very accessibility and seeming concordance with common sense fatally damning its status in the eyes of the Followers of the Veil” (in Eco 1992, 9). That is, there is a continuing belief in ‘secret’ meanings “encoded in language in ways which escape the attention of all but the initiated few” (ibid.). For Foucault, it was the preeminent ‘masters of suspicion’—Nietzsche, Freud, Marx—that, in addition to the biblical hermeneutic tradition, added weight to the belief that language is not always as transparent as it seems (NFM, 272). The legacy of this suspicious attitude is that it is considered possible for some—those Richard Rorty affectionately refers to in this volume as “code crackers” (in Eco 1992, 93)—to distinguish reality and appearance, reinforcing the belief in the existence of a noumenal world.

Ongoing belief in the existence of a noumenal world can be addressed in part by considering the second question posed above. Any text can be considered a volitional act by an author to communicate or express something. Tension arises when this ‘something’ is incorrectly (according to the intensions of the author) decoded. For Eco, texts are “a device conceived
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115 One might note how this is another example of how knowledge is used ‘for cutting,’ since the appropriation of the secret (i.e. correct) meanings can be viewed as an act of power.
in order to produce its model reader” (Eco 1992, 64). He explains further that because “the intention of the text is basically to produce a model reader able to make conjectures about it, the initiative of the model reader consists in figuring out a model author that is not the empirical one and that, in the end, coincides with the intentions of the text” (ibid.). In this view, correct decoding is considered a successful interpretation of the real—‘the real’ defined as the text’s (as in the ‘ideal’ author’s) intention. Getting it “wrong” is to position the individual reader’s interpretation as both subjective and deviant from the model reader—the one who correctly knows the author (or ideal author). This point is underscored by Eco when he suggests “when a text is produced not for a single addressee but for a community of readers—the author knows that he or she will be interpreted not according to his or her intentions but according to a complex strategy of interactions which also involves the readers” and the expectations of the disciplinary field (67). There exist, in other words, “public criteria” (25). In this case the communicative process is further complicated in that the author must assume to know the community of readers, and the readers must assume to know the author based on shared understandings of intentionality and shared understanding of concepts. That is, everyone must assume to know each other.

116 Subsequent page numbers in this section refer to Umberto Eco, with Richard Rorty, Jonathan Culler, Christine Brooke-Rose, Interpretation and Overinterpretation, ed. Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
I proffer that producing an interpretation that does not conform to that of the model reader or model author is problematic for readers and authors alike, in that it casts aspersions on the communicative process. If deviant interpretations are allowed, doubt is introduced in at least two ways. First, the ability of the author to know the reader is questioned, and the ability to control meaning is jeopardized. Eco highlights this problem in discussing his work, *Foucault’s Pendulum*, a book whose subject matter does not deal in any way with Michel Foucault: “I hoped that my Model Reader would not try to make a superficial connection with Michel. I was to be disappointed; many smart readers did so.” Relenting, he adds: “The text is there and maybe they are right” (83). Why, it must be asked, should it matter to Eco that readers made a connection between his book and Michel Foucault? And why is it more important they interpreted the text “correctly” than found it personally rewarding? One obvious answer to these questions is that doubt is raised about Eco’s knowledge of his Model Reader, and his ability to control how his text would be used.

Second, if alternative interpretations are granted status equal to standard interpretations, the ability of the reader to discern reality and appearance (and hence know authorial intention) is questioned. In this case interpretation is transformed into a matter of trust/competence: which interpretation does the community believe stands the best chance of being a True discernment of the author? This compulsion to ‘get it right,’ I suggest,
is sustained by our belief in a real (noumenal) world, and our faith in the ability to know what it is. Relativism, subjectivism, and arbitrariness simply do not provide enough of a normative base in order to operate in the world. Furthermore, the basis of social interaction is predicated on a belief in intersubjectivity.

For Rorty, the issue, and a partial response to the third question posed above, is resolved with a use-interpretation distinction. Our obsession with the Truth, he claims, leads us down the wrong path: “We start succumbing to the old occultist urge to crack codes, to distinguish between reality and appearance, to make an invidious distinction between getting it right and making it useful” (108). Rorty’s pragmatic response, and a point I believe well-taken, is to suggest that concepts (interpretations in this case) are merely tools employed for particular purposes, rather than bits of a jig-saw that represent “How the World Really Is” (Collini, in ibid., 11). I think it necessary to go one step further, however. Not only is interpretation of a noumenal world a misguided effort in that no such world exists, but it is necessary to view the very act of interpretation as constitutive of ‘the real world.’ It is also important to recognize that Rorty’s distinction is only helpful to a point. While it is relatively easy to accept concepts as tools for particular purposes, this does not solve the problem of discerning what, precisely, these purposes are—or determining whose purposes are deemed of greatest value.
Jonathon Culler takes Rorty as suggesting that the whole matter of interpretation is a moot point. While he does agree that traditional views of interpretation are problematic,\textsuperscript{117} he objects to the idea that the study of interpretation is a misguided effort, remarking, “the fact that people can speak English perfectly well without worrying about its structure does not mean that the attempt to describe its structure is pointless, only that the goal of linguistics is not to make people speak English better” (117). For Culler, the problem is not so much overinterpretation as underinterpretation (112). He chooses to reframe the debate, pointing to Wayne Booth’s distinction between understanding and overstanding, where overstanding “consists of pursuing questions that the text does not pose to its model reader” (114). Culler, then, shares poststructural views that (a) what is most interesting is “not what the work has in mind but what it forgets, not what it says but what it takes for granted” (115), and (b) meaning is always context bound—and since context is historical, interpretation is never complete and can never be fully known in advance (120-21).

I have introduced this discussion for two reasons. First I want to reemphasize (again) that this study is not about producing an empirical statement of fact about the world of school band discourses. I have produced a reading of the discourses, but my reading, while an

\textsuperscript{117} Culler refers mockingly to the Little Jack Horner conception of criticism, famously described by Northrop Frye, that views the literary work as a pie into which the author has stuffed things; the critic then pulls them out saying ‘what a good boy am I’ (in Eco 1992, 115).
interpretation, is itself an examination of interpretations, not an examination of a noumenal world. As such, I acknowledge that my reading participates in the creation of meaning about the very subject of my investigation.

Moreover, my claims need to be viewed as claims about the impact of discourse (based, admittedly, on a subjective account of the world of school bands), not as claims about the difference between what was said and what really is. As I alluded to earlier with the phrase ‘Dreams fulfill desires,’ one of Foucault’s genealogical purposes was to document not just the meaning of discourse, but how the meaning of discourse changed over time. That is, while Foucault does at times offer his interpretation of certain discourses, his claims are really about describing in detail how certain things meant ‘x’ at this time and ‘y’ at another, not about what things really mean. His work shows how discourse contributes to our sense of self, not the difference between discourse and who we really are.

My second reason for introducing *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, connected in some ways to the first, is to address the issue of reader reception and communicative action. I have, throughout my analysis, endeavoured to identify truth claims. My interest, however, lies not with the veracity of the claim, but in considering the presence of such claims, why and how the claim came to be a claim, and the impact of such claims. All of these tasks require introspection on the part of the researcher, as meaningfulness can only be discerned in relation to context. Providing the
widest degree of context combined with a thorough and systematic examination of what was (is) said/done has been my goal. In addition, I have attempted to bring a critical/poststructural sensibility to my analysis, at all times asking, ‘why this and not that?’ and ‘why this term/concept now?’, thereby trying to determine what is not present as well as what is. Ultimately, however, the worthiness of my project, to borrow Rorty’s pragmatic approach, lies not in its accuracy, but in how others use it.

**Discourse Analysis Discussion**

A key difference between most forms of DA and CL is that the latter usually makes claims to objectivity and replicability; in DA the analyst’s reading position “is candidly admitted” (Bayley 2007, 54). As a theoretical framework, CL is concerned about “subjectivism” (Koller 2006, 241) and inter-rater reliability (Stefanowitsch 2006, 11). My theoretical framework should make clear I am not making specific linguistic claims about the data. I do not have any interest in linguistic “facts,” nor does the technology available to me permit such an exacting analysis. It is expected other researchers might not necessarily agree with my subjective assessment of what constitutes truth claims within the discourses. By using CL (or CADS) methods, however, I feel confident my examination is more open to replicability and has included aspects that might otherwise have been
neglected when dealing with such a large quantity of data (see Partington, in Clark 2007, 124). As Bayley argues, even an “apparently banal entry point” such as word frequency can alert the analyst to regularities and irregularities in texts (2007, 56). And although it is sometimes argued that CL disregards context (Baker et al. 2008), Bayley points out in CADS “the analyst is free to shift backwards and forwards between the data provided by concordance findings and the texts themselves” (2007, 54), something I have done with great regularity in this study. As Koller acknowledges (with specific reference to metaphoric analysis, although the comparison holds), “even in its simplest form, corpus research ascertaining the frequencies of metaphoric expressions can help draw inferences about the productivity and relevance of conceptual metaphors in discourse” (Koller 2006, 242).

Another key difference between CL and CADS is that the former concentrates only on what is explicit in the text, “rather than what could have been written but was not, or what is implied, inferred, insinuated or latently hinted at” (Baker et al. 2008, 296). I have used corpus methods primarily to help me see what is present in the data, but also in order to consider ‘subjugated knowledge’ and the “complex linguistic choices made during the processes of text production” (ibid., 281). That is, my research question involves an examination of how the truth claims came to be. Three points are fundamental to this perspective. First, language use involves choices. This makes it constitutive and places it in the realm of the political.
Based on the findings of several research studies, Partington argues (again, in reference to metaphor) that “all the evidence shows how metaphor is used, not simply to describe the world, but to make claims about it, to construe it in ways convenient to the speaker/writer” (2006, 267). That is, by examining the network of particular language structures in a specific discourse, it is possible to “hypothesize how actors in an institutional setting (purport to) see their world and their own behavior in it” (ibid.).

Second, all texts are important but some are more influential than others. According to Foucault (see Chapter Two), this suggests all texts are worthy of study, but one does need to account for such things as subject position and strategic choices. As van Dijk argues, beliefs are discursively acquired. Public discourses, controlled by “symbolic elites,” such as politicians, journalists, scholars, teachers and writers are a primary source of shared “ideology” (ctd. in Baker et al. 2008, 280). The journal of the Canadian Band Association represents a professional discourse that is not alone in constructing discursive truth in instrumental music education, but because the journal is a textual reflection of the community of Canadian band directors, and because the published authors are presented in an authoritative manner, this particular journal has a disproportional impact in representing and constructing truth within its community. I have not, as this

\[118\] van Dijk is clearly operating from a cognitivist/ Marxist perspective, one not necessarily in line with Foucault’s, but van Dijk’s prominent work on discourse analysis seems relevant here.
study makes clear, restricted my analysis only to the journal of the CBA, but have used it as a central focus.

Third, there is a boundedness to the profession of instrumental music education that allows for the introduction of reader expectation—something addressed more fully in the previous section. Briefly, as Koller explains, “in-group membership is (re)constructed to a significant degree by drawing on the group’s shared cognitive and discursive resources” (2006, 240). That is, authors in such situations\textsuperscript{119} “show a high degree of readership orientation and thus echo and reinforce the conceptual models they perceive in their audience” (ibid.). My point is there is a strong magnitude of “textual coherence” within the journal of the Canadian Band Association. In such texts, Martin (2006, 227) points out, there is a “high degree of semantic overlap and interconnectedness.” There is, in other words, a high degree of consensus about what the profession of instrumental music education is or should be, and about the concepts it employs. This is not to suggest the journal does not exhibit what is known as *intertextuality* and *interdiscursivity*. The former refers to texts being linked in a variety of ways (topics, actors, events, arguments), the latter to the fact that topics themselves are related to multiple discourses (see Baker et al. 2008, 299). For example, while the journal’s focus is primarily on band activity, the discourses assume and subsume such things as the history of music, music  

\textsuperscript{119} Kohler uses the example of journalists, but a similar situation can be said to exist wherever authors have a strong knowledge of the readership.
theory, general musicianship, the arts, etc. There are also many interrelated, interdiscursive topics within the teaching of band (instrumental music): repertoire, instrument pedagogy, conducting, teaching methods, assessment, motivation, and discipline, to name just a few. There is, my research suggests, a strong textual/discursive cohesion within the journal. This boundedness and professional cohesion help render choices made within the text more explicit, and hence easier to analyze. Why, for example, is there such an apparently high degree of consensus about the importance of “quality” repertoire? Conversely, why is there such a glaring absence of gender issues, multicultural issues, or class issues?

A recognized challenge in analyzing the data and accounting for the social, political, historical and cultural context of the data is that it is very “labour-intensive” (Baker et al. 2008, 285). One must then acknowledge there are empirical constraints (Martin 2006, 28) limiting the extent of the analysis. Kohler writes that examining each and every instance of every word is extremely time-consuming and “not necessarily realistic” (2006, 242). Nevertheless, I have endeavoured to examine each and every instance of selected words (approximately 25,000 instances in all). The selected words were “downsampled” from a categorical reduction of words. In each case I used the ‘find’ feature to instantly locate each occurrence of a selected word and then quickly attempted to ascertain its significance, and subsequently (if significant) its context by reading the co-text. This co-text
was not limited to a typical 5-10 word concordancing, but involved as much text as necessary to determine the usage of the word in question. In addition, although I ultimately decided to limit my analysis, I also examined the entire concordance in order to locate silences and gaps: words I might have expected to occur more frequently, and words that suggested other words that were missing. For example, the two appearances of “aboriginal” in the Canadian Band Journal (over 950,000 words, three letters or more) and one appearance in Canadian Winds (over 275,000 words, three letters or more) led me to investigate words potentially associated with First Nations and other racial/ethnic groups, multiculturalism, and diversity issues.

Empirical constraints limited not only how many individual word usages were investigated, but also impacted what Gee (2003) refers to as the “frame problem.” Gee calls this problem a “double-edged sword for discourse analysis” (2003, 31) in that, while critical approaches to DA (e.g., CDA) necessarily involve consideration of utterances within broader frameworks, these frameworks too face empirical constraints. That is, changing the contextual frame can bring out new meaning that “may change how we think about certain issues” (ibid.). Critics, however, can turn this technique back on the analyst, asking how purported meanings might change if the analyst were to consider other contexts—“wider aspects or just additional features at the same level of detail” (ibid.). As evident in my
analysis, I have brought many contextual factors to bear on the data, but it
must be acknowledged that greater or different contextual factors are bound
to bring out meanings different than what I have presented.

Foucault and Discourse Analysis

Enunciative Modality and Statements

Key to grasping Foucault’s archaeological analysis is the notion of the
enunciative function, or enunciative modality. This modality involves four
aspects: a referential, a subject, an associated field, and a materiality (AK, 129). All four of these aspects are constituted in what Foucault calls
‘statements.’ Although the statement is one of the fundamental building
blocks of archaeology, it represents—at least in my reading—one of the most
ambiguous aspects of Foucault’s system of analysis. Consider the fact
statements are “neither visible nor hidden” (ibid., 122). What, precisely,
does this mean? According to Sawyer (2002), Foucault’s concept of the
statement is the equivalent of Noam Chomsky’s concept of ‘words.’ That is,
statements are fundamentally speech acts. If it were but this simple.
Consider the following questions, descriptions, and explanations in The
Archaeology of Knowledge: “A series of signs will become a statement on the
condition that it possesses ‘something else,’...a specific relation that concerns
itself—and not its causes, or its elements” (AK, 100); “And what of the sentence? Should we not accept an equivalence between the sentence and statement?” (92); “A sentence cannot be non-significant; it refers to something by virtue of the fact that it is a statement” (102); “the statement is not the same kind of unit as the sentence, the proposition or the speech act” (97); “a genealogical tree, an accounts book, the calculations of a trade book are statements; where are the sentences?” (93); “A statement exists outside of any possibility of reappearing...[And if] an identical formulation reappears, with the same words, substantially the same names—in fact, exactly the same sentence, it is not necessarily the same statement” (100-01). Despite these seeming contradictions, Foucault does provide some examples and clarifications that help elucidate what is, as I have shown, a less than simple concept.

Foucault presents the declamatory sentences, “The golden mountain is in California” as an example intended to show the distinction between a referent and a ‘referential’ (101). The ‘golden mountain’ cannot be a referent (golden mountains do not actually exist), but it can be a referential (in, for example, a fictional novel). Extending the idea of function and context, Foucault offers “Colourless green ideas sleep furiously.” To claim meaninglessness here is to exclude a variety of possibilities: “that it describes a dream, that it is part of a poetic text, that it is a coded message, 

120 Subsequent page numbers in this section refer to AK.
that it is spoken by a drug addict—and that one assumes it to be a certain type of statement that must refer, in a very definite way, to some visible reality” (101-02). This is why Foucault suggests sentences are always statements. They always refer to something; they are referential. Statements, however, go beyond the level of sentences. Statements constitute a function that “cuts across a domain of structures and unities, and which reveals them, with concrete contents, in time and place” (98). Statements are that “which enables...groups of signs to exist” (99).

The existence of signs requires someone or something to emit them (104). For Foucault, however, the author should not be considered synonymous with the subject of the statement, since the subject is not, in fact, “the cause, origin, or starting-point of the phenomenon of the written or spoken articulation of a sentence” (107). Meaning can only be determined by assigning a subject position to the statement. To illustrate, Foucault points out the meaning of the sentence, “For a long time, I used to go to bed early” varies considerably, depending on whether one hears it in casual conversation or reads it at the beginning of Proust’s *A la Recherche du temps perdu* (104). That is, the subject position can be filled in a variety of ways, none of which should be automatically assumed as a “speaking consciousness” or author (129). Archaeological analysis, then, does not

---

121 Foucault is referring to Proust’s most famous novel, *In Search of Lost Time* (or *Remembrance of Things Past*), a semi-autobiographical novel known for, among other things, involuntary memory.
consist of “analysing the relations between the author and what he [sic] says (or wanted to say, or said without wanting to).” Rather, it is a matter of “determining what position can and must be occupied by any individual if he [sic] is to be the author of it” (107).

Statements do not exist in isolation (111). They are always in a series of relations, relations existing in an ‘associative field’—something that turns a series of signs into a statement and provides a context and content for what is said. This series of relations forms a “complex web...made up of all the formulations to which the statement refers (implicitly or not), either by repeating them, modifying them, or adapting them, or by opposing them, or by commenting on them; there can be no statement that in one way or another reactualize others” (110-11). Underscoring this point, Foucault emphasizes, “if one can speak of a statement, it is because a sentence (a proposition) figures at a definite point, with a specific position, in an enunciative network that extends beyond it” (ibid.). Finally, to be considered as a statement, a linguistic element must have a “material existence” (112). Foucault points out that the same words operate very differently depending on whether they are spoken or exist in a written text, or whether they occur in a letter, a book, or a poster;\(^\text{122}\) the words used in a newspaper headline often cannot stand alone in casual conversation (113). To this Foucault adds, do the same words constitute the same statement when uttered loud and

\(^{122}\) To which one might today add email.
soft? Does the same text translated into another language constitute one statement or two (114)? He continues by pointing out that the evolutionary claim constitutes different statements before and after Darwin (116). As mentioned previously, “Dreams fulfill desires” is not the same statement in Plato as in Freud (ibid.).

I have used Foucault’s concepts of the statement and enunciative modality to aid in my analytic efforts. The statement, “Lives will be changed through the medium of music,” could potentially mean many different things. For analytic purposes, the meaning potential was delimited by identifying the referential (students), subject position (composer of Western art music), the associative field (band as music education), and materiality (the promulgation of the view that band participation is unconditionally good for people). This statement was then put into a grouping of other such statements, leading to an examination of gaps and connections. For example, this particular statement was part of a group of statements that assume that music is automatically good for people, and because bands play music, bands are necessarily good for people. While by far the majority of statements analyzed consisted of sentences, I also examined the CBJ/CW corpus with an eye towards identifying other examples of statements. The printing of concert programs as a regular feature in CW is another example of a Foucaultian archaeological statement. Making sense of such statements requires identifying the referential (e.g., paradigm literature), subject
position (e.g., conductors as determiners of repertoire), associative field (e.g., pieces in relation to the band canon, and, in the case of CW, in relation to the issue of Canadian repertoire), and materiality (a regular journal feature that identifies the names of directors and their chosen repertoire, advancing the view that repertoire is central to the music education experience).

**Discussion**

Interpreted in its more narrow sense, the study of discourse in a Foucaultian framework suggests a more archaeological than genealogical methodological approach. Graham (2005b) has adopted this interpretation in her analysis of children presenting ‘problematic behaviour in school.’ Interpreted in its more broad sense as inclusive of discursive and non-discursive practices, a Foucaultian discourse analysis incorporates both archaeological and genealogical approaches. There is, however, a problem when one turns to the question of actually doing discourse analysis using Foucault, since Foucault himself adamantly refused to be prescriptive, and thus avoided discussing many of the specifics about his own methodological approaches (ibid., 5). Of what, precisely, a “Foucaultian” investigation is comprised is a matter of contention within both the field of Foucaultian scholarship and poststructural investigations. “It appears that many scholars using discourse analysis within a Foucauldian framework have adopted a
‘Foucauldianistic’ reticence to declare method, fearful perhaps of the charge of being prescriptive,” or perhaps because one is always at risk of being dismissed as ‘un-Foucaultian’ if one “doesn’t get it right,” writes Graham (2005a, 2). (There is, as Graham points out, a certain irony in getting it wrong when there are not any explicit rules for getting it right.) Or perhaps, she suggests, the difficulty in finding “coherent descriptions” of how to do Foucaultian discourse analysis is due to the fact there simply is no such thing (ibid.).

Graham proceeds to describe how many discourse analyses—Foucaultian and non—appearing under the banner of ‘critical discourse analysis’ seem to share a poststructural sensibility that, among other things, “rests upon complexity, uncertainty and doubt and upon a reflexivity about its own production and its claims to knowledge about the social” (Ball 1995, qtd. in Graham 2005a, 3). The difference between many CDA and poststructural theoretical approaches, Graham points out, is the former often make claims to objectivity and truth the latter take pains to avoid (ibid.). The result is Foucaultian and other poststructurally-informed investigations attempt to avoid “the substitution of one ‘truth’ for another” (ibid.). While Foucault has been described as a “positivist historian” (Veyne 1997), it would be a mistake to assume that Foucault makes his interpretive
claims through appeals to scientific objectivity. One of the most salient features of Foucault’s work is that he demonstrates how discourse works not only to produce meanings, “but also particular kinds of objects and subjects upon whom and through which particular relations of power are realised” (Graham 2005a, 4).

For Graham, the doing of a Foucaultian discourse analysis presents a dilemma: should she adopt “prescriptive models” that “can be repeated, triangulated and generalised, in order for [her] work to be taken seriously and counted as quality research,” or does she remain “ambiguous” in order to maintain Foucaultian integrity? (ibid., 5). In adopting what she calls “methodological anarchy,” Graham develops a discursive analytic—a methodological approach allowing her to do “a form of poststructural discourse analysis that is informed by and consistent with the work of Michel Foucault” (ibid., 2). That is, a way to “locate statements that function with constitutive effects” in which one can recognize ‘acts of formulation’ (ibid., 11). More specifically, Graham identifies in her work, statements “as things said within the discourses used to describe problematic behaviour in schools that function with constitutive effects to speak into existence the ‘behaviourally disordered’ schoolchild as a recognizable (Butler, 1993) ‘object of discourse’ (Foucault, 1972)” (2005b, 5). Similarly, I have identified statements within the discourses of the journals of the Canadian Band

---

123 I discussed the normative aspects of Foucault’s interpretive claims in Chapter Two.
Association that serve to construct a discursive formation (see Chapter Two) about music and music making. Like Graham, I attempt to “map the system” (ibid.) through which particular truth objects (e.g., composer, score, art) are formed in order to draw attention to the way the disciplinary practice of instrumental music education constructs subjects in particular ways. Just as Graham alludes to the fact psychological discourse produces one kind of ‘disorderly’ child and medical discourse produces another (2005a, 11), pedagogical discourse within *CBJ/CW* produces a very specific kind of student.

I believe what I have conducted goes beyond the ‘discursive analytic’ Graham describes, insofar as I have employed corpus-assisted techniques to aid my identification of potential statements. Moreover, I believe I have taken a broader approach by including social historical, political, and intertextual aspects that go beyond the statements themselves. My general aims, however, are entirely consistent with what Graham describes: to “dissect, disrupt and render the familiar strange” by interrogating discourses of true and false, the formation of objects, and their effects in ‘the real’ (ibid., 4). The problem, Graham points out, is how to maintain an openness to poststructural antifoundationalism “without being accused of unsystematised speculation” (ibid., 4-5). Like Graham, I seek “intellectual freedom” as I remain fully appreciative of the traditions and expectations of “a community of scholarship” (ibid., 6). In this study I do not rigidly follow
existing models of archaeology, genealogy, DA, CDA, CL, or CADS (such as they are) but, rather, I attempt to make explicit as possible my analytic procedures and to present careful and substantial scholarship in line with doctoral expectations.

By systematically examining how this specific practice of instrumental music teaching in manifested in language, I interrogate the 'intellectual subconscious’ of the discipline of instrumental music teaching in schools. I have at all times asked: how is it this statement appears rather than another? My exercise is not one of deciphering a hidden code known only to me in my capacity of the all-knowing researcher, but of bringing to light many of the taken for granted claims and assumptions within the world of school bands. Mine is not an emancipatory exercise predicated on the belief there is a higher or more enlightened stage of consciousness my "truer account” will illuminate. Rather, I examine what is said and done, and what ‘what is said and done’ does. That is, I examine the kinds of knowledge produced in these discourses, the things said and done in the name of music education through school bands, and how these have come to be.

An oscillation in voice between my role as an analyst and my role as a participant in the ongoing discourse of bands will likely be apparent. This problem is also present in Foucault’s genealogical work when Foucault uses the word “true” as both a genealogist and as a discourse-participant, something that has lead to some confusion (and criticism) about the
candidness of the analyst’s position. For Habermas, for example, genealogies cannot be truly empirical unless they endorse some standard of truth irrespective of history. As Prado explains, “historicism subordinates truth and knowledge to history. It makes truth, knowledge, and rationality itself what our time and culture deem them to be. Claims to objectivity then reduce to expressions of consensus among social, disciplinary, and political groups. All of this is taken as abandonment of governing standards for intellectual inquiry” (2000, 19). This leads Prado to ask: “What does Foucault see that makes him think he can offer historicist but cogent critiques of truth, knowledge, and rationality? How can his inescapably reflexive analysis of reasoning itself lead to the conclusion that reasoning’s regulative principles are historical products, and still present that conclusion as intellectually compelling?” (ibid., 46). Without some form of external reality, in other words, why should Foucault’s accounts—or mine—be believed? Indeed this criticism should be taken seriously, although I think it can be partially resolved not by endorsing Habermas’s appeal for universal standards of truth, but instead by accepting the interpretative aspect of the genealogies. This may reduce them to rhetorical rather than positivistic forms of inquiry, but I believe this may be a major point Foucault is trying to make: everything is rhetorical inquiry; one should be suspicious of all those who claim otherwise.
I can only stress again my analysis must be considered nothing but a reading, albeit one where second-order judgements are suspended as much as possible—done not in the name of feigned objectivity, but in the interest of letting the statements and practices speak for themselves. Nothing is disinterested when deciding what statements to include, which to exclude, and how to organize the data.\textsuperscript{124} The integrity of this study, I submit, lies in its systematic examination of the discourse. By using corpus-assisted methods I have been able to examine each and every occurrence of a "downsampled" list of words (see Appendix F). Replication of this study might result in a different reading, but would not produce a different set of statements based on the same subset of words. I have not attempted to disguise my biases, but I have tried to avoid making too many evaluative judgements about ‘what is.’ Nevertheless, I suspect at times my descriptions may read as criticisms—perhaps unwelcome ones, especially to those who share and endorse the values of the present. I wish to make clear my reading is critical, but it is not intended as an indictment. It is instead offered as a reflexive exercise aimed at a reconsideration of practice. As discussed in Chapter Two, Foucault has occasionally been faulted for presenting his readings as “truer accounts” of reality. I believe the reason his work has proven so attractive to researchers in such a diverse array of

\textsuperscript{124} As Foucault reminds us, “where knowledge is concerned—one abandons the opposition between what is ‘interested’ and what is ‘disinterested’” (DP, 28).
fields is because he successfully demonstrates the contingency, and hence surpassability of our existence. Such is the inspiration I have drawn upon in the present study.

Archaeological Principles

• Statements have been examined with respect to: the referential (object), subject position, an associated field (concepts), and a materiality (strategic choices) (see AK, 130).

• The specific author and hidden intentionalities are of no concern.\(^\text{125}\)

• Statements are taken at face value. The metaphor of ‘depth’ is rejected (see May 2006, 51).

• Not all statements are equal (AK, 185, 189). That is, they are considered within their domain. Statements in an advertisement are not necessarily commensurate with statements in a pedagogical article. This is not due to intentionalities, but, rather, to the fact that they occur in different domains and involve different strategic deployments.

• The ‘sites of discourse’ (AK, 56) and roles played (i.e. university professor or composer)—what Foucault calls “various positions of subjectivity” (AK, 60)—have been, to the degree possible, accounted for.

• I have continuously asked, “How is it that one particular statement appeared rather than another?” (AK, 30).

• I have been sensitive to, but not under the spell of succession (AK, 186). I have looked for discontinuities, breaks, and ruptures, but have not always analyzed discourses linearly. No attempt was made to identify ‘progressions’ within discourses. While statements are always linked to those that proceed and follow (AK, 31), they are not necessarily cumulative. It is more a matter of trying to show “the

\(^{125}\) That is, “statements can be analyzed as a field without reference to a subject of consciousness that would have produced them” (Paras 2006, 56).
intersection between necessarily successive relations and others that are not so” (AK, 186).

• While I have attempted to be sensitive to Foucault’s caution that the sign is not a statement, since the statement is that which allows a sign to exist (AK, 99), I always began my investigations by examining the signs, for where else might one begin? If statements allow signs to exist, then the signs offer a starting place. I attempted, however, to heed the advice of Deleuze: “We must therefore break open words, phrases and propositions and extract statements from them” (1988, 52). In so doing, however, I have also tried to observe Foucault’s caution: “One is not seeking, therefore, to pass from the text to thought, from talk to silence, from the exterior to the interior, from spatial dispersion to the pure recollection of the moment, from superficial multiplicity to profound unity. One remains within the dimension of discourse” (AK, 85).

• I have delimited my examination by following Deleuze’s suggestion that the words and phrases chosen should revolve around focal points of power (1988, 17). This has usually, but not always, meant examining truth claims.

**Genealogical Principles**

• *Form problems in the present and work backwards via descent.* I have endeavoured to “breach self-evidence.” Historical narratives have been viewed with suspicion. My historical work is a “present-tense exercise” (Prado 2000, 43). I have tried to raise questions about how things “came to be the way they are” (McLaren 2002, 4), attempting to “rediscovering the connections” that may have become lost in order to counter “epics that claim to depict underlying continuities” (Prado 2000, 40).

• *Observe changes in force relations (the political).* I have paid particular attention to “the reversal of a relationship of forces, the usurpation of power, the appropriation of a vocabulary turned against those who had once used it” (Foucault, qtd. in Prado 2000, 41). What is of primary importance is any change in relationship.

---

126 This, however, is not to be confused with power as it exists as part of genealogy. Power, in this instance, relates more to the materiality of strategic choices.
• **Account for as many factors as possible (discursive and nondiscursive).** Genealogy is interested in ‘who we have come to be.’ This aims towards multiplicity, not reduction. Accounts of change must include “as many as possible of the factors that contribute to its coming about” (Prado 2000, 41). Genealogy illuminates “that truth or being do not lie at the root of what we know and what we are, but the exteriority of accidents” (NGH, 374).

• **Take into account all forms of discourse.** “Power relations are exercised, to an exceedingly important extent, through the production and exchange of signs” (SP, 338). Scientific, or ‘expert’ discourse maintains a privileged place in genealogy, but the true interest of the genealogist is in how “individual maneuvers and diverse situations have, over time, come to construct what are taken by many to be ‘expert disciplines’” (Prado 2000, 40). Ideally, one ‘sifts through the details’ of multiple forms of discourse to discern Foucault’s objective: thought (Deleuze 1988, 116).

• **Be sensitive to humanist claims.** The discernment of human nature is “the manufacture of that nature” (Prado 2000, 87). We become what truth orients us to become, “and we pave the way for others to become it as well” (May 2006, 85). That is, discourse creates reality. This is particularly problematic in reference to who and what we are claimed to be.

• **Be sensitive to disciplinary effects.** The school has become a central site where pedagogy “functions as a science” (DP, 187), since disciplines have been appropriated by institutions that use them as “an essential instrument for a particular end (schools, hospitals)” (DP, 215). The question thus asked is: What forces of the body are increased and which are diminished? (DP, 138).

**ANALYTIC PROCESSES**

To this point I have discussed discourse analysis in order to provide the reader with an understanding of the methodological underpinnings of the analysis of the discourses in *CBJ/CW* presented in Chapters Four through
Six. In this section I articulate, as specifically as possible, the exact process that led to the collection of ‘data’ from *CBJ/CW* used in the analysis. What I cannot show in this section is how I determined the associated texts that I included as part of the framing in my analysis. These were largely examined and incorporated based on my prior knowledge of the history of bands and the history of music education, although, in the spirit of Foucault, I did pursue leads (especially historical events) wherever possible. I cannot, however, claim to have exhaustively sought out historical primary source data as Foucault often did.

**Process**

**Stage One**

I initially conceived of *CBJ/CW*\(^{127}\) as a form of archive. The eighty-seven *CBJ* issues and twelve *CW* issues, it seemed to me, constituted a bounded set of knowledge reflective of discursive and non-discursive practices that I believed fairly reflected, to a degree open to speculation, instrumental (band) activity in Canadian schools. The challenge lay in how to make sense of the seemingly overwhelming amount of information. My goal from the outset was to try to establish the primary discourses in *CBJ/CW*, particularly those relating to subjectivity and subject formation. I began at

\(^{127}\) Reminder: *Canadian Band Journal/Canadian Winds*. Technically, the full name of *Canadian Winds* is *Canadian Winds-Vents canadiens*. I have omitted the French half of the title for the sake of clarity since it is only a direct translation of “Canadian Winds.”
the macro level, by simply listing in a spreadsheet all the featured articles in 
the ninety-nine issues. Next, influenced by Koza’s (1993) article, “The 
‘Missing Males’ and Other Gender Issues in Music Education: Evidence from 
the ‘Music Supervisors’ Journal,’ 1914-1924,” I counted the photographic 
images in the CBJ. I then examined the advertising, taking note of the 
geographic distribution of advertisers, believing that advertising was a likely 
indicator of geographic membership and activity. That is, companies are 
more likely to advertise (a) where they are likely to have an expectation of 
immediate (hard) economic return, and/or (b) where they feel they have an 
expectation of longer term (soft) economic return in terms of raising their 
practical or moral profile with their intended audience of band directors.

It was quickly apparent that my initial efforts at broad content 
analyses were insufficient, as they did not sufficiently address the heart of 
archaeology: the statement. Having re-read my work on Foucault, I scanned 
(300 dpi) one volume (4) of the CBJ as a searchable portable document 
format (PDF) file. I subsequently executed a concordance analysis using 
the software program, DevonThink Professional. It immediately struck me 
that word frequencies might offer a crude, but potentially effective means of 
analyzing the discourses within the journal. I proceeded to scan all ninety-
ine issues of CBJ/CW.

128 Technical specifications: I used a Canon MP530 printer/scanner and an 
Apple G4 Powerbook for scanning.
129 Version 1.5.4.
Examining the presence of individual words is quite obviously not what Foucault means by ‘the statement’ (although they may be instances of ‘signs’). Just as obvious is the fact that, dictionary definitions aside, isolating words irrespective of their context tells us very little of their usage. The word “music” by itself does not provide any indication of how the word is being discussed. Still, the repeated appearance (or non-appearance) of words does indicate something. Examining the *CBJ/CW* concordance makes clear that the journal is not about farming or chemical engineering. A layperson could likely discern much of what instrumental music education in schools is about by glancing over the list of the two hundred most frequently appearing words. And while the meaning of words is undoubtedly contextual, the process of reading is such that many words often pass by us so quickly that we fail to take notice of them.\(^{130}\) By scanning *CBJ/CW* as searchable PDFs, I then used the Apple software program *Preview\(^ {131}\)* to find all instances of a given word (or variations of that word) within any given volume. For example, by setting the appropriate search parameters, an examination of “teach” finds all instances of teach, teaches, teacher, teachers, and teaching. By locating each individual occurrence of a word, I then easily ascertained its contextual usage in very short order, allowing me to examine thousands of individual words relatively efficiently. This process, known as “introspection”

\(^{130}\) Hence, discourse becomes a transparent, yet constraining, environment unless subjected to the kind of scrutiny employed in this study.

\(^{131}\) *Preview* version 4.1 on an Apple Intel-based iMac running version 10.5.5.
in corpus linguistics, might be considered analogous to how crime investigators use a flashlight instead of turning on the lights. The process of “spotlighting” helps us to see what we might otherwise miss. Indeed, this procedure proved itself invaluable throughout this investigation.

*Caveat One.* Optical Character Recognition (OCR) is not error-free. In examining the concordance results, it is clear that the software misidentifies many letters. Similar looking letters, such as c and o, o and a, i and l, t and l, or e and c, for example, are sometimes inadequately recognized by OCR. In addition, spacing between words results in further misidentifications. For example, “of the” might be interpreted by OCR as “ofthe.” As a result, word counts should not be considered definitively accurate. A close examination of the concordance ascertains, however, that OCR misidentifications are localized, not generalized. That is, at no time does it appear that OCR has consistently misidentified particular words or groups of words, nor does it appear that OCR misidentifications are higher in particular volumes. With rare exceptions, the errors are evenly distributed, not concentrated.

*Caveat Two.* I have endeavoured to account for misidentified words in my word counts, but am not claiming perfection. I have attempted to identify OCR mistakes, looking for common misidentifications, such as “teacher” and
“leacher.” I cannot claim to have accounted for every misidentification, however.

Caveat Three. Print, and therefore scan quality varied from issue to issue. The print quality changed over the twenty-five year run of the _CBJ_, although it should not be assumed that these changes resulted in better scans and greater OCR accuracy in later volumes. Although later _CBJ_ volumes appear to contain what would generally be described as possessing a higher, more consistent publishing print quality, a close analysis reveals that OCR errors are spread more or less equally over the years. There are, however, clear instances where certain pages have not scanned very clearly. Furthermore, although _CW_ presents a more polished overall journal look, the use of matte paper (or perhaps the choice of font) resulted in poorer PDF scans than the glossy pages of the _CBJ_. I note many more misidentified words in _CW_ than in _CBJ_, something the reader may want to account for in examining the frequency counts as they appear in the appendices.

I do not consider scanning/OCR errors fatal to the analysis in any way, since the percentage of successful scans is so high.\(^{132}\) While it is true that certain pages may not have scanned as successfully as others, the number of poor scans is very low (an exact number is hard to report, since at times

\(^{132}\) I ascertained success in scans by visually inspecting the page on the screen and then using the search feature to see if a given word on the page was found. Even on seemingly poor scans, the search feature was surprisingly effective at finding the words.
a page is only poorly scanned in a small section, such as along the spine, distorting only the first or last word in a sentence). Nevertheless, the presence of misidentified words by OCR underscores that frequency counts should be considered approximate. Their use and their presentation is intended to suggest trends and themes, not as definitive empirical evidence.

Caveat Four. Canadian Winds includes French translations (and, rarely, a French-only article). This at times distorts the rankings slightly, as well as potentially inflated word counts in instances where French and English words are the same.

Stage Two

Having scanned all issues of CBJ/CW, I conducted concordance analysis on both the CBJ and CW in order to examine patterns, trends, or other similarities and differences. The two concordances were examined individually and compared with one another. Individual words were examined in a variety of ways: total word count, representation by volume, and alphabetically. Total word counts were used to get a sense of what the journal discourse were “about” in the most immediate sense. A volume-by-volume examination was conducted to determine if particular words were topical or widespread, or exhibiting diachronic or synchronic tendencies. Finally, an alphabetical examination was conducted in order to identify
“silences,” or gaps in the text. This process allowed me to consider what the corpus of CBJ/CW is and what it is not. While hypothetically the absence of almost anything might be considered a silence, I was primarily interested in words that might alert me to topics or concepts related to power. As previously mentioned, word ‘aboriginal’ appears only two times in the CBJ and two times in CW. This led to an examination of racial, ethnic, and multicultural issues that may not have presented themselves simply by examining the most frequently occurring words. The focus on what something is not is consistent with poststructural orientations that consider issues of power. In other words, what something is is the results of choices that have been made from among (usually competing) alternatives.\(^{133}\)

I approached my problem in a variety of ways. First, I compiled and categorized article titles to get a sense of topic and context. Second, I compiled various statistics comparing the two corpora (CBJ and CW), including a comparison of the top 200 and top 500 most frequently occurring words\(^{134}\) (see Appendix A, B, and C respectively). The concordances allowed me to evaluate certain similarities and differences between the two journals. The strong overlap in vocabulary suggests that in spite of a different journal look and different authors, the discourse of school bands has remained fairly

\(^{133}\) I maintain that this stage in the research was valuable, even though I eventually decided, based on a careful rethinking of my research problem, not to include silences in my data presentation in Chapters Four through Six. A brief discussion of the matter is included in Chapter Seven.

\(^{134}\) Four letters and more.
consistent over time. In order to ascertain the “representativeness” of the journal (in terms of both national representation and of school music teaching) I examined geographic place names in both CBJ and CW (see Appendix D). As well, I scanned in a recent supplementary issue of The Recorder, the journal of the Ontario Music Educators’ Association (The Best of The Recorder 2000-2007). As shown in Appendix C, there is a strong overlap with the discourse in CBJ/CW, although few notable exceptions exist, such as the words curriculum, assessment, and rubric—all missing from CBJ/CW. The strong textual cohesion between CBJ/CW and The Recorder suggests that my assumptions about the CBA discourses representing the world of instrumental school music teaching in Canada are very likely correct.

My third approach was to categorize the top 1000 most frequently occurring words from the CBJ into four groups: what/who, proper nouns, concepts/evaluative, and doing (see Appendix E). While somewhat crude,

---

135 Although not indicated in the appendices, I set up my analysis to examine vocabulary by volume in addition to the entire corpus. That is, I was able to examine if particular words were localized to certain years or occurred regularly. Almost all words in the top 500 occurred with regularity, confirming the constancy of the discourse.

136 One observes a predominant Ontario and Western Canada presence (with Alberta less prominent in CW), with Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick all notably absent from the list. This is not entirely surprising, however, given they are three of the smallest provinces by population. Overall the journal appears to exhibit a national presence.

137 As mentioned in Chapter One, OMEA is an organization made up of elementary, choral, and instrumental music educators in the province.
this categorization process—what Stefanowitsch (2006) might call identifying “target domain vocabulary”\(^{138}\)—allowed me to ‘downsample’ words related to subjectivity and subject formation, shown in Appendix F. First, I assembled a preliminary list for the examination of co-text, searching three volumes (12 issues) of the *CBJ* using the ‘find’ feature in the software program *Preview* in order to determine if the word in question was worth doing a thorough examination of the corpus. This step aided efficiency, since the line between a useful word—one that contains the presence of knowledge or truth claims related to disciplinary practices—and a non-useful word was a fine and unpredictable one. Second, I narrowed my sample to the words consistently included in truth-claim statements based on my introspection. As explained earlier in this chapter, while CL techniques using specific concordance software are often limited to 5-10 words of co-text surrounding a given node, I manually searched each occurrence of every word. Sometimes the usage could be ascertained by a quick visual inspection (a word in a title or in an advertisement, for example). Other times whole sentences or paragraphs were read to contextualize a word’s usage. Overall, this was a very labour-intensive process that occurred over the span over approximately ten months. In all, approximately 25,000 word occurrences were examined.

\(^{138}\) The primary vocabulary constituting the discourse.
Caveat Five. Empirical constraints. As discussed earlier, introspective analysis is very time consuming. While the length of time varied considerably from word to word, the examination of any given word (or word form: teach, teachers, etc) could take anywhere from two to six hours. Following the concept of ‘data saturation’ from Grounded Theory, I completed my analysis when I reached the point of diminished returns; that is, when I felt that further examination was no longer yielding significant additional insights. That said, a more exhaustive examination would likely add to what I have managed to investigate in this study.

Stage Three

Truth-claim statements based on individual word analysis were compiled in a database and sorted according to the following categories: music, learner, teacher, teaching, music making, and benefits. I then re-examined the claims in light of the Foucautian guiding principles listed in ‘Foucault and Discourse Analysis.’ From these principles, and by continually referring back to my research problem, I formulated a series of questions to help focus my analysis, such as: Why does one statement appear rather than another? How are the roles and responsibilities of teacher, educator, band director, and conductor understood by the profession? How are music and music making understood? How is the teaching of bands and their members manifested in the journals? How is “music education” put into
discourse? And how did the educative force of learning music in schools as band performance come into being, and how does this accord with the historical functioning of bands? These questions led me to ask how each claim became a claim. How, in other words, did the discipline come to be the way it is?

From my research on early bands, I came to see a disparity between the music-making ethic undergirding early band participation and the ethic promulgated in the corpus. These two practices—‘banding’ and music education via school bands—while superficially the same, were in fact very different. In Foucault’s concept of rapport a soi I found an analytic device I could use to help make sense of the discourse of musicality in band participation, one that helps to explain how the ethics of music making changed from a relationship with music (in the service of others) to a relationship to music (as an object of study leading to a special form of enlightenment). Following Foucault’s archaeological and genealogical methods, I organized Chapters Four through Six in terms of a presentation of truth claims, and a reading of how these claims came into being.

**On Presentation**

Consistent with my Foucaultian theoretical framework, no attempt has been made to hierarchize citations in terms of authority, nor have I sourced
any of the authors in *CBJ/CW*. Authors outside *CBJ/CW* have been cited, but statements within *CBJ/CW* have been identified only by volume, issue, and page number, since the name of the author, according to Foucault, does not bear on the veracity of the statement. Although we often believe that we filter the meaning and value of statements according to our knowledge of specific authors, Foucault maintains that the fact a statement appears in a specific context, such as under the guise of authority in a journal, demonstrates its validity. All sources, therefore, were treated as equivalent contributors to the discursive field. Subject positions were taken into account, since positionality introduces aspects of values and interests. These are generalizable to a subject position only, however, as Foucault argues strongly against attempts to decipher or attribute intentionality. That is, subject positions come with rewards and punishments: the concerns of the composer likely differ from the concerns of the school teacher. Speculation on individuals is of no real interest since the individual in question could potentially be anyone. That is, from an anti-humanist perspective, the individual is only acting according to the rules of the discursive field, and it is ultimately the discursive field that is of interest.

My analysis demonstrates that the discourses of the *CBJ* and *CW* do not vary, save the few differences noted in my discussion, in any substantial

---

*Put differently: if author ‘A’ did not supply the statement, author ‘B’ would have. The appearance of a statement is the result of the enabling conditions of the respective discourse.*
way. As a result, no effort has been made to try and make an overt
distinction in the text between the two journals. To keep the text as clean
and uncluttered as possible, journal citations do not include the journal
name, but rather are distinguished through the use of a colon to separate
volume and issue for CBJ citations (e.g., 15:4, 23 represents volume 15,
issue 4, page 23) and a virgule (forward slash) for CW citations (e.g., 3/2,
76). As there are only six volumes of CW, and there are very few citations
for the CBJ in volumes 1-6 (none, in fact, for volumes 1, 2, and 3:1), there
should be minimal confusion over the journal source.¹⁴⁰

¹⁴⁰ Foucault, in his later works, kept citations to a minimum, often refusing
to even acknowledge or cite his sources. While I believe that eliminating
journal citations would in fact strengthen my presentation, dissertation
practices demand I source my data.
Chapter 4

The “Truth” About Bands

INTRODUCTION

If you walked into a band class at any junior or senior high school across Canada, what would you observe? Certainly, there would likely be some warm-up and, of course, there would be the ubiquitous announcements. But chances are that a good portion of the class, probably the majority, would be taken up with rehearsing repertoire. That is, teachers would be helping their ensembles prepare two or more selections of music, probably for a forthcoming concert or festival, much in the same way a conductor prepares a symphony orchestra for a forthcoming performance.

(4/1, 15)

The statement above describes my own knowledge of and experience with school bands. It describes what school bands do. This is not to imply there are not exceptions or variations, but rather that school band classes are in many ways a very logical outgrowth and extension of historical large ensemble music-making practices. School bands are also, however, the product of many other discourses having to do with music, teaching, learning, and education, among others. While the description above is apt, it is incomplete. Among the unaddressed questions are: What music? How, precisely, does the symphony orchestra conductor rehearse? What are the
implicit/explicit aims of the activity (presuming it is not to sell concert tickets or recordings)? What is the nature of the music teacher’s subject position (teacher? conductor? band director?)? and What is the nature of the relationship between teacher (conductor) and student (musician)? My research question, "What ‘regimes of truth’ are fashioned in school music (bands) discourse, how did they come to be, and what are their potential effects on the subject?" was intended to allow for as much flexibility as possible in the analysis of the CBJ/CW discourses in order to examine these and other unaddressed questions. In this and the following two chapters I present a combination of the Foucaultian archaeological and genealogical, with the aim of describing disciplinary ‘regimes of truth’ and how these truths came to be, with the caveat that my description of how is not one of deducing causality, but rather one of providing a preliminary description of some of the historical conditions—or contingent possibilities—that have contributed to what is often presented in the discourse as natural or inevitable.

The “Truth” About Bands

The value of ensemble participation for music education is seldom questioned. Most institutions with a music education program require students to participate in an ensemble as part of their pre-service education. Students often have a choice between a number of major ensembles
such as concert band, wind ensemble, orchestra, and jazz ensembles.
(22:1, 11)

If there is one truth claim beyond reproach in *CBJ/CW*, it is that the goal of the activity of large ensemble music making is for the conductor to faithfully and responsibly interpret and realize the composer’s creation. Failure to do so is to jeopardize the musical/artistic aspects of the experience, and hence its educative value. Resistance to this idea is almost non-existent, save one (and only one) instance. A veteran school teacher—in reference to jazz, where the sacrosanct belief in the composer’s creation might be permissibly challenged—writes: “Remember that no music is written in stone. Don’t hesitate to re-voice chords to fit your players’ ranges... Learning about arranging and composition is a great thing to do...You may also be able to edit sections or whole charts to better suit your group, its strengths and weaknesses” (23:4, 27). In opposition to this statement, the predominant ‘regime of truth’ is that all aspects of the musical experience—even those involving strictly technical issues—revolve around discerning meanings as intended by the composer: “The technique of playing accented notes often results in their [sic] being slightly late—especially bothersome in ensemble playing. Attention must be focused on this problem to assure that the accents are observed and that the rhythm of the passage is intact; either without the other is not sufficient to achieve the composer’s musical intention” (5:2, 15).
The co-text for the epigram makes clear the author is not questioning the value of ensemble participation, but is in fact offering it as a truth claim. It is simply accepted that ensembles, meaning large ensembles, are or should be the basis for music education in schools. Large ensemble performance dictates the musical experience for the large majority who pass through school music in North America. And if we are a product of our experiences, then a part of who we are, at least for those who participate in school music, is dictated by the large ensemble experience. Our ethical relationship in music—or sense of musicality, in other words, is a product of how we experience it through the medium of wind band participation. It is thus important to understand the ‘regimes of truth’ that operate in the band world in order to understand subjectivity and subject formation as it occurs in and through school music.\textsuperscript{141} To clarify, these ‘regimes of truth’ are not descriptions of what every band director believes or does, but rather, are the environment—the normative frame—against which practices are measured. They are the expert pronouncements which encourage or censure actions within the pedagogical world of school bands. Practices that do not conform to these ‘regimes of truth’ are considered contrarian. Practices deviating too far are simply not recognized at all.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{141} I am not claiming out-of-school experiences of music are unimportant or are not a contributing factor. My examination, however, concerns only the in-school music experience.

\textsuperscript{142} For example, an article promoting “deviant” practices is quite unlikely to be printed by the journal editor(s).
As my analysis and discussion shows, participating in bands is not supposed to be about such things as entertainment or enjoyment (I hesitate to use the word “fun”). Instead, bands are to exist for education in and through Art. The learning and performing of the music is important, but only insofar as it realizes the composer’s intended (artistic) musical message. This is to be brought about as expediently as possible by the conductor, whose duty is to fulfill this task. This chapter articulates the many such truth claims made in this regard, demonstrating how one’s musical relationship through participation in school bands is a relationship to music rather than with music. Music, which is to say the music itself, has become an unmistakable object of study. Chapter Four is laid out in four sections: teachers, teaching, students, and music. Following an examination of truth claims about who teachers of school bands are supposed to be, I look at the act of teaching itself. The discourse is unequivocal: directing bands is a matter of training. Due to the resonances with Discipline and Punish it seems fitting to entitle the section “The Means of Correct Training.” In the third section, “The Growth Metaphor,” I present claims that consider the student something of an empty vessel or seedling requiring the care and nurturing of Art in order to bring about the desired subject status.\textsuperscript{143} Finally, I conclude

\textsuperscript{143} The discourse contains much inconsistency in the use of “art” and “Art” (as well as “the arts” and “the Arts”). Generally, my use of “Art” refers to the reified domain of “great art” often implied by certain authors, even when they spell the word as “art.” Differences in spelling should not be considered overly significant.
this chapter with statements in the discourse that leave little doubt about the nature of the musical experience in school bands. School bands are supposed to be about the study of music (as object), the goal of which is to faithfully recreate a musical work in accordance with the intentions of the composer.

**TEACHERS**

**Being a Teacher, Conductor, Musician**

Let it not be forgotten: all of the great conductors, regardless of what they conducted or what kind of group they conducted it with, were all teaching conductors.

(14:2, 10)

The personal and artistic attributes of the conductor are found in their wind bands in much the same way that Grieg believed artists to be created.

(1/1, 29)

If language helps create reality insofar as we think in language, are born into it, and cannot escape it, then the language we employ to describe who we are and what we do matters. The roles, or subject positions, in which we see ourselves matter. The labels ‘band director,’ ‘conductor,’ ‘teacher,’ and ‘educator’ are often used interchangeably in *CBJ/CW*, as though all roles (and labels) are one and the same. Although some authors do employ combinatory terms as ‘teacher/conductors’ or ‘director/teacher,’
indicating distinctions may exist between being various roles, the use of such terms also has the effect of eliding any such differences. That is, the term ‘teacher/conductor’ is not offered as a binary, but intimates that conductors are teachers and teachers are conductors. Generally, university professors were more apt to employ the term ‘conductor’ while school teachers were more likely to use ‘educator,’ ‘music educator,’ or ‘teacher,’ suggesting many university professors view their role as closer to that of the professional conductor whereas school teachers view their position as perhaps more of a music educator who conducts bands. What is consistent in the discourses is that all school teachers were assumed to be music educators, who were assumed to be band directors (understandably so, given the journal and its intended audience), who were all assumed to be conductors. One finds remarks, for example, placing the primary emphasis on the conductor role; being a teacher is merely an attendant effect of being a band director situated within an educational institution: “the band director in the schools, being of necessity a teacher as well as a conductor” (16:3, 13).

In an article entitled, “The Band Director, ‘In Pursuit of Excellence’” a professor of music education remarks, “If you, like me, are ‘walking a fine line’ between being an educator and a musician, what impact would this tend to have on your interactions with your students?” (17:2, 21). The professor continues, asking, “Do we need, for the sake of our own emotional
well-being, to be the central focus of the music classroom, while our students really need us only to structure and facilitate their individual interactions with music? Also, do we sometimes demand of our more advanced ensembles the re-creation of the quality and difficulty-level of our university band experience, when a more appropriate educational goal might be that of a larger diversity of less difficult but quality experiences?” (ibid.). These types of reflexive statements that question the centrality of the conductor-as-musician do not appear in CW, where the needs of the student are presented as synonymous with the “needs of the music” and the needs of the conductor/teacher. This aforementioned article, which questions many common practices in the world of school bands, raises the issue of musician identity among school band directors.

The research of Brian Roberts on identity issues among music teacher candidates affirms the ambivalence expressed by the university professor. Roberts writes, “it is clear from this research that where Schools of Music profess to undertake the education of music teachers that students still see their own task as primarily to develop an identity as a performer and certainly not as a teacher” (1993, 211). He then offers a speculation that resonates with the question of whether band directors place their own musical and emotional needs before those of students, asking, “Do music teachers make curricular decisions for their students in their schools in order...

144 A reminder I examined every single occurrence of the words teach*, direct*, conduct*, educat*, and instruct* in the CBJ/CW corpus.
to provide opportunities for themselves to gain status as a ‘musician?’” (ibid., 213).\textsuperscript{145}

An increased emphasis on conducting, something that places teachers at the center of the pedagogical relationship, can be considered a manifestation of both the need to maintain one’s identity as a musician, and an increased attention to the art object as the focal point in learning (discussed further in parts three and four). That is, the composition-as-art-object embodies specialized knowledge demanding the expertise of the conductor as sage interpreter. As an example of power-knowledge, this strategy entrenches the necessity of the conductor, placing students—whose knowledge is considered ‘low status’—in a subservient position. Consistent with this increased attention to music-as-object is a noticeable change in emphasis in the relative importance of conducting as an activity of the band director. In an article entitled “The Education of the Band Director,” it is notable that in a list of competencies compiled by the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) in 1975, conducting is just one of several (6:2, 13). The late 1970s and early 1980s, however, saw the proliferation of

\textsuperscript{145} The research of Isbell (2006) casts doubts on the extent to which Roberts claims undergraduate music education students feel ‘in competition’ with performance students, and consequently, the extent to which undergraduate music education majors identify primarily as musicians. Isbell suggests that there is a latency period, and that teacher identity among undergraduates begins to develop after field experience, becoming stronger as they approach graduation. Neither Roberts nor Isbell examine identity issues as they impact on teaching practices. Roberts’ speculation remains an important consideration.
'conducting symposia’ in North America aimed at “Advancing the Conducting Craft” (1/1, 15). Usually hosted at universities (often by individuals with some connection to CBDNA), these symposia promote the view, implicitly or explicitly, that conducting is the most important (or only!) form of ongoing professional development for ensemble directors. One author (a university conductor) makes clear that good conducting is central to instrumental music teaching, and improvement in this area is a professional responsibility, writing, “when we took our first teaching position, we made, or should have made, a commitment to become the best conductor teacher possible” (21:1, 16). The author claims the way to do this is to belong to groups such as the Canadian Band Association, MENC, National Band Association, CBDNA, and the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles, participate in conducting symposia, attend rehearsals of conductors you respect, and study the great conductors (ibid.). The implication here is that the educational value for the student is dependent to an extraordinary extent on the actions of the conductor. A noted university conductor is quoted as saying, “an expressive, clear, and musically knowledgeable conductor is the most effective teacher of ensembles. Conducting that does not develop the musical skills of performers of any age

Promotion for the 1980 National Conducting Symposium suggested there would be “presentations dealing with the nature of what conductors are and do” (5:2, 20), implying a rather standardized concept of the role and responsibilities of conductors. These symposia continue to proliferate and are an ongoing facet of secondary music education in Canada.
is a marginal experience” (1/1, 19). The value of the learning experience, in other words, depends on the kind of knowledge manifested in the role of conductor. The kind of “musical skills” developed by proper conducting is the goal of music education.

Quite clearly, conducting is central to one’s growth and development as a music educator, since, as the discourse suggests, ‘conducting equals teaching.’ It is not surprising, therefore, to find a call for the expansion of graduate programs in Canada that include the ‘needs of band directors,’ such as literature and conducting (5:4, 19). While the proliferation of conducting symposia in response to the need for better conducting may be viewed as a reflection of the perception school band conducting practices are inadequate, what is significant is the effect of conducting symposia aimed at school band directors. The increased emphasis on conducting as the primary form of professional development promulgates a particular conception of the music educator as a conductor first, teacher second. Rhetorical strategies are then employed to justify this positionality. Note in the following statement how a commitment to oneself as a musician and conductor is presented as care for the students and, significantly, the music.

What do you find passionate about music? What is it about the music that you have passion for? Are you showing this in the music you make? We must find and show the spirit of the music with every gesture we make. The music deserves it. Our musicians deserve it. And we deserve to feel truly fulfilled as

---

147 This exact sentiment was conveyed to me directly by the head of a music department at a Canadian university.
By showing one’s passion for music through gesture it is suggested, students will benefit. Just as importantly, however, teachers deserve to feel fulfilled as musicians. Again, concern for students is used strategically to justify one’s own development as a musician, and the kind of knowledge embodied in being a conductor: “We want our bands and ensembles to improve, but we often ignore the most important ingredient that makes this happen: our own musical growth!...We need to keep in mind that student growth depends on our growth... What do we do that contributes to our own musical growth?” (21:1, 15). The writer continues, saying, “It is generally understood that if we are not growing as a musician, conductor, and teacher, we become complacent and apathetic. We tend to lower our standards and lose some of the excitement we once had about music” (21:1, 16). Becoming complacent and apathetic is apparently especially problematic for teachers working with younger, less advanced students: “Our role is to discover these elements of the music and bring them to life. We need to ask how we can define the multiple layers, manipulate the sound, and play with textures, just as the visual artist does. When we teach this way we are musician educators and we remain excited about making music even with

148 The ellipses are part of the title of Joseph Schwanter’s composition for advanced bands. The Red Balloon is a piece for young bands by Anne McGinty.
beginners” (1/1, 22). Very clearly, then, it is important for school band directors to maintain an identity as musicians, as indicated in the use of the label, “musician educator” (1/1, 21).

**Pastoral Care and Being a Great Teacher**

It is no accident that some band directors consistently turn out excellent ensembles which garner high grades and honours while others consistently produce mediocre or poor ensembles. Talent is distributed equally among schools and communities. It is up to the teacher to motivate and teach the concepts...[N]ot only will high grades result, but the students will know they have learned correctly and are capable of repeating their successes. (17:4, 15)

As teachers, every such decision in our daily work is bound to influence our students... And if this is true in scientific and academic subjects, how much more true is it in the arts, where the conductor/educator has almost unlimited power of choice in almost everything: in particular, the choice of music to be studied and performed, and the way it shall be interpreted. (13:2, 15)

For Foucault, pastoral power is an example of governmentality (the governance of ourselves and others). While originally the purview of the clergy, this form of power has spread to many institutions, notably the school. Foucault claims that pastoral power “is salvation-oriented (as opposed to political power). It is oblative (as opposed to the principle of sovereignty); it is individualizing (as opposed to legal power); it is
coextensive and continuous with life; it is linked with a production of truth—the truth of the individual himself [sic]” (SP, 333). Foucault claims that pastoral power has now “spread and multiplied outside the ecclesiastical institution” (ibid.), and that the state, through its institutions such as schools and universities, now constitutes a “new form of pastoral power” (ibid., 334). Its goal is no longer the next world, but this one. The concern is now “health, well-being (that is, sufficient wealth, standard of living), security, [and] protection against accidents” (ibid.). The discourse examined in this study includes many examples where the institution of education is viewed as central to fostering in society the “right” kind of musical taste and appreciation, often cast in terms of concern over individual development and the fulfillment of “human” capacities for art and beauty.149

The CBJ/CW discourse makes clear that students are entirely “dependent on their conductor for guidance and leadership at every moment” (15:4, 25); the conductor is the shepherd. There is an ambiguity, however, about the exact nature of the care to be exercised by teachers. Is one’s primary obligation to the individual, the group, or the music? The answer to the question apparently depends on each individual’s self-determined criteria. One author suggests “success in the band world means

different things to different people.” The writer argues a range of criteria exists, including an appearance of one’s group at the Midwest Band and Orchestra Clinic, “producing students who understand and appreciate music,” having a large program, or being an “‘in demand’ adjudicator, guest conductor, or clinician” (3/2, 64). All of these “authentically indicate” aspects of success. (Note, however, how all of these criteria are framed in terms of teacher achievements, not those of the students.) Another author concurs, stating: “There is no one model of leadership success that is appropriate for everyone. People are different and so are their pictures of success. Success needs to be defined individually by each unique leader” (15:4, 38). In this last statement one finds a consistent theme: great teachers are great leaders. In spite of the suggestion that models of leadership (teaching) can vary, the discourse is unmistakable: great teachers do not facilitate learning, they dictate it. It is also clear, as in the first epigram above, that, in spite of the suggestion that exact definition of “success” in the band world might vary from individual to individual, success is defined by the field as having ensembles earning high grades and honours [at competitive festivals].

Great teachers are therefore great leaders who are evaluated in terms of their ensemble’s performance level. The deciding factor “comes down, as it always does, to the question of taste and knowledge on the conductor’s part” (15:4, 25). The ensemble’s performance, and hence learning, depends on conductor knowledge and conductor leadership. Conductors alone are the
absolute “arbiters of quality and taste” (13:2, 31). Observe it is the conductor’s role to “ensure that if the audience is to hear anything at all in his [sic] performance [note it is not the group’s performance]...they had better hear [the melody]” (25:1, 3). Being a great teacher/leader/pastor means ensuring first and foremost that the music is excellent by being an “effective” teacher/conductor. In the words of one conductor, through proper rehearsal preparation [score study] “you are leading them more effectively because you know what you want” (4/2, 71; emph. added). As a band director this form of pastoral care extends to ensuring the pre-conditions for successful performance. For example, the band director has a significant responsibility for “shaping instrument preferences of children” in order to achieve the “goal of balanced instrumentation in school music programs...Unbalanced instrumentation caused by proliferation of performers where large numbers are not necessary may...inhibit chances of success in music” (3/1, 15).

At times pastoral care is invoked as a tactic to justify what I describe in the next section as ‘correct training.’ For example, one author implores teachers to be mindful of retaining students by maintaining faith in them. “We can never give up on the students and risk losing them in our impatience, for if they are not longer in our classroom, how can we teach them music?” (17:4, 16). Great leaders, like great pastors, are responsible for their flock and show unconditional love in order to shepherd them
through the vicissitudes of school music: “We are their stewards, their couriers, their all-important mentors of music, and it is our charge to keep them at our side until we proudly graduate them to the next leg of their journey” (ibid.). Being a ‘mentor of music,’ however, has a very specific meaning and purpose. It means bringing students to a stage of “Enlightenment,” defined as “the realization that we must spend countless hours mastering the fundamentals, [for] only then will we enjoy the fruits of our labor in this important art” (ibid.). Note that while care is being expressed for the individual, the real aim of such care is to ensure the individual will become enlightened and “master the fundamentals” and thereby enjoy the “fruits” of the labour—fruits, it should be added, that are likely to help guarantee high grades for the ensemble and assure the teacher of her or his status as a great leader.

TEACHING: “THE MEANS OF CORRECT TRAINING”

Generally, learning to play a wind instrument in a school-band programme starts with a book and an instrument. We talk about assembly, care and maintenance, mouthpieces, correct posture, how to hold the instrument, and how to produce a sound. The next step is to put the method book on the music stand and teach the student about the staff, note values, note names, and their corresponding fingerings. It becomes a process of matching the dots on the page to the buttons on the instruments (or slide positions for the trombone), while

150 From Foucault’s Discipline and Punish.
putting it all in rhythm. It is essentially an exercise in co-
ordination from eyes to brain to fingers.  
(4/1, 17)

Our ability to train a band is often of far greater value than 
our ability to conduct. In fact, a good trainer who is only a 
mediocre conductor will, in all probability, obtain the better 
results.  
(4:2, 3)

Obey the leader or director, in every particular, in relation 
to the performance of the music; a Band to play well must 
be governed by one mind. 
—Rules for Band Practice, 1853 (Hazen and Hazen 1987, 
61)

The word discipline functions as both noun and verb: it is both a field 
or branch of knowledge and the process of training people to obey or 
conform. Both definitions of discipline are in evidence in the world of 
instrumental school music. As a verb, discipline achieves the twin goals of 
increasing productivity and promoting docility. Disciplining occurs in various 
forms in the discourse, characterized by the desire for efficiency (what 
Lyotard might call performativity), assumptions about teaching and learning, 
and assumptions about music making. Efficiency might be considered a 
manifestation of either historical practices in bands where expedient means 
have developed over time, or technical rationalist pressures in modern (neo-
liberal democratic) society, where expectations for maximizing results take 
precedence over all other concerns. For example, when one author writes, 
“The exercises outlined below are designed to teach your students how to 
respond to conducting gestures and to save time in rehearsal by eliminating
unnecessary verbal commands” (6/2, 87), it is obvious what is desired is not meaning making or initiative on the part of the students, but productiveness and docility. This is something that lies entirely within the teacher’s ability to achieve: “If we want to get maximum efficiency of our time and effort in rehearsals and performances (or anything else in life), it is vitally important to establish a POSITIVE-PRODUCTIVE-ATTITUDE... Knowing this, the obvious ‘key to success’ in any endeavour is to be certain all those involved have a proper ATTITUDE” (20:4, 5; orig. caps, emph. added). Another author reinforces the point that productivity and docility lie within the teacher’s control: “Effective conducting is a stimulus-response, a musical ‘tug’ between conductor and musicians. To achieve this stimulus-response, we need to be conveying what we intend as clearly as possible to our musicians” (6/2, 64). Only once in the entire corpus did I find a countervailing view of conducting, where an author raised a potential problem with the ‘stimulus-response’ approach. A school teacher writes: “I find that if I don’t guard against over-conducting my band, they become lazy and too dependent on me...If I then, perhaps am trying to deal with some unexpected problem and don’t help as much as usual, they become insecure” (23:3, 21).

The Pavlovian undercurrents of the ‘stimulus-response’ model suggest a very asymmetrical relationship: “Train your students to respond to smaller gestures. Don’t accommodate them by over-conducting. Make them come to you. Insist they watch you” (4/1, 9; also 6/2, 63). Another writes, “the
conductor should bring about these musical changes through his or her conducting technique and not through verbal directions. The aim of these rehearsal techniques is to achieve the ultimate goal of complete musical control by the communication of the conducting gestures combined with the rapid and correct musical response by the instrumentalists in the ensemble” (22:3, 19; emph. added). Although paternalism can be argued as inherent in all teaching/learning relationships, a common distinction cited between education and training is the outcomes of the latter are presumed to be predetermined rather than emergent and unfolding. Very clearly, music teaching and learning in band performance classes are supposed to include predetermined ends: “Good conductors/trainers must have a musically-valid pre-conceived idea of what the music should ultimately sound like, (that is, how the composer intended it to sound), and this conception must precede the first rehearsal” (4:2, 3; emph. added). What is more, the line between training and education is blurred when conditioning is cast as teaching: “you can actively teach students to follow your conducting gestures. Make this a part of their very first instrumental experiences. Have the ensemble play, clap, or sing in response to variations in your conducting pattern” (1/1, 15; emph. added).
Occasionally this form of training takes on Panopticonic overtones.\textsuperscript{151} For one writer, the key to creating a “positive experience” for students is to ensure the “path to success,” defined as “excellence,” becomes part of a student’s intrinsic motivation (20:4, 9). Sometimes this form of self-regulation is described in altruistic terms as care for student independence: “The greatest gift we can give our students is the ability to be able to work, develop, and grow effectively without us. As much as we can, in rehearsal, we want to help our students develop the concepts and skills that will enable them to enjoy that independent development” (2/1, 22). As the article makes clear, however, this form of independence is oriented towards “[helping] build the fundamentals of effective practicing” that will aid in the efficiency of ensemble rehearsals (ibid., 20). Another author reminds the reader the “long-range goal” for students is to move them from being a “field dependent learner” towards becoming a “field independent learner,” the definition of which is “intrinsic learners who delight in choosing literature

\textsuperscript{151} In \textit{Discipline and Punish} Foucault provides the example of Jeremy Bentham’s ‘Panopticon,’ a prison designed so the prisoners are arranged around the circumference of a circle, with a guard tower situated in the center. Due to the arrangement of windows and the division of the cells, the guards can see the prisoners, but the prisoners cannot see the guards (or each other)—and thus have no idea how many guards, if any, are watching. Eventually the prisoners come to believe they are being watched at all times. Panopticism, argues Foucault, is what our modern lives have become. We are self-monitoring, with the result that the “deliberate obedience of regulations” turns into “habitual compliance with norms” which then turns into ‘internalization’ of norms (Prado 2000, 61). This, writes Prado, “is the attempt to show how physical, regulatory, and judicial control of the body becomes control of “the soul” through the imposition of values, beliefs, and self-identity” (ibid.).
and practising it until beauty of performance is obtained” (17:2, 22). The discourse contains an assumption that students (players) and teacher (conductor) share identical goals: “we all know that our students would enjoy more immediate and sustained success [i.e. the ensemble would sound better] if they practiced more and practiced better” (ibid.). Once students have experienced success in the form of error-free execution of their parts, students will police themselves to ensure future error-free playing through proper preparation of individual parts:

When students value these effective elements of music, their desire to develop the individual performance skills required to reach higher levels of performance is greatly enhanced. The wish to learn because of their own internal discipline as much as because they wish to either please the teacher/conductor avoid angering that person. This internal discipline then stays with them as they continue beyond the influence of a particular teacher/conductor. (19:3, 20)

“In our profession of music,” writes another, this sense of self-discipline is a “must” (13:3, 19). “The people who ‘make it to the top’ seem to have this art of DISCIPLINE down pat” (ibid.).

The conception of learning-as-training in bands has obvious historical precedents. Band and large ensemble discourses have many references to such things as “military training” or “orchestral training.” Once again, in these latter traditions the ends are predetermined. Learning is less of a creative, indeterminate process than a mechanical and technical one.

152 For example, an advertisement for McGill University announces, “Professional Training for Wind and Percussion Players” (15:3, 26).
Importantly, it is one where the teacher establishes from the outset how learning is to proceed. At workshop sessions entitled “The Secret of Success” and “Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques,” a venerable university conductor states, “no matter what else a great conductor does they all have two elements in common. They all know the score and have a definite aural picture of what the work is and they persevere until the group performance matches the aural picture” (15:1, 36). Learning, in other words, is teacher-dependent and predetermined. As a CW author explains: “To help your students understand the music more deeply, you must know it yourself. You must spend time studying the score before you stand in front of your ensemble, coming to each rehearsal with a firm idea of what you want and how you will lead your students to realise it” (5/2, 67). The students, in other words, are considered successful when they produce the musical ends the conductor (teacher) predetermines for them. Another writes: “Knowledge of the score at the first rehearsal of the work allows the conductor to lead the ensemble through what is outstanding about the work” (5/2, 106; emph. added). Musical learning is assumed to be dependent on the musical experience, and this occurs best when the music conforms to the conductor’s ideal: “The music-making experience is heightened and more enjoyable when conductors can rely on musicians to respond to their gestures confidently and the musicians, in turn, look for musical ideas in their conductor’s movement. Never under-estimate the influence your
gestures have in molding the music and advancing the artistic pursuit” (1/1, 15).

While the discourse in *CBJ/CW* propagates and participates in the production of particular music-making processes reinforcing the view that the conductor rightly determines all aspects of curriculum and instruction, a rare voice of dissension appears when one writer cites a recent criticism of large ensemble performance practices, where the relationship of teacher and student is described as that of “master and slave.”

The teacher is the conductor in the political tradition of the dictator. The teacher must know all the music and be able to make all musical decisions. The students obey, conform, “recite” the correct answers (or musical phrases). Otherwise, the band will not be ready for the required concerts, the standard will not be up to collegial expectation, the reputation of the teacher (conductor) and ensemble (symphony orchestra) will not be noteworthy. (4/1, 13)

The proposed solution to this undesirable situation where the teacher is the center of all decision making is to, somewhat ironically, reconceptualize the role of the teacher as the hub of a wheel. While perhaps not the most effective counter-image to refute the alleged criticism of teacher-directed curriculum and instruction in band classes, the author’s aim is to argue for increased communication among stakeholders (students, administration, parents, etc.) while acknowledging the apparent unavoidability of teacher-centeredness in the instrumental music classroom.

Although the aforementioned author implies teacher-centeredness may be an effect of personality as much as the nature of large ensemble music
making, other statements, particularly in CW, make clear that most aspects of music performance and music learning are non-negotiable; they are always predetermined by the teacher. CW includes a regular feature of ‘study guides’ to repertoire—a practice appearing with increasing frequency in the band world, made especially popular with the publication of the Teaching Music Through Performance in Band series starting in 1996.\textsuperscript{153} One finds these types of rehearsal imperatives to the teacher to ensure the optimal performance:

Take care also to bring out the inner lines (second and third parts) that are so often the key to harmonic richness, especially when these lines descend chromatically. (5/1, 37)

The conductor must take care to balance the markings in measures.... Great care must be taken to ensure each player has the same idea of this gesture...Great care must be taken to contain the energy and sound of the ensemble here. (5/1, 20)

Be careful to differentiate between the lengths of dotted quarter-note and quarter-notes followed by eighth-rests. Also take care to maintain full length on longer notes followed by rests (this is a basic stylistic point in any music), and, of course, create shape through the percussion break that precedes the abrupt shift to F major at bar 45... Take care to unify the articulations in the third statement (starting at bar 52), being certain not to overdo the accents. (6/1, 29-30)

Note in this way, care for student learning is recast in terms of caring for the correct way to perform any given work of music. In addition, this practice has the ancillary effect of universalizing the wind band experience.

‘Rightness’ is not accountable to people, time, space, or place, but is, rather,

\textsuperscript{153} This series has expanded to include series on choir, orchestra, and jazz.
immutable and subject only to the ‘natural’ (that is, universal) norms of proper performance. Each piece has a right way to be performed.

Finally, it can be observed that the teaching/learning of music as training in large ensembles has, as alluded to above, strong resonances with behaviorism. The assumption is that the teacher’s job is to “train the behaviors you want to see” (5/2, 59). The writer explains, “this is how it works: gain control of the class (because learning cannot take place in chaos). Then train the behaviors you want to see, which will enable you to teach the specifics of music training” (ibid.). “Classroom control” is necessary, because “if one does not possess the techniques needed to create and maintain an optimal learning environment, then musically satisfying results will not ensue” (3/2, 98). Moreover, “maintaining order in the classroom” is “a paramount factor in terms of job satisfaction” (ibid.). It is clear, then, that the learner is positioned as object, not subject. Students are beings to be trained and conditioned to fulfill the bidding of the teacher, who bears the responsibility of ensuring the proper environment for and experience of learning, a situation Lave and Wenger describe this way:

When the process of increasing participation is not the primary motivation for learning, it is often because “didactic caretakers” assume responsibility for motivating newcomers. In such circumstances, the focus of attention shifts from co-participating in practice to acting upon the person-to-be-changed. Such a shift is typical of situations, such as schooling, in which pedagogically structured content organizes learning activities...[and where] the identity of learners becomes an explicit object of change. (1991, 112)
In the school band world, just “being a part of” the experience of conductor-centered instruction is considered sufficient for, if not equated with, learning, rather than a situation where, as Peter Abbs puts it, the student becomes “the protagonist in his or her own learning” (2003, 15).

Current practices in instrumental music classrooms have evolved to a point of efficiency and effectiveness as measured by the product of ensemble performance. The performance level of school bands does vary considerably, but it is not uncommon for high school bands to accurately execute “technically advanced” repertoire often performed at the university level.

What is rarely discussed in the discourse is any potential price paid for such “effective” disciplinary practices. In an article entitled “Advanced Instrumental Conducting,” for example, a university conductor seems to have overlooked the incongruity of ensemble practices that train very specific behaviors and then expect student initiative. He rhetorically asks, “where does creativity, imagination and expression fit into…the process of what we do?” (18:2, 11). Pedagogical practices have tradeoffs. One cannot continually treat students as objects and then suddenly expect them to act as subjects. Asked in a slightly different context, but which I think has merit here, is Judith Butler’s Foucaultian-inspired question: “How are we formed within social [or musical] life, and at what cost?” (Butler 2005, 136).
STUDENTS: THE GROWTH METAPHOR

Lives will be changed through the medium of music.  
(4:2, 3)

What was your artistic diet during the last year?  
(21:1, 15)

As we know, different plants grow best in different types of soil. What I like to do is get to really know the students and then provide the best “soil” for their growth.  
(4/2, 60)

The growth metaphor is not unique to music education. It is embedded in many ways in the discourse of development itself, which, as Foucault’s work in The History of Sexuality has shown, for example, has come to construct very normative ideals regarding what is properly human. In the discourse of CBJ/CW, growth appears in various guises, such as titles like ‘the care and feeding of (fill in the blank)’ (e.g., 6/2; 6:2, 4), where it is clear that music teachers, like Lave and Wenger’s “didactic caretakers,” must be held accountable for the kind of music to which students are exposed. Rooted in Platonic beliefs that music has moral-altering potential, contemporary discourse occasionally invokes scientific research to emphasize the point: “The brain tells us that the very act of performing music changes our brains, and therefore changes in a deeper sense the individuals we are” (25:2, 29). From the discourse it is clear that it is not

154 The banking metaphor is closely related, but the organic nature of the growth metaphor seems more appropriate to the CBJ/CW discourses.
just the performing of music that is important. One must perform the right
kind of music: “no single choice among all those they are called on to make
in the course of their daily routine is so important, far reaching, and of
lasting effect, as the choice of music to be studied and performed” (23:1, 5).
Another author suggests that despite any potential learner differences
(learners who are said to have “diverse learning styles and musical
backgrounds”), “well-chosen literature forms the foundation for the musical
growth and artistic development” (5/2, 105; emph. added). The best “soil,”
it would appear, always takes the form of a “well-chosen” music. Music
teachers are constantly reminded of their obligation and responsibility to
select appropriate repertoire, lest proper growth and development of the
student be put at risk: “Without YOU, their music teacher, they are
somewhat at the whim of a musical diet consisting of top-forty hits, the
latest MTV release and the hottest CD on the charts. (There could well be
some credence to any and all of these, however other options should also be
added to this musical meal). Your influence is wanted and needed” (17:4,
16; orig. caps). As previously discussed in the ‘Pastoral Care’ section,
teachers are ultimately “responsible for the musical growth” of students
(15:1, 21). As organic entities, students grow as a result of musical
exposure (food) provided by their teachers.

Repertoire-as-diet is a theme permeating the discourse. For one
composer, teaching and learning in music is a matter, reminiscent of the
racial recapitulation theories I discussed in Chapter One, of transitioning
students from simple to complex, where it is implied the adult world of art
music is unquestionably the goal of music education.

Baby food and baby-food music have their place, an important
place and purpose without question, in the development of our
student performers, but in both cases we must get them off the
children’s menu and into the adult world as quickly as possible if
they are to have strong, good-looking and healthy teeth, and
correspondingly strong, good-sounding and healthy musical
minds respectively. (12:3, 11)

In this case, pedagogical music—that designed with specific technical
development goals rather than solely “artistic” goals—is presented as baby-
food music. Complexity, in the form of a “serious” composition, is to be
favoured over the simplicity and functionality of pedagogical exercises or
pedagogical compositions. The making of music in and of itself is insufficient
to develop healthy musical minds. For this, “adult” music must be given to
students as soon as possible. Indeed this diet theme holds not just for
students, but for teachers as well. Conductors are reminded that in order “to
develop their intuitive, inner sense of artistic feelings” they must consistently
seek out for themselves “a healthy artistic diet” (21:1, 13; emph. added).

The diet metaphor of ‘you are what you eat’ is often used to assert the
educational value of art music and deprecate other musics by employing a
healthy food/junk food dichotomy. One writer refers to the pedagogical
practices of a prominent conductor in the band world, who would apparently
say to his students: “What are you feeding your students? Healthy, balanced
meals, or McDonalds? McDonalds is fine for a treat every now and then, but you can’t subsist on junk food every day” (6/1, 9). The kinds of music implied by the metaphors of healthy and junk food can hardly be mistaken, as the author later makes clear: “At the end of the year after all the hard work of preparing for festivals, concerts, and tours, a lighter pops concert is perfect. Use this opportunity to program music that can be learned in a few weeks, the ‘treat’ I mentioned earlier” (6/1, 10). The pernicious effect of equating ‘popular’ or ‘light’ music with junk food can be viewed as a tactic to assert the superiority of the musical tastes of those who are already in control of choosing repertoire in schools—those who value composed music in the tradition of Western European art music. It can also be viewed as a tactic to reinforce the belief educational value does not reside in the act of music making itself, but in the art object.

Do we teach music as an activity rather than an Art? The latter can only be accomplished through quality music, selected carefully. You, the director, are the leader, that one person who can set and maintain the standard. As your students’ highest example, you must give and demand quality. Leave the “junk food” diet alone, and teach to build an awareness of styles, history, and musical values. Boredom, exploitation, and indifference versus accountability and credibility. (8:1, 2)

Musical, and hence educational values are clearly not to be found in “junk food” music. To study and perform such music is to jeopardize one’s professional obligations as a music educator. To be credible and accountable (to students, parents, the music education profession, and taxpayers one presumes), one must demand quality repertoire. Failing to do so risks the
exploitation of students, leading inevitably to boredom and indifference.

Students fail to grow.

Concomitant with this tactic of placing the educational value in the art object rather than the music-making activity is the equation of valuing art music with being a ‘truly educated person.’ Achieving the status of being truly educated requires “intellectual growth,” something only accomplished by acquainting oneself with *enduring* (read universal) values.

[We, as directors, must] face the inescapable fact that musical growth means intellectual growth (is indeed inseparable from it; the two go together hand in hand) and that just behind the surface façade of entertainment, sex and titillation that music, like all the arts, so enticingly provides, there must also be present at least some of those enduring intellectual values that alone separate real food from junk food, physically and spiritually. And that the sensitivity to, and enjoyment of, just these values is what constitutes the truly educated person, the objective today of all education and not just music education. (12:4, 7)

Music education, accordingly, is making students sensitive to the kinds of intellectual values central to being educated, and hence truly (or at least more) human. The metaphor of depth is employed here by suggesting while all music inevitably provides some form of entertainment, only certain music has a deeper level of value separating the ‘wheat’ (the real music) from the ‘chaff’ (the junk food). This deeper level of value is of a lasting, more fundamental nature.

For the author cited directly above, entertainment is acknowledged to have a place in life, but “it cannot take the place of life itself and the solid
preparation for it” (12:3, 11). Education is presented as “preparation for real life in the real world,” and entertainment, like a food “treat,” cannot be considered to lay the foundation for one’s life “any more than the highly nutritious, carefully prepared baby food can take the place of real, natural food throughout one’s adult life” (ibid.). So while both art and popular music have entertainment potential, and “pedagogical” repertoire may hold some momentary utilitarian value, only art music has educative potential in the form of imparting enduring values. Notably, even when pedagogical music is presented as well-intended (highly nutritious and carefully prepared), it must never be confused as the goal of music education. Pedagogical music serves only an instrumental role in leading students towards the truly musical (and hence educational) goal of art music, the exposure to which provides the fertile soil or substructure to permit human flourishing.

**MUSIC**

Thomas Stevens, the principal trumpeter of the Los Angeles Philharmonic, said in an interview, “The orchestra under a paramilitary regime...is difficult to bear. It has become a conductor and repertoire business. The musician is only a tool.”
(4/1, 11)

Use the rehearsal to connect them to the finer details of the music; beauty, tone, shape, and nuance. The essence of an artistic experience is the commitment to detail in order to achieve a higher performance level of work.
(21:1, 19)
The contemplative attitude may be the most salient characteristic required in discerning the important qualities of music.

(11:1, 25)

What is potentially problematic about the CBJ/CW discourses on music, at least for those sharing a commitment to equity and diversity and rail against the negative effects of eurocentricism, is how unexamined assumptions about what music is serve to discredit other musical practices and traditions. It is understandable enough that wind band participation relies on and promotes such things as notational fluency and characteristic tone quality. What is remarkable is how the reliance on notation and tone quality—among other things perhaps—has resulted in a view of music deifying the composer and score to such an extent the students have become, as indicated in the epigram above, merely a “tool” to execute the wishes of the conductor and repertoire (read: “the composer’s intention”). Significantly, the musical needs of students are almost never addressed, or are consistently assumed to be synonymous with the needs of the music/composer. The discourse exhibits a very distinct ‘regime of truth’ about what music is and, consequently, how music is supposed to be done. There is a right way, and it requires the right music. Successful performance, it is said, requires an understanding of “the basic natural laws

\[155\] One author proudly proclaims the importance of experiencing music from “other countries”: “For example, repertoire is readily accessible from Japanese, Austrian, British, and Dutch composers” (5/2, 106).
which underlie all music, of whatever time, place or style” (25:3, 7).

Presenting musical laws as “natural,” like tactics that justify action based on appeals to “human nature,” inevitably have deleterious effects on musics outside the normative boundaries of good tone and notational fluency. The definition of what music is, in other words, results in very definitive ideas of what constitutes “good music.” For example, endorsing the Western European art music perspective often results in statements resonating with Hanslickian formal aesthetic viewpoints:\(^{156}\) “Good music is not, as a rule, obvious. There are in good pieces those surprises that both retain and refresh attention. Much of our band literature is predicated on the “slam-bam-gotcha” school that calls for little creative effort or sensitive perception on the part of the performer or the listener” (11:1, 25). What follows are three prominent themes about music and music making in the CBJ/CW discourse.

**What Music Is**

The meaning and value of music are embodied in its sound, and good music demands good tone quality for its expression.

\((11:3, 23)\)

\(^{156}\) Eduard Hanslick (1825-1904) is well known for promoting an “autonomous” or absolutist view of music, eschewing ‘non-musical’ elements (such as a “program”). The value of music for Hanslick resides in its formal elements.
Beauty of tone and expressive sound are what successful music is all about ultimately.  
(24:2, 22)

The answer lies in a consideration of the basic need of all music: to be heard and heard clearly by whoever may be listening...so that its “message”...can be grasped, understood and reacted to in the way that only music among all the arts can engender in the human psyche and spirit.  
(25:3, 9)

Assumptions about what music is and what it does are unequivocal: the concept of “music” as it appears in the journals refers to music of the Western European art music tradition of large ensemble instrumental performance. The only exception to this is jazz, although even then, jazz is envisioned within the established practices of art music performance: “Traditional and jazz styles do qualify for a place in music education as part of an overall program. It is our responsibility to maintain a perspective of educational priorities” (15:3, 50). These educational priorities, however, maintain that “the basics of good playing (tone quality, intonation, technique, interpretation, ensemble, etc.) must be of first importance” (ibid.). Predictably, conceiving music in this way results in a delimited view of what constitutes music and, as a result, the educational ends of an education in music. Although jazz may qualify for a place at the curricular table, it must be done in such a way the “basics of good playing” as defined

\[157\] It is unclear what exactly is meant by “traditional.”
by the Western European music tradition are not transgressed. “Beauty of tone” is frequently (if not incessantly) invoked as central to “good music.” “One of the goals of music educators,” writes a university professor, should be to “develop in our young musicians tonal concepts of the band and orchestral sound” (3/1, 13).

Given the emphasis on Western European music as the de facto definition of ‘music,’ it is not surprising to find the characteristics of Western European music are the very definition of being “musically well-educated.” Musicianship is therefore defined by possessing notational fluency and the ability to generate the right kind of sound on one’s wind instrument. The number one step to “true musicianship or musicality” is described by one author as the ability “to reproduce with voice and or instrument any rhythmic pattern heard by the ear…and then [write] it down in proper musical notation” (21:1, 5). Instrumental music programs are claimed by another as needing to develop two basic skills: “(1) musical literacy, and (2) characteristic tone quality coupled with some degree of facility on their instruments” (4/1, 15). This, points out the author, is not to say loving music, being “musically creative,” or making music throughout one’s life are not important goals for students. It is just that “without the ability to read music fluently and to sound pleasing on their chosen instruments...these

158 With apologies to bell hooks.
159 To be precise, the professor cites DeGregori (1961, 58) to add weight to his claim.
other attributes may be moot” (ibid.). The definition of music (and musical engagement), then, is constrained to the kinds of music dependent upon traditional notation as performed on traditional orchestra wind and percussion instruments. ‘Music’ means the recreation of musical works.¹⁶⁰

**Score or Bible?**

The score represents, in black and white symbols, the composer’s creation... Successful musical growth occurs when the conductor and, subsequently, the students make important connections with the score and composer. (21:1, 16)

How many times have you heard a conductor get up in front of his or her ensemble and say, ‘o.k., gang, let’s see how this is supposed to go.’ The sad thing about that comment is that he probably means it. More than likely he hasn’t spent any time studying the score to find out what it is trying to say, what the problems may be in it and how he is going to solve them while trying to interpret the composer’s intentions. (8:3, 11)

[The score], when properly re-created in performance under the conductor’s direction, will result in the audience experiencing the same state of musical exhilaration that the composer felt when he first heard these sounds in the privacy of his or her mind. (24:3, 12)

“We must understand the score” (1/1, 23). The musical, and hence educational value is very clearly found within the score’s hidden meanings, or “secrets.” The conductor’s responsibility is to decipher, in a process akin to biblical hermeneutics, the “composer’s intent” and bring the work to fruition in performance. One writer describes it as “Preparing to Communicate a Work’s Message” (5/2, 106). An esteemed university conductor describes it this way: “The essential challenge of conducting is finding a way to portray the sound physically, to visualize the audible and, in the process, do it in such a way that helps the players and audience understand the expressive, emotional, and aesthetic content of the work” (4/1, 8; also 1/1, 15). So incontrovertible is the score’s truth (bordering at times on Truth), it is described as containing “true musical knowledge...The finest adjudicator would never comment with authority without having the score as a reference, the ability to read that score, and the knowledge and experience to interpret the context of the performance in relation to the score” (17:4, 15). Emphasis is thus placed firmly on the musical object. The point of music learning is to know the music itself, or more precisely, the meanings embedded in the work. Again, the religious, almost messianic parallels are hard to miss: “By studying each score carefully, a conductor (and hopefully the members of the ensemble) can begin to understand the composer’s intent and the beauty in the aural landscape that performing musicians at all levels have been charged to share” (1/1, 21). The musicians
are thereby *charged* with ‘spreading the word’ of the composer. In order to successfully ‘spread the word,’ “conductors must be able to analyse, interpret, express, and ‘ingest’ the score” (21:1, 13), making it “part of one’s inner self” (21:1, 17). The score is “our direct link with the composer, the creator of all these sounds” (ibid.). The objective is to try “to get into the conceptual areas of the composers, so we know not just how they THINK, but can begin to understand them and grasp the feeling of their music...It’s the feeling that we’re trying to discover, then transmit to the players and to the audience. We seek to discover objective knowledge of the music that is analytical; but then we use this information to find out how the sound feels” (ibid.; orig. caps).

The ability to discover this objective knowledge would seem to be enhanced by attending conducting symposia or workshops such as “The Conductor as Effective Interpreter” (20:3, 25), where master conductors aid in both the hermeneutic and communicative processes. One assumes this process is necessary because notation is an imperfect symbolic system. The encoding and decoding process (sounds into and from notation) is never a perfect one. Openings—what postmodernists might call ‘gaps’ or ‘fissures’—are therefore ever-present, casting the threatening shadow of undecidability about the objective knowledge supposedly sought. This uncertainty can be seen to demand expertise and authority due to an overriding concern for the authenticity of the work’s (composer’s) message. In the physical absence of
the composer, the question is begged what, precisely, is intended by the notation? Significantly, rather than relying on pragmatic criteria evaluating the translation of sounds according to what the players and audience find satisfying at the time—the kind of ethic I describe in Chapter Three—there is a sustained belief that correct or “authentic” decodings exist. The important task of discerning the correct meanings cannot be entrusted to just anyone, and certainly not students. Instead, the responsibility lies solely with the conductor, who must arbitrate this crucial process.

**Being the Composer’s Advocate**

The whole process [begins] with the inspiration of the composer that led to a new artistic musical creation; continued with the conductor connecting with this creation through score study; the conductor then shares this information and his [sic] interpretation with an ensemble of players through the creative process called the rehearsal. (21:1, 16)

After all, the performing group exists to play the music written for it by the composer. (9:1, 3)

The conductor’s task has always been, and must always be, to realize the intentions first and foremost, trust in the composer’s inspiration and feeling allied with his [sic]

---

161 This phrase has gained currency within the discourse of wind band conducting. In addition to its presence in *CW*, I have experienced it personally as a participant at a conducting symposium held at the University of Toronto, 2006.
technique, to bring the work forth in living sound... but in accord with the composer’s stated intentions. (23:2, 5)

The conductor in music education... must prepare the concert through rehearsals, conduct the performance, all the while teaching what is inside the music, how it adapts to the instruments and how to put it together to produce in sound what the composer had in mind when he [sic] put it down on paper. (8:3, 11)

Why should it matter if the audience hears the music exactly as the composer intended? Why are the needs and desires of the composer placed above those of the conductor, the performers, or the audience? Two possibilities come to mind. One is that the composition is considered the composer’s property indefinitely, regardless of sheet music purchase, and this entitles the composer to total control over all aspects of the performance. The other is that the privileging of the composer’s intention is an act of power. Consider the following two statements by a composer:

[By] permitting the clearest possible perception by the audience of what the composer is trying to say, [the conductor] is truly serving the composer’s best interests, as well as those of his [sic] audience. (15:4, 25)

The carefully trained student will have been made to see that there are only two individuals in a performance ...who can hear the total, overall sound emanating from the performing group: the conductor, and the audience. And the conductor is constantly attempting to “listen with the audience’s ears” in order to be certain that what the audience is actually hearing at any moment is what the composer and the music want them to hear. (17:1, 19)
Note here how the audience is portrayed as being best served when they hear the composer’s message. They are, in effect, in need of the composer’s message; they will benefit from it. In the second statement, which echoes ‘The Means of Correct Training,’ it is imperative that students not question the authority of the conductor, who has been charged with ensuring the intentions of the music (and it is the composer’s music) are honoured. Their own performance needs are either irrelevant, or implied as being best served when the musical intentions of the composer are fulfilled. In either case, the audience and performers are cast as subservient. The composer knows what is best for everyone.

Because the educative value of the musical experience resides in the artistic value (see Chapter Six), honouring the composer becomes paramount to the process of music education. Speaking of a school band context, the composer cited above writes, “And if the audience does not hear what the composer wants them to hear in his [sic] music...then the total effect of the artistic experience offered by the performance of that work will be compromised, and the expenditure of time, effort and money in producing that performance at that concert can certainly be called into question” (19:1, 17).162 Viewed from a distance, or when one isolates and

162 The same composer reiterates this point elsewhere, suggesting the composer’s responsibility is always to “realize a performance from his [sic] players that will convey the composer’s music to the audience’s ears in the best manner possible” (19:2, 6); the ensemble’s goal is always to “[play] for
compiles all of the statements as I have done, one sees the attitude towards the composer as one of reverence for a deity—so completely deferential to the composer is the conductor concerning how the music is to be performed. While statements made by composers might be attributed to vested interests, consider this remark from a university conductor: “Every day I ponder how I can best work with the colours represented by the instruments in front of me and what I must do to provide definition of colour, and ultimately texture, as I work through a piece to better understand the composer’s intention” (1/1, 23). An unmistakable belief is the goal of music making is to be faithful to the one who brought forth the magic and mystery of creation.

Associated with this faith is that one’s chances for success are improved if we can become closer to the composer; if we can come to know the composer better we might succeed in honouring his (with one exception, included below, the composer is always a referred to as he) intentions, thereby fulfilling the music-making objective.

Another important connection to make is with the composer. As we study a score, we want to know information about the composer’s life; why he [sic] wrote the piece; and obtain statements he made concerning the work. These are valuable pieces of information that can help ourselves, and our students, connect with the artist, interpret the work, and value more highly the experience. (21:1, 13)

the audience in such a way as to permit the composer’s music to sound in the audience’s ear exactly as he [sic] intended (19:2, 11).
Look for interviews or letters from the composer where s/he talks about the piece. These can give you insights into what is important to him/her, and what s/he may want emphasized. When you are conducting, you are the advocate for the music and the composer’s intent. (4/2, 70)

Although the discourse is concerned with music-as-object, particularly the score, the ultimate truth clearly lies with the composer. If it were otherwise, why would intent matter? Simply translating the notation into a performance satisfying to the conductor and performers is presumed to be insufficient. A clear assumption is that true meanings must exist in the sounds as encoded in notation, and the conductor’s job is to bring those true meanings to life.

One is reminded here of Plato’s notion of the original and the simulacrum. Due to the inability of signs (e.g., notation) to successfully capture intended meaning, the ideal of the original is always unattainable. We will always be left with the simulacrum; but, based on the belief we can come to know ‘the other,’ (i.e. the composer), our chances of coming closer to the ideal are improved. One must endeavour to get it right. As one conductor states: "To be truly effective and to be the composer’s advocate, we have to know the score, and know it well. It is our responsibility as conductors” (4/2, 68). Note here that the primary responsibility is not to the musicians, who, in the context of schooling, are students, the supposed object of care and concern. Instead, our care for them is cast as a responsibility toward honouring the ‘word’ (score) of the composer. Another conductor writes, “throughout the process [of score study] we must
continually reflect on our findings so that we deepen our understanding of
the piece and are better able to share these findings with the musicians we
work with” (1/1, 23; emph. added). Teachers are “effective” for students
only to the degree they can divine the correct meanings (the “findings”) intended for them. This is true, ironically, even in those rare cases where
performance interpretation deviates from the score. As part of a study guide
for a well-known piece of band music, an author interviews the composition’s composer who reveals one of his favourite performances came from an
ensemble that did not perform one of his pieces exactly as marked.
Remarkably, however, even this admission is used as warrant for honouring
the composer’s intent: “In summary the evidence suggests that [the composer] wants instrumentalists and conductors to do more than is marked
on the page to create their own unique performance” (6/1, 15).

SUMMARY

There are, then, several overt ‘regimes of truth’ present in the journal
discourses. The value of the learning/musical experience is purported to be
dependent on the kind of knowledge embodied in the score. It is the
teacher’s/conductor’s professional responsibility to seek out this “objective”
knowledge through score study, sharing it (the “findings”) with the members of the ensemble—while being at all times the “composer’s advocate.” The
process of sharing this knowledge does not depend on the learner’s needs: one must “[come] to each rehearsal with a firm idea of what you want and how you will lead your students to realise it” (5/2, 67). Put slightly differently, learners are assumed to be in need of whatever the teacher/conductor determines is best for them: the teacher as conductor is a leader, and being a leader means training “appropriate” behaviours and providing the best possible repertoire for the students’ musical development. The goal of music making is in no way dependent on the performers, the audience, or the nature of the performance event. Instead, the goal of music making is to realize the composer’s intent, for the composer is the ultimate creator of musical knowledge. Exposure to anything less than the knowledge supplied by great composers puts the student’s growth (i.e., their music education) at risk. Among the many questions that might be asked about such ‘regimes of truth’ are: How do these truths about bands compare to those of non-pedagogical band discourse? and How and why did these truths emerge? These questions are addressed in the next two chapters.
Chapter 5

Strike Up the Band

INTRODUCTION

Historically, there have been many kinds of bands serving many different purposes. My intent in this chapter is not to elide such differences, but rather to lay out some basic historical information that serves as the backdrop for trying to understand how the current ‘regimes of truth’ in pedagogical discourse came to be. Quite simply, although bands of all types invariably retain vestiges of their military origins, I contend that bands of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries operated under a very different ethic than bands—or at the very least bands operating in formal learning institutions—today. Early bands no doubt exhibited certain authoritarian aspects (as implied by the title “bandmaster”), but civic bands were also promoted on the basis of their commonness and accessibility. And although bands were considered a form of “cultural uplift,” they were understood as an egalitarian institution that, unlike the symphony orchestra with its elitist connotations, “fostered democracy.” Participation in the town band was a matter of civic pride, often reciprocated by the community in their willingness to support the band financially. From my research on early band
activity it is abundantly clear that participating in community bands—or, as it was and occasionally still is called, ‘banding’—was a form of activity; it was (or is) something to do. One’s personal sense of musicality in banding was and is determined by, and subject to, the level of enjoyment afforded to self and others. This is not to say banding was/is not character-forming. It was/is, but the kind of character in question is of a civic nature, not an artistic one. One’s ethical involvement in music is not subject to (subjectivation) the universal principles and expectations of Art, but rather, mutual satisfaction in terms of one’s personal goals for musical engagement and the service expectations immanent in one’s community. In this chapter I provide some historical background on bands, band performance, the concept of “banding,” and a foreshadowing of the standardization and institutionalization that ultimately changed the nature of bands. My purpose is not to duplicate the efforts of historians more fully dedicated than I to exploring these issues, but rather to set the stage for Chapter Six, where I describe how the concept of “music education” ultimately changed the nature of band participation in the second half of the twentieth century.

Power and Institutions

In this and the following chapter I consider the enabling conditions and processes of power-knowledge that have led to the production of truth
claims articulated in Chapter Four. Although Foucault’s various modalities, or what Conway calls “relational valences” (1999, 72), of power can be difficult to follow, he does provide in “The Subject and Power” five points on the analysis of power relations that help to better understand Foucault’s conceptualization. First, there is the ‘system of differentiations’: “every relationship of power puts into operation differences that are, at the same time, its conditions and its results.” Second, there are the ‘types of objectives’: the “maintenance of privileges, accumulation of profits, the exercise of statutory authority, the exercise of a function or a trade.” The third point attends to ‘instrumental modes’—how power is exercised, such as the effects of speech, or economic disparities. Fourth, one analyzes ‘forms of institutionalization.’ These include (and may mix) traditional institutions (such as the family) and more closed, contrived institutions, each “with its specific loci, its own regulations, its hierarchical structures that are carefully defined, a relative autonomy in its functioning (such as scholastic or military institutions).” And fifth, one notes the ‘degrees of rationalization.’ The exercise of power “endows itself with processes that are more or less adjusted to the situation” (SP, 344-45). I have used these five points extensively in my analysis of processes of social reproduction in Chapters Five and Six. For example, in “The Emergence of ‘Bandmasters’” and “Institutional Reproduction” I document (a) differences in the understanding and use of bands between the Ministry of Education and the CBA, (b) the
type of objectives sought (e.g., certification, taxation support), (c) the mode of implementation (e.g., training diplomas), (d) forms of institutionalization (e.g., CBA, Phi-Beta Mu, bands in schools), and (e) how those involved with bands have attempted to adjust to, for example, changes in leisure practices in the period between the two world wars.

The inclusion of institutions seems to me central, since disciplinary power, governmentality, and what Foucault calls biopower (or ‘bio-power’) all, to my mind, include or stem from institutions. Biopower (and subsequently biopolitics) centers on the relation between the body and institutions and the way in which the state, for example, participates in this technology of power in managing populations (Danaher et al. 2000, 124-25; HS, 140-45). To illustrate, Foucault provides the example of the educational institution:

> the disposal of its space, the meticulous regulations that govern its internal life, the different activities that are organized there, the diverse persons who live there or meet one another, each with his [sic] own function, his well-defined character—all these things constitute a block of capacity-communication-power. Activity to ensure learning and the acquisition of aptitudes or types of behavior works via a whole ensemble of regulated communications (lessons, questions and answers, orders, exhortations, coded signs of obedience, differential marks of the “value” of each person and of the levels of knowledge) and by means of a whole series of power processes (enclosure, surveillance, reward and punishment, the pyramidal hierarchy).

(SP, 338-39)

Although bands have operated, and continue to operate, inside and outside of state institutions, one of my primary arguments is that institutionalization
has changed the nature of contemporary band participation. Whereas early bands, as I demonstrate in this chapter, were largely informal organizations sharing, at most, a common commitment to community music making and the employment of some combination of wind and percussion instruments, institutional demands—loosely resembling Foucault’s description of the educational institution—have forever altered the way people interact with music through bands. That is, demands for excellence, accountability (in terms of demonstrable learning and the use of appropriate repertoire), individualization (in terms of assessment), and uniformity (in order to aid comparability) have turned music into a formalized subject of knowledge and hence, a site of power relations.

Institutions, suggests Foucault, “constitute a privileged point of observation” for analyzing power (SP, 342). They also, however, present a number a problems, since one needs to separate those mechanisms that are “essentially reproductive” from those that are truly relations of power. One risks explaining “power by power,” for example, when one analyzes power relationships “from the standpoint of the institutions” (ibid., 343). That is, “one lays oneself open to seeking the explanation and the origin of the former in the latter” (ibid.). Ultimately, Foucault admits that institutions are vitally important sites in establishing relations of power, but cautions that “one must analyze institutions from the standpoint of power relations, rather than vice versa,” and that the “point of anchorage” for the relations is to be
found without rather than within the institution (ibid.). My analysis in
Chapters Five and Six show how bands cannot be understood outside of their
institutional associations. My concern in these two chapters is not so much
to differentiate between Foucaultian power relations and reproductive
mechanisms, as it is to demonstrate how various institutions (e.g., CBA and
other professional organizations, schools, communities, universities,
governments) have impacted on the evolution of band participation.

THE MUSIC OF THE MASSES

The band was a mobile unit that could perform either outdoors or indoors. Its volume and sonority have been
traditionally linked with a patriotic and martial spirit. Uniformed bands provided visual reinforcement of this
patriotic feeling; and repertoire, both loud and rhythmic,
was and is more accessible to the average public more
enchanted with the popular art forms than with the
masterworks of geniuses.
(Keene 1982, 293)

[Historically] the “band” was, primarily and functionally, an
outdoor type of musical organization, providing a certain
type of music for a specific purpose; it was not called into
being, nor did it develop, as the orchestra subsequently
did, for purely musical purposes, free from any other extra
musical, utilitarian considerations.
(6:3, 5)

Authoritative histories of the wind band are available elsewhere. My
purpose here is simply to establish that although bands cannot and should
not be reduced to a singular entity with a singular function, bands have
historically been what the symphony orchestra was not.\textsuperscript{163} The musical function of bands was not the presentation of “art” music in a formal concert setting.\textsuperscript{164} This is not to suggest bands were incapable of playing music in an “artistic” manner, but that this was not their primary \textit{raison d’être},\textsuperscript{165} as Goldman makes clear:

Historically, the wind band was entirely functional. It existed to provide music for specific occasions and needs, military and civic. In this, it is completely different from the orchestra, which developed because of the demands of art—that is to say, of serious composed music. The wind band or ensemble had no such force behind it. It existed to make noise, to perform simple types of popular music, to sound hours, to give cadences for marching, and to perform other useful duties. (1961, 7)\textsuperscript{166}

These ‘useful duties’ historically included providing music for such things as roller skating and ice skating, promoting amusement parks, selling land, publicizing commodities, promoting religious, social and political

\textsuperscript{163} History shows there were, and are, many types of bands, from military to civic to industrial, each possessing distinct functions.
\textsuperscript{164} As shall hopefully become clearer, I consider art music to be a social construction. As is the case with the example of Marcel Duchamp’s \textit{Fountain}, the music is considered “art” by virtue of its social setting and intention, not its inherent musical qualities. Hence, bands did not originally perform “art” music.
\textsuperscript{165} Hazen and Hazen (1987, 199) argue the Goldman band was the first to follow such a path.
\textsuperscript{166} It should be added that Whitwell provides a compelling argument that the “true” history of the wind band shows it to be an ensemble more akin to the symphony orchestra than commonly observed (Whitwell 1972, 79). Whitwell, however, is arguing on the basis of the band’s history outside of North America. While Whitwell’s history may be correct, and I do not disagree with his desire to “alter history” to better reflect the historical roots of bands, the fact remains that the band has come to be known in North America much more as Goldman describes.
organizations, and civic ceremonies (Hazen and Hazen 1987, 2-11). Bands, write Hazen and Hazen, were “considered suitable for virtually any occasion” (2). In fact, so important were bands early in the twentieth century, that when Sir Wilfred Laurier visited the town of Yorkton, Saskatchewan in 1910, “the absence of a local band necessitated importing one from Langenburg to play during his visit” (4/1, 6).

Arguably, one of the most important roles for bands in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was in providing free music to the ‘masses’ in the form of outdoor concerts that had the power to “enrich and improve the common people” (Hazen and Hazen, 11). In the nineteenth century, for example, military bands with British and British-trained musicians provided professional, State-sponsored music for many Canadian communities.

For a whole century, from the British conquest until Confederation, regimental bands were the backbone of instrumental music in Canada. In addition to performing at military functions, they became a true communal force, reaching a wide and warmly appreciative public. Almost daily a band could be heard: at a gathering of high society, at a garden party, on a public square, or, more rarely, between the acts of a theatrical performance. (Kallman 1955, 14; see also: McGee 1985, 31-33; Kallman 1960, 45-46)

Bandstands became a feature of public parks not just in the United States, but in many parts of Canada as well (see, for example, Mellor 1988; Draper 167-168)

---

167 All subsequent Hazen and Hazen citations in this chapter are to this work.
168 The motto of the Chicago Band, for example, was “Free music for the masses” (Hazen and Hazen, 12).
1975), symbolizing the band as not just a “culturally elevating institution,” but one that “fostered democracy” (Hazen and Hazen, 11). Bands were, in other words, of the people and for the people.\footnote{Hazen and Hazen cite a concert review in Minneapolis Tribune, 1875: “These concerts are the contribution of art to the people, to be enjoyed by the occupant of the humblest cabin and by the master of a mansion, and harmonizing all classes in the democracy of music” (12).}

An interesting paradox thus presents itself as bands were considered both an egalitarian, democratic form of music making and a source of cultural uplift. On the one hand, unlike the symphony orchestra or opera which were ‘elitist’ due to their physical and psychological segregation from lower and middle class society and their historical associations with the aristocracy, the band was a truly public, free, and open musical medium, where participation was often viewed as a form of civic duty: “with ability to play in the band there comes to each bandsman [sic] a sense of citizenship, of belonging to an organization which is considered necessary to the success of public enterprises, of pride and importance in having a part in civic

\footnote{As late as 1948, a public band competition held in Waterloo, Ontario, attracted fifty-five bands and over twenty thousand people (Mellor 1988, 100). In Green and Vogan’s appraisal: “Orchestras appealed to the elitist ambitions of the cities, bands to the general population. People from a wide range of national backgrounds in both urban and rural settings looked to the band to provide opportunities for musical participation as well as entertainment. In the instrumental realm band music was the music of the common folk, for even with the rise of the ‘big name’ bands on radio, the concert in the park and on parade retained their popularity” (1991, 146).}
affairs” (Graham 1952, 179). McCarthy (1997, 75) claims the community music movement in the early part of the twentieth century “was an outgrowth of the democratization of music in American social life.” Edgar Gordon viewed it, she points out, as “a protest against the professional and vocational monopoly of musical art and...an encouragement to amateurs” (qtd. in ibid.).

On the other hand, participation in bands involved the making of a music which, prior to the Second World War at least, was viewed as promoting ‘culture’ in the community—irrespective of its inherent entertainment nature. McCosh’s Guide, a band handbook produced as part of a Lyon and Healy catalogue in 1891 announced: “the most practical way of indulging a taste for the arts, is in the organization of a Brass Band” (Hazen and Hazen, 146). Band music, promulgated as ‘cultural’ and as a form of the ‘arts,’ was thus capitalized on as a form of ‘cultural capital’—albeit in a way that was cast, somewhat ironically, in egalitarian, anti-elitist terms. That is, bands were promoted as being common (of the people), but at the same time were intended to elevate cultural tastes (presumably to the level of the “educated”).

---

171 A publication by the Rudolph Wurlitzer Company pronounced, “by the very interest and enthusiasm which it arouses, the band is a tremendous influence for promoting the welfare and prosperity of a community” (Hazen and Hazen, 146).

172 One could of course add here many other rationales for bands, such as the purported effect of boys’ bands on reduced delinquency, seen in the 1948 Ontario headline: “Police Chiefs Laud Boys’ Band Movement” (Mellor 1988, 100).
Vestiges of the band’s functional/entertainment past continue to exist. Military and community bands, while certainly not operating to the extent they once did, have not disappeared and, in the case of community bands, seem to be on the rise. 173 A more contemporary example of functionality, however, lies in marching and show bands. While much less common in Canada than in the United States, their continued presence in parades and sporting events in North America are a continuing reminder bands often operate in the service of other events.

“BANDING” AND COMMUNITY

Due to the geographic diversity in Canada, caution must be exercised when making assumptions about generalized practices across the country. That said, it is striking how similar community band practices of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries appear in locations as disparate as Brantford, Ontario and Regina, Saskatchewan. What is notable is how band activity is clearly a social practice embedded within the workings of a community, summed up most adequately, I think, in the colloquial phrase occasionally used in connection with music making of this type: “banding.”174

173 Witness the New Horizons program, for example.
174 For example: “Remember those people who were the pioneers in the band movement in Canada and how much we appreciate them and what they have accomplished on behalf of banding” (4:3, 6). One finds this not only in North America. In a column regularly addressing band activity in “the
As a social practice, banding celebrates self-improvement in the context of community. *Telos*\textsuperscript{175} is firmly rooted in interpersonal enjoyment. At the turn of the turn of the nineteenth century, write Hazen and Hazen, hundreds of thousands turned to banding in search of “congenial fellowship and an opportunity for self-improvement” (41). One did not participate in banding in order to honour the intentions of the composer with the hope of attaining greater wisdom into the human condition through contact with beauty.

While arguably considered a global practice, at least among nations historically connected to Western Europe, the goals of banding are entirely local. Belonging to the community band was/is a form of togetherness celebrating time, place, and space. When the band performed outside of community (as many often did, especially in competitive contexts), its members were representatives of the community. Edwin Wasiak\textsuperscript{176} writes of the Regina Citizen’s Band, for example:

In addition to park concerts, the band performed at community events such as the Regina Exhibition, and celebrations for Saskatchewan’s inauguration as a province. The Band’s activities also included one particularly successful excursion to Winnipeg, Manitoba, in August 1905, to perform at the Industrial Fair. (22:2, 10)

---

\textsuperscript{175} See *rapport a soi* in Chapter Two.

\textsuperscript{176} I mention the author’s name in this context because the *CBJ* article in question involves historical information adapted from Wasiak’s (1996) DMA dissertation, “The Historical Development of School Bands in Saskatchewan: A Study of Four Selected School Divisions.”
Hazen and Hazen also highlight intense inter-town band rivalries, with communities trying to outdo each other not just musically, but also in appearance.\textsuperscript{177} “These aspiring musicians spent enormous sums of money on plumed shakos, silken sashes, and the gold and silver replating and elaborate engraving of their instruments, just to create a more pleasing display than that of a rival band” (66). This willingness to expend financial resources on visibility, something continuing to this day with many marching and show bands, speaks to a concern for belonging and pride of membership. The spectacle affirms identity as it proclaims ‘I am a part of this activity, and this group represents me and where I am from.’

Given the visibility of the band as an example of communal celebration, it is perhaps not surprising that this activity was seized upon by those who saw the character-forming potential in this particular social practice. An example of banding oriented towards the disciplining of youth can be found in the Brantford School of Instrumental Music. Originally conceived as the Brantford Boys’ Band, organized in 1931,\textsuperscript{178} the Brantford School of Instrumental Music is an explicit example of using music as a means of manipulating subjectivity—although significantly, this use of music is not conceived as a way of humanizing people through heightening their powers of apprehending beauty. As a member of the BSIM explains: “We

\textsuperscript{177} Although Hazen and Hazen write from an American perspective, evidence of inter-town band rivalries can be found in Canadian sources as well (e.g. Mellor 1988; Draper 1975; McIntosh 1989).

\textsuperscript{178} The BSIM began “training” girls as of 1957.
feel strongly that our organization is a real force for good in the community as it combats crime, vandalism and generally assists in curbing juvenile delinquency, simply because it provides a real and lasting interest for the youth, both boys and girls” (6:2, 11; emph. added). Note the concern here is with the providing of a “lasting” activity. The moral aspects of the activity are oriented towards productivity yes, but not towards becoming good audience members with educated tastes.

This attitude of taming the unruly tendencies of youth is consistent with early twentieth century beliefs about music being a wholesome activity.179 The fifteenth annual convention of the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association included the following comments: “Young people, in or out of the schools studying music would be so fully occupied that they would have no time to get into mischief. They could not roam the streets, nor loaf on the corners. There would be less likelihood of their acquiring questionable habits. It is true saying that ‘Satan finds some mischief for idle hands to do’” (18:1, 24).180 To reinforce his claims, the speaker cites support of youth bands by the Guelph, Ontario Chief of Police. The salient point is that youth bands were viewed not as a source of edification, but of avocational interest and

179 One is reminded of the early slogan, “A boy who blows a horn will never blow a safe,” made popular by Paul Whiteman in the 1940 movie, Strike up the Band. It is also a central theme in the musical, The Music Man.

180 While this sentiment may appear quaint today, consider this passage from 2006: “the study also found that children who take part in musical and other arts activities were also less likely to be overweight. Keeping their hands busy keeps them out of the fridge, Tremblay theorizes” (4/2, 62).
population control. They were something for young people to do that was considered a worthwhile use of time.\textsuperscript{181}

Instruments, sheet music, music stands, uniforms, rehearsal space, and quality instruction can be costly. Early bands, without the revenue support of ticketed concerts in the tradition of the symphony orchestra, were thus faced with the ongoing problem of finding ways to support their activities, as Wasiak’s research on early bands in Saskatchewan makes clear:

Saskatchewan’s first bands relied solely on the availability of trained musicians; consequently, they were affected, either positively or negatively, by skilled players or bandmasters moving to or from a community. Funding, rehearsal facilities, and general interest and support for a band within a community were also significant actors in sustaining these early bands. Lapses in activity with subsequent reorganizations were common. (22:1, 23)

Invariably, the only recourse was for the community band to appeal to the community for financial aid. The same research on early Saskatchewan bands cites a newspaper story from 1887 that states the town band was willing to “play without charge for any local institution or entertainment when required,” but was asking the local townspeople for their financial support (22:2, 11). Similarly, the Brantford School of Instrumental Music

\textsuperscript{181}In a sense, then, there are parallels between early youth bands and today’s school bands in terms of control of subjectivity (and Foucault’s notion of ‘population management’). For the purposes of my arguments in Chapters Five and Six, it is worth bearing in mind the distinction between civic bands and strictly youth bands.
launched a city-wide campaign in the early 1940s “to raise funds through public subscription to purchase land and build a band auditorium” (6:2, 11).

The importance of community bands to the general public is evident in the existence of the Ontario Band Tax Law. Emulating the Landers Band Tax Law in the United States, the Ontario law, first introduced in 1937, permitted communities to levy a tax in support of the local band. ¹⁸² Although the appeal for the band tax law can be viewed as an act of power aimed at self-preservation or social reproduction, the public’s endorsement of the law speaks to the degree to which bands were valued as a significant aspect of community life. Although band members may have participated out of a desire for self-improvement, ¹⁸³ there was a clearly understood relationship between the band and its community. In exchange for public financial support, the band would contribute its services to the cultural life of the community.

THE EMERGENCE OF “BANDMASTERS”

(a) Aims and Objects, (b) Introduction of Low Pitch In All Canadian Bands, (c) The Possibility of Forming A Bandmasters School of Training, (d) A Canadian

¹⁸² Major George Landers authored this movement for state legislation to permit minor cities to tax themselves for the support of municipal bands; half the States passed the law (Graham 1952, 168).

¹⁸³ Hazen and Hazen write: “virtually every band instrument catalog and advertisement took advantage of the predisposition toward self-improvement” (146).
Instrumentation Standard, (e) Encourage District Massed Band Concerts, (f) Promote Canadian Compositions, (g) Specify A Standard Pitch For Patriotic Airs and (h) Establish An Official Interpretation of “God Save The King” —Agenda items for the first meeting of the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association, 1931 (11:4, 18)

An article celebrating the achievements of an Alberta music teacher is indicative of how the directing of bands was professionalized over the course of the twentieth century. Apparently a “fourth-generation bandmaster,” this band director was the first member of the family “to make it a real profession” (7:2, 19). His great-grandfather, a blacksmith, led the community band in the village where he lived near Warsaw, Poland, and “encouraged his children to contribute to the musical life of their church and community” (ibid.). Formal training of “bandmasters” outside of military institutions did not exist in Canada in the first half of the twentieth century. While this was not necessarily problematic in the contexts of community groups, the issue became acute with the introduction of bands into schools, begging the question in 1939: “What musical education should instructors of these bands possess, before they are permitted to teach?” (15:1, 30).

The professionalization of the band world in Canada paralleled in many ways that of the United States. For example, although the founding of the American Bandmasters Association in 1929 predates the formation of

184 The first program training teachers specialized in school music occurred at the University of Toronto in 1946.
Canadian Bandmasters’ Association by two years, Captain John Slater, Bandmaster of the 48th Highlanders Band in Toronto, had been advocating for such a group since 1918 (6:4, 2). Similarly, while the Music Supervisors National Conference had established a Committee on Instrumental Affairs in 1923 to administer the National School Band Contest (Manfredo 1995, 3), A.L. Robertson and some Toronto businessmen convinced the Board of the Canadian National Exhibition to set up prizes for a band contest starting in 1921, to be administered three years afterwards by the newly formed Ontario Amateur Bands Association. Given that school bands were not nearly as prevalent in Canada as in the United States at that point, the CNE contest was clearly aimed at community (amateur) bands, but the fact such a contest came into existence when it did points to a degree of formalization during the decade of the 1920s.

Organizations such as the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association and the American Bandmasters Association did not form as school-based organizations, but quickly became involved with issues relating to bands in schools. As Green and Vogan (1991) indicate, school bands operated as an extra-curricular activity in Canadian schools from the late nineteenth century onwards. In Green and Vogan’s account, however, the curricular inclusion of bands in schools really only came about circa 1946. They provide very little detail on how bands transitioned from their extra-curricular to curricular role, or on the relationship of the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association to the
in institution of formal education. Historical articles in the pages of *CBJ/CW* show that in the 1930s a concerted effort existed to formalize the place of bands in Ontario schools:

The Secretary reported that CBA Board of Directors had been called into conference with the Deputy Minister and Supervisor of Music. The Secretary was accompanied by Capt. Slater and Mr. Robert Moore. Two important details were discussed, (1) Who are to be the first teachers, as eventually the teacher should be a member of the school staff?, and (2) What preparation should be made to prepare them for such an important task? The Secretary reported that the Department insisted that the teacher shall be a competent musician on all instruments in the band, and that something must be done during the next three or four years to prepare those teachers. If 10, 12 or 14 of the 149 schools in Toronto were opened to organization what would the C.B.A. do to meet the requirements of the Department? (13:4, 12)

Teacher certification prior to the Second World War was under the sole jurisdiction of provincial departments of education and not universities. The specialized training required for leading school bands was, apparently, not feasible within the Normal School teacher preparation structure.\(^{185}\)

Therefore, if bands were to operate in schools, some form of institutionalized training and certification would be required. The minutes of the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association meetings display evidence of this discussion:

> Should we, as bandmasters of C.B.A., prepare a course (maybe a summer course) and undertake the necessary preparations? If

\(^{185}\) As Green and Vogan (1991) suggest, the predominance of a British conservatory model in Canadian universities up until the end of the Second World War (and beyond in some cases) did not facilitate instrumental music teacher preparation as many programs did in the United States, preventing the kind of rapid expansion of school band programs experienced south of the border.
one goes into the school to teach, a degree will be required, yet
at the outset the band will likely be taught as an extra-curricular
activity, outside of regular school hours. Now what would we do?
Shall we undertake to prepare some method whereby a course
can be given year after year (as in England)? Capt. Stares said
there was no question that anyone expecting to teach in any
school must have a certificate, and they were preparing for this
in every Normal School...He said there were men in his band that
had a first class certificate and a BA Degree who were also
certified musicians. Some Inspectors and Boards of Education,
however, were not too keen that music teachers should have the
first class certificate. (13:4, 12)

The Canadian Bandmasters’ Association subsequently adopted a resolution
“to adopt a policy of examinations for future music bandmasters in the
schools and that they must possess the Canadian Bandmaster’s [sic]
Association certificate and produce references” (14:4, 26). This turned out to
be a 24-page document which “outlined the requirements for candidates
wishing to be examined in ‘the several grades of musical proficiency.’
Successful candidates would be awarded Junior, Intermediate, and Senior
Diplomas. The Licentiate (L.C.B.A.) and Fellow (F.C.B.A.) Diplomas served as
Canada’s ‘flagship’ certification of band directors” (24:2, 3). The “School
Band Movement” thus became “a child of the CBA” (15:1, 30).

Several issues are evident here, most notably that the directors of
bands needed some form of certificate to prove their qualifications, thus
introducing the need for standardization and codification of the discipline,
and setting up the potential for the institutionalization of band director
training outside of the military. It is also interesting to observe the logistical
issues facing the introduction of bands in schools, such as overseeing an
ongoing program of certification, the status of a bandmaster in schools given
that instruction was likely considered extra-curricular, and the relationship
between music teacher and Boards of Education.\textsuperscript{186} The salient point is that
the introduction of bands in schools brought with it the necessity for
codification and standardization not necessary in the amateur world of
community bands. By introducing a course of study for bandmasters,
decisions had to be made about what, precisely, constituted not just proper
band activity, but proper \textit{educational} band activity.

\section*{INSTITUTIONAL REPRODUCTION}

It should be the duty of the bandmaster and his\textsuperscript{187}
committee and every member of his band to “sell their
band and band music to the citizens” which cannot function
without activity and earnestness or the day may soon
arrive when bands will become a thing of the past and by
our activity, have contributed to such a condition.
—President’s remarks at the 1939 CBA Convention (15:1, 30)

Let us all be leaders in our profession and do our share to
better it for ourselves, for our students, and for the
bandsmen of tomorrow. Let us paraphrase the words of
John Fitzgerald Kennedy: “Think not what the C.B.D.A. can
do for you; rather think what you can do for the C.B.D.A.,
your fellow band director, your profession, and the band
movement in general.”

\textsuperscript{186} It bears noting the educational system in Ontario was highly centralized
at the time, with provincial supervisors and inspectors possessing great
authority. Ontario had several very influential Supervisors of Music (see
Brault 1977).
\textsuperscript{187} The CBA was an all-male organization in 1939.
I know, as do you, that I love [band]. It is my passion, my profession, my hobby, my livelihood, my life. Will it always be so? Will it be for future generations? I hope so. I am supported by the weight of history. We played Wagner’s *Trauersinfonie* last night. I wonder if he had doubts as to whether a band in Canada would be playing it two hundred years later.

—President’s column, 1995 (20:2, 27)

As previously discussed, Foucault considers institutions an important but complex “point of observation” for analyzing power. They are complex, he suggests, since one must be careful not to describe reproductive mechanisms as relations of power. He also, however, points out how disciplines were appropriated by institutions such as schools as an instrument to perpetuate certain ends (DP, 215). My purpose in this section is to describe a few of the reproductive strategies employed by the CBA. As suggested in the epigrams, for those who love bands, the first priority is to preserve bands by any means possible in order to avoid their potential extinction. The strategies and tactics employed, as I argue here (and largely throughout this study), have residual effects impacting on how and why music is made, and, consequently, impact on how we are in society.

Especially within the *CBJ* (less so in *CW*), a sense of collegiality is expressed, indicative of the desire for institutional (particularly school bands) reproduction. Witness, for example, this comment:

Whether it is the summer band camp, the school or community program entrusted to your care, or the Canadian Band
Association, the foundation is the band director building for the future. We are colleagues, one to another, and as such belong to an exciting world community of creative individuals united by a common love and artistic bond. You and I have dedicated our careers to this art form. We believe in the values of music and music education and in our ability to enhance the lives of our student performers. We are colleagues reaching for the future and as such need and deserve each other’s support. (14:1, 30)

It bears mentioning that the original name of the *CBJ* was the *Canadian Band Directors’ Journal*, a name clearly indicating the intended constituency.

It also bears mentioning the mission statement of the CBA. While it today reads: “The Canadian Band Association is a voluntary, non-profit organisation that promotes and develops the musical, educational and cultural values of bands and band music in Canada,” it originally read: “Concerned With The Professional Development And Growth Of The Individual Band Director; And With The Promotion Of The Musical And Educational Values Of ‘Band,’” a statement placing much greater emphasis on the band director. It also makes clear where the values and priorities of the group reside. One’s primary identity is as a ‘band director’ rather than a music educator. In both mission statements, however, it is not music, or

---

188 Note the use of the British spelling of “organisation.” Significantly, the *CBJ* consistently used American spellings, such as color, honor, program, etc., something *CW* has, since its inception, apparently taken great pains to avoid.

189 A historical example of the importance of the band director/music educator division is the case of the British Columbia Schools Instrumental Teachers’ Association (BCSITA). By 1960, the group was facing a choice between affiliating with the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association or the British Columbia Music Educators’ Association. A BCSITA member speaking in 1959, foreshadowing the eventual decision, wrote: “In the long-term view there
not just music that is important, but band. Those involved are first and foremost obliged to promote what is frequently called “the band movement.”

This emphasis on collegiality is evinced by the presence of Phi Beta Mu: The International Bandmasters’ Fraternity in the pages of the CBJ. It is also reinforced by frequent references to the North American Band Directors’ Coordinating Council, an organization to which executive members of the CBA once had close ties. As is clear from this statement, furthering the institution of bands and band performance was a central concern of the NABDCC:

The band movement on the North American continent continues to grow, and through the vehicle of NABDCC we are able to discuss growth and accompanying solutions for bands everywhere. The most common concern seems to be that of making school officials and elected legislators aware of the value of and the place of music in our schools and communities. The place of community and college and university bands in our towns and villages has done much to enhance the place of music in both of our nations. (19:2,12; emph. added)

Note that band and music are discussed interchangeably. The use of the phrase ‘band movement,’ however, is a reminder the primary emphasis is not on the value of the music alone, but on the specific form of music making. It is very clear from the co-text and subject position of the author the concern here lies with the making of music (“banding”), not just the study of music.

will be, in time, only one organization and ... the name Music Educators is superior” (Green and Vogan 1991, 371).

^190 CBJ editor Keith Mann was vice-president of Phi Beta Mu from 1995-97 and president 1997-2001.
This strategy of social reproduction was further enhanced by tactics that encouraged the active promotion of the value of bands to both individuals and Canadian society. One example of this was a 1987 CBA initiative called “Canadian Band Week,” the goals of which were:

a) To increase public awareness of the value of Canadian bands and band music in the community and the benefits derived from them.
b) To provide short and long term educational benefits to band students and directors.
c) To provide an opportunity for Canada’s many cultural organizations to work together in support of Canadian Bands and Canadian Music.
d) To increase public awareness of Canadian band literature and encourage further composition for bands.
e) To strive particularly to reach Canadian youth with the message of their unique musical heritage and then encourage participation at the grassroots level by both young and old.
f) To increase awareness of cultural heritage which bands have provided in Canada and their importance in the development of Canadian culture.
g) To encourage special projects and events, throughout Canada, with the focus on participation. (13:3, 3)

Six of these seven points address the participatory aspects of ‘banding.’ Only point (d) refers to the music performed by bands. Quite clearly, “Canadian Band Week” was to appeal to the importance of bands as an activity—one historically connected to aspects of Canada’s cultural history. Notably, the emphasis is firmly and unmistakably on bands themselves, not the concept of “music education.”
Chapter 6

The Turn to “Music Education”

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I discuss various ways in which the subject may be thought of as the target of multiple interests—for example, the State, composers, musicians, bandmasters, artists, educationalists, communities, universities, schools, and families. That is, twentieth century practices related to bands can be viewed not as the logical outgrowth of a changing society, but as a site of contestation where groups struggle to achieve dominance and ‘make history.’ In this respect, the discourse can be understood as a field of meanings intended to support various interests—most often those of an institutional nature—related to the concept of “musicality.” As both Green and Vogan (1991) and Mark and Gary (2007) discuss, the period between the two world wars was a pivotal one for music education. Professional organizations developed and expanded, and instrumental music, which had previously been rare in schools, became increasingly widespread. Likewise, as Hazen and Hazen (1987) and Mark and Gary (2007) suggest, the nature of bands changed enormously in

191 All subsequent Hazen and Hazen citations in this chapter are to this work.
response to changes in technology, specifically transportation and communication. Following Foucault, I do not accept the ready-made synthesis of history. Green and Vogan provide the most complete and authoritative history of music education in Canada to date, but I find many aspects of their presentation wanting. Their story is one of a gradual and inexorable unfolding that reflects what they call the “cause” of music education. This chapter provides an alternative account of history, explaining how the current ‘regimes of truth’ (described in Chapter Four) came into being.

Two main themes present themselves with respect to bands, music, and music education. First, a concerted attempt, particularly among those in postsecondary institutions, is made to distance the band from its historical associations with entertainment by emulating the world of Art and “high” culture generally associated with the orchestra. Second, an ongoing tension, connected in part to the first theme, surrounds the presence of bands in compulsory schooling. That is, there is an ambiguity, perhaps intentional, regarding the rationalization of bands in schools. They are justified, variously, on musical, artistic, or “extra-musical” grounds depending on the circumstance. In more recent years, however, a confluence appears around the idea that for bands to be educationally valid, they must be artistic

---

192 Their failure to consult major figures within the CBA has to be considered a profound omission, given the predominance of bands in schools, let alone university schools of music.
entities performing the *right* kind of music. The discourse reflects an increasing convergence about the importance of repertoire—*the music itself*—in the role of music education. With increasing frequency, statements appear that effectively police and regulate what counts as the right music and why. I have organized this chapter according to the four aspects of *rapport a soi*, described below. These four aspects should not be read as suggesting any kind of linear development. They are interrelated and are not intended to present a historical narrative. The four sections can potentially be read in any order. I conclude the chapter with a short discussion and summary.

*Rapport a Soi: From Community Service to Personal Enlightenment*

The band student does not speak in *CBJ/CW*. In a sense, the subject is always treated as object. That is, the band student is always the target of pedagogical discourse. In another sense, however, one can discern from the discourse the desired relationship one is to have with oneself and with music. To frame my analysis in this chapter I have adapted a term Foucault uses in “On the Genealogy of Ethics.” As discussed in Chapter Two, *rapport a soi* is how Foucault describes one’s relationship with oneself—what Foucault calls ethics. It involves four aspects: *ethical substance, subjectivation, asceticism, and telos*. Briefly, these may be described as the actions people
perform (asceticism) on ‘x’ (ethical substance), according to or as determined by ‘y’ (subjectivation) in order to attain or achieve ‘z’ (telos).

According to Foucault’s research, in the ancient Greek (Hellenic) period, rapport a soi was characterized by a self-examination of pleasure, according to epimeleia heautou (‘care of the self’) in order to achieve mastery of oneself (which allowed for the mastery of others). Subjectivation was an aesthetic mode that involved a personal choice about how to live a beautiful life. One did not avoid doing certain things because they were forbidden, but because they would prevent the attainment of the ultimate goal of building a beautiful life. In Christianity, claims Foucault, the relationship changes. Ethical existence becomes the deciphering one’s thoughts according to divine law (which was one’s obligation as a rational being) to attain immortality and purity.\(^\text{193}\)

In my reading of CBJ/CW and associated discourses I perceive a change in the nature of the ethical relationship one should have vis-a-vis music. To summarize, the predominant mode (or the ‘regime of truth’) operating in early bands (up to the middle of the twentieth century) can be described in terms of rapport a soi as self-improvement and making a contribution (ascetic work) to community/personal well-being and enjoyment (ethical substance) according to community/personal needs (subjectivation) to attain a sense of purpose, personal balance, spirit, and

\(^{193}\) See GE, 268.
membership/belonging in community (telos). Musicality, in other words, was
defined according to interpersonal enjoyment. The activity was undertaken
for the personal enjoyment it provided, but there was an acknowledged
obligation to one’s community. One engaged in the practice of ‘banding’
knowing the band existed to contribute to the culture of the community by
providing free music for various events which contributed to a sense of time,
space, and place. Due to a number of factors, such as the inclusion of bands
in schools and increasing professionalization, the relationship to oneself in
music changes through the second half of the twentieth century. Musicality
becomes redefined in terms of the successful recreation of a musical “work.”

Rapport a soi in band performance becomes the fulfilling of one’s role (being
submissive to the conductor and the repertoire) (ascetic work) in order to
perform one’s part artistically (ethical substance) according to the
composer’s intentions (subjectivation) in order to become a well-rounded
knower (knowing beauty) and supporter of the arts (telos).

It would be a mistake to think the change I am describing was a
wholesale shift. Aspects of ethical substance, subjectivation, asceticism, and
telos should instead be considered as in a constant state of flux with
individuals in various spheres holding personal beliefs about ethical aspects
of musical engagement. Indeed, what I have described based on the
discourse can only be considered a generalization, although as I
demonstrate, it is one that is difficult to ignore. I am not suggesting the
current ‘regime of truth’ has completely superseded the former; the paradigms co-exist. What I am claiming is that as bands became entrenched as the primary medium for music instruction in secondary schools (and consequently became a major component of university ‘schools’ of music), and as education increasingly became the target of State concerns over “progress,” the discourse of band performance changed from one of supplying music in order to create a sense of community and personal enjoyment to one of edification through exposure to Art objects (i.e., great repertoire).

**TELOS**

**From a Good to a Right**

Music for Every Child; Every Child for Music. —1925 Slogan of MENC

The real concern is we’re going to end up with a cultural caste system where only the rich can afford access to music education. —John Mahlman, MENC executive director, circa 1997 (22:2, 25)

The introduction of music as a curricular subject into Boston public schools in 1838 is often cited as a watershed event in the history of music
education. In the 1837 report to the Boston School Committee one finds traces of themes that make repeated appearances in statements made about the place of music in public schooling. Although the claims were originally made in reference to vocal and not instrumental music, few such distinctions are found in the CBJ/CW discourses. Rather, these original claims have been capitalized on in various arguments by those desiring to see music instruction in public schooling. Examples of the claims in the Boston School Committee report include the intellectual character of music (something said to be lacking in dancing), the capacity of music to ameliorate the dangers of idle hands, the usefulness of music as a form of recreation, the capacity of music to make people useful and contented members of society, the importance of developing the well-rounded human being, and, significantly, that the widespread introduction of music in schools would lead to a more musical society (Mark 1982, 134-43). The other significant aspect of the report is the line, “Once introduce vocal Music into the common schools and you make it what it should be made, the property of the whole people” (ibid., 140), for here one finds evidence of the claim music should not be in schools just because it is good for people, but

---

194 Mark and Gary point out this has been called the “Magna Charta of Music Education” (2007, 164). A Canadian equivalent might be considered the achievement of Egerton Ryerson in prescribing vocal music as a school subject in the Common School Act in 1846 (see Green and Vogan 1991, 50).
195 For a thorough discussion of rationales used for music in education in the United States, see Jorgensen (1995).
because instruction in music should be made common to everyone and not remain the privilege of an elite few.

One hundred years later (1936) one finds a similar refrain from a well-known member of the Ontario Amateur Bands Association, who claims at the fifth annual convention of the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association, “every child had the right to develop musically and that the schools should provide the opportunity for performance and could do so at very little public expense” (13:2, 19).196 The convention approved the introduction of school bands in the Educational System of the Province of Ontario for the following reasons: a) is a factor of education, b) is a means of self-expression, c) is a mental discipline, d) develops an intelligent body of art lovers, e) is a vocational training, f) provides a means of employing leisure time, both for oneself and others (13:1, 16).197 The rationale of the OABA is somewhat different than that of the Boston School Committee, however. Whereas the concern of the latter can be viewed as part of the democratization of music—an egalitarian reaction against elitism, the former addresses a presumed

196 This statement, consistent with the ‘democratization of music’ theme, bears a striking resemblance to one made by Music Supervisors National Conference president Osbourne McConathy in 1919: “Every child should be educated in music in accordance with his [sic] capacities, at public expense and his musical development should function in the life of the community” (Mark and Gary 2007, 266).

197 The fact a group such as the Ontario Amateur Bands Association “approved” the introduction of bands into the educational system appears somewhat fanciful today.
right of children to develop their capacities to their fullest. As one writer puts it: “without our school music classes, many young people will never have this important option [talent development] in their formative years, let alone their adult life” (17:4, 16).

**Sustaining the Western Mind**

The arts are a great humanizing force. (22:4, 19)

Since the beginning of time music has represented the higher aspirations of man [sic]. (20:3, 3)

There are many other connections between music and civilization. For example, great music, like all great art, carries the highest values of individual and social life that our history has commended to us. (18:2, 5)

We somehow turn into better people, better schools, and better communities as a result of this total immersion in music.

—Parent comment about band festival participation (21:3, 23)

Historically, bands have been employed as part of the discourse of manipulating subjectivity in the reproduction of the ‘Western Mind.’ An early example of the use of bands to affect subjectivity can be found in Canada’s

---

198 See also, for example, an article entitled “Music Democratized” in the *Music Supervisors Journal*, 1919, which asks, “What is the place for music in the new educational democracy?” (ctd. in Mark and Gary 2007, 266).
colonial history. According to Wasiak, the first school band in Saskatchewan was the Qu’Appelle Industrial School Brass Band at an Indian residential school in Lebret. Begun in 1891, the band “quickly assumed a prominent role within the school and surrounding district,” performing frequently throughout the area. “In support of the Band, the school’s principal, Father Hugonnard, stated: ‘It is an attraction for the boys, and has a civilizing effect on them, and to the public is a striking proof that Indian [sic] children can be educated, since they can be taught to read music and play it correctly in so short a time. Every instrument in the Band is played by Indian children’” (22:2, 11). Without digressing too far into the postcolonial aspects of this statement, ones implying “Indian” children are in need of the civilizing and educational influences of Western “saviors,” it is significant to point out how, consistent with historical thought traceable to the ancient Greeks, instruction in music is considered to have the potential to affect who we are and what we become. Bands were a tool of the colonial project to sustain particular Western European values.

199 On Indian Bands in the United States, Hazen and Hazen write: “that these bands existed at all is probably due more to the schools’ desire to Americanize the Indians than to a genuine interest in the band movement on the part of Native Indians” (54). See also McIntosh’s (1989) discussion of ‘Indian Bands’ in British Columbia.

200 Green and Vogan write of the effects of British missionaries in British Columbia: “Their brass band is the best Indian band in the Province...This band paid a bandmaster from Prince Rupert to help them last winter...and 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
The control of subjectivity inevitably raises Biesta’s question (Chapter One): ‘who designs the entrance test for humanity?’ For those involved with music and the arts, the answer to this question frequently invokes claims about human essence. It has apparently “been well established, both from a psychological and psychiatric point of view, that aesthetic and spiritual expression are basic to human behavior,” and that “the arts have aesthetic and spiritual connotations which give meaning to life” (22:4, 19). Moreover, “every definitive response to the arts, by the very nature of the act, is inherently creative” (ibid.)—which is implied as being inherently human, and hence important. Similar claims stress the connections between the learning of music and the arts and becoming a well-rounded human being. Following the popularity of the movie, Mr. Holland’s Opus, actor Richard Dreyfus made a public statement emphasizing this point:

Perhaps we’ve all misunderstood the reason we learn music, and all the arts, in the first place. It is not only so a student can learn the clarinet, or another student can take acting lessons. It is that for hundreds of years it has been known that teaching the arts, along with history math, and biology, helps create The Well Rounded Mind that western civilization has been grounded on. Our greatest achievements in science, in business, in popular culture, would simply not be attainable without an education that encourages achievement in all fields. It is from that creativity and imagination that the solutions to our political and social problems will come. (20:3, 19)

From this one notes an instrumental aspect of music and arts promotion, appealing not to the nature of the music making itself, but to the potential of barbarous customs... we are surprised that with their very limited opportunities they have made such progress” (1991, 93-94).
the arts for solving political and social problems. Engagement is undertaken for the sake of “progress” in the form of societal achievements—something made possible by the ‘Well Rounded Western Mind.’

Sometimes the Well Rounded Mind is defended on the basis of biology, as in this example: “What have the arts got to do with being successful in life? A lot! Physiologically, the brain is divided into right and left. The cells on the left are nurtured by logic and analytical thought. The right side is developed through creative and imaginative thinking. Which side is poorly developed in our present educational system?” (7:2, 18). The concern for well-roundedness is thereby transformed into a concern about lack, deficiency, or incompleteness. “We should teach music,” asserts one author, “so students will develop awareness and sensitivity; so students will have the capacity for more love, more compassion, and more gentleness” (21:1, 14). This is apparently because “students are human beings that need to recognize beauty” (ibid.; emph. added). A celebrated Canadian band director describes his teaching philosophy as “helping students become more aware of their humanness by fostering in them a knowledge of, and a love for, music through performance” (24:1, 31; emph. added). Music (and “the arts” when it adds weight to the message) is thus connected with human nature and the need for beauty; an education without music risks leaving students incomplete beings.
A prominent magazine editor echoes these types of sentiments, stressing the study of music provides “perhaps the best chance a student will have of meeting grace and beauty in schools,” the opportunity to “explore and cultivate” emotions, and “is an interesting way to learn the value of practice, discipline, and (with a band or chorus) collaboration” (21:1, 25). Another writer, in emphasizing the centrality of the arts to being human, suggests the arts are not just valuable in and of themselves, but in how they enhance other areas of learning: “Not only do the arts contain an important part of what it means to be human, the arts also give coherence, depth and resonance to other academic subjects” (15:4, 32). To be fully human, then, is to be well-rounded, something necessitating the nurturing of such things as beauty, emotions, creativity, discipline, and cooperation. These human qualities attributed to the arts are claimed to be “a vehicle in enhancing the quality of life” (21:3, 3). It behooves those involved with education, therefore, to pay heed to music and the arts if the Western mind and Western lifestyle are to be sustained: “No education is complete without awareness of music; music is an essential expression of the character of a

society” (15:4, 32). The “mission of music education” is described as bringing students “an art which will afford a new level of understanding in every facet of their future” (20:3, 9; emph. added).

Despite such overtures, the position of music and the arts in schools is perceived as constantly under threat of elimination.\footnote{202 I repeat that this threat of elimination is perceived as ever-present. I observed this theme throughout the entire corpus.} “The value of music education is being questioned like never before. When there are more demands than money to meet those demands it forces administrators to make choices. It forces them to place a value on each subject area” (17:3, 25). For those involved with music and the arts—both inside and outside of education—the struggle to convince those not involved with music and the arts of their intrinsic value to the individual is an ever-present battle, one that strategically argues for curricular inclusion on the basis of what can be viewed as an example of Foucault’s concept of power-knowledge. That is, those in the arts claim the arts provide a special knowledge, the lack of which leads to incompleteness and a loss of quality of life. For example:

> The arts deal with knowledge which one philosopher has labeled as “untalkables.” The knowledge that is accessible through the study of music cannot be gained in any other way and the musician knows some things that the non-musician can never know. A fully educated person must have the ability to gain access to this knowledge. (17:3, 26)

Note this knowledge is made special by casting it as ineffable, and unknowable/unattainable to those outside of musical practice. Another
author puts it this way: “music education introduces us to compelling perceptions and understandings we could not acquire any other way. The arts are fundamental systems of meaning that probe the intuitive, emotional and irrational aspects of life that science is hard-pressed to explain” (21:1, 14).

It is not surprising, then, to find the National Commission on Music Education urging the “arts be re-established as basic to education...because they are fundamental to what it means to be an educated person” (15:2, 42). This insider/outsider positionality makes it possible to describe those who fail to support musical/artistic knowledge as simply not understanding what it means to be fully human. As one writer puts it, “we seem to be at this time materialistic consumers who value the bottom line and forsake the qualitative and spiritual aspects of what it takes to be a creative, balanced human being” (2/2, 56). Another author writes of “individuals of authority who apparently have not developed an understanding of, nor appreciation for the value of music in society” (21:3, 3). Yet another points out the difficulty in changing “contrary opinions and attitudes” predicated on the belief “ignorance is bliss.” The solution, one positioning those in the arts as teachers (those that know) and those not supporting the arts as pupils (those that do not know), is described as the “need to educate our public leaders, and colleagues, of the value of the arts...not just as a tool to
entertain, but as a vehicle in enhancing the quality of life.” (ibid.; orig. ellipses).\textsuperscript{203}

\textbf{Adaptation and Problematization}

The first question is whether music is or is not to be a part of education... Which does it produce?—education or amusement or intellectual enjoyment, for it may be reckoned under all three, and seems to share in the nature of all of them. (4:4, 12)\textsuperscript{204}

Self-perpetuation of practices invariably occurs in a milieu of competitive interests. Strategies and tactics of social reproduction are a response to the ever-changing power-knowledge environment. For example, with the advent of mechanical reproduction of music, the free music once offered by community bands was no longer as necessary or in demand. Hence, the band world sought other means to sustain itself. Facing declining instrument sales, the music products industry in the United States seized the

\textsuperscript{203} One finds this strategy used repeatedly. Two other examples are: “We as music educators must accept the challenge of educating the public. Educating the parents of our children in the value of music education is equally important to the educating we do in the classroom” (17:3, 25); and “In the words of AMC [American Music Conference] Executive Director, Robert Morrison, ‘We need to look forward—to maintain the focus on continuing to educate the general public about the value and importance of music in our culture, society and for our children’” (22:2, 10).

\textsuperscript{204} This passage is, surprisingly, uncited by a university professor, who presents it as his own work. It is from Aristotle’s \textit{Política, Book VIII} (Mark 1982, 36).
opportunity to promote bands within schools. Advocates for music in public education ("music education"), regardless of any personal views on bands themselves, no doubt welcomed any opportunity to further their interests within the school system. Although the demand for some of the original functions of bands within communities was declining, by emulating the art world of the symphony orchestra, the art-oriented wind band (community and school) could claim a new *raison d’etre*. By entrenching itself within educational institutions, the band world could assure itself thousands and thousands of participants and a new form of visibility.

The introduction of bands in public schooling and university schools of music brought a whole host of logistical problems which ultimately altered the nature of the activity, however. That is, the aims of band activity as they existed within the institution of community were not necessarily congruent with the aims of the institution of education. As pointed out by Aristotle in the epigram above, this problem was not unique to bands, but to music in general. By setting the concept of education in opposition to that of amusement and enjoyment, music’s place in the curriculum is problematic. Because music is so often experienced as pleasurable and education cannot be about pleasure, doubt continues to surround its educative potential. The Boston School Committee circumvented this doubt by appealing to music’s potential to impart moral, physical, and intellectual benefits. As or more

---

205 See, for example, Bryant (1975, 39); Hazen and Hazen (1987).
importantly, however, the teaching of vocal music in schools was promoted as leading to better singing in church (Mark 1982). The schools appropriated music, in other words, to serve their purposes. The advocacy process for music education is thus exposed for what it is: those who proselytize the virtues of music in education believe they are convincing others of the value of music education, when in fact they are only capitulating to values already prized by the community. Advocacy messages are hence an indication not of what music educators value, but what society at large values. When the needs of schools and society change, so must the rationales, and hence practices, of school music.

The Music Supervisors National Conference stated in 1915: “The ultimate aim of music teaching in the public schools is to cause children to know, to love and to appreciate music in as many forms as possible, and thus to bring added joy into their lives and added culture and refinement into their natures” (Birge 1973/1939, 249). The promotion of “adding culture and refinement” to one’s nature, while arguably Platonic in its origins, works as an advocacy message, I suggest, because schools at the turn of the century, dealing with a sizable immigrant population, were concerned with such matters.206 A slightly different message is presented forty years later by Ontario’s “Music Man,” Roy Fenwick:207 “In general, the schools are

206 See also, for example, Green and Vogan (1991).
207 Fenwick was Provincial Supervisor of Music for Ontario, 1935-1959, and proselytized relentlessly for music in the schools (Brault 1977).
concerned chiefly with developing interested and discriminating listeners, and the courses of study in use in Canadian schools are designed to bring the young people into contact with beauty, assist them in self-expression, give them an outlet for their emotions and provide them with a rewarding means of using their leisure time” (Fenwick 1955, 146-47). A concern with beauty, self-expression and emotions is present, reflective perhaps of a growing concern with child-centeredness and individualism, and a concern with how people were choosing to spend their leisure time. Importantly, a concern with the development of “taste” is present in both of these examples, an issue that created problems for the introduction of bands in schools.

The school orchestra always had as its model the best professional symphonic organizations and required no artistic rationale for its introduction, even though the full symphonic realization would be rare. The school chorus also could look back upon a long tradition of choir singing dating from the nation’s earliest days, and the singing organizations of the nineteenth century sought to perform the world’s best literature. But the band arrived in the schools with a far different background. Always closer to show business than to rarified artistic pursuits, the band, which was quickly attracting a student following, had to prove itself intellectually to the teaching profession. The answer for the band lay in democratic and egalitarian principles. (Keene 1982, 288)

In Keene’s explanation, orchestras and choirs could rely on the rationale of cultural enrichment due to their history as art-oriented ensembles. Although early bands were promoted from their earliest days as a means of elevating cultural tastes in the community, this argument was
based primarily on accessibility. That is, bands were thought to be the easiest way to introduce musical culture into a community. The ultimate cultural goal, however, was unmistakably the orchestra, not the band.\footnote{Green and Vogan write that the appearance of community orchestras indicated “the prairie cities were cultivating a more sophisticated palate with respect to instrumental music...Moreover, progress was aided throughout the 1930s by the availability of music through radio programs. Orchestras appealed to the elitist ambitions of the cities, bands to the general population. People from a wide range of national backgrounds in both urban and rural settings looked to the band to provide opportunities for musical participation as well as entertainment. In the instrumental realm band music was the music of the common folk” (1991, 146; emph. added).}

Bands, therefore, were not the desired medium for school instruction based on a cultural enrichment rationale (i.e., bands performed music for entertainment, something hardly justifiable as educational or as developing taste). Within “citizenship education,” however, bands could still find a niche for itself—at least where citizenship education was valued in schools.\footnote{Canada experienced high rates of immigration in the first decades of the twentieth century. Music was viewed as an effective means of instilling dominant values (Green and Vogan 1991).} When and where citizenship education was not highly prized, bands were forced to turn to other rationales.

Having now ensconced their place in schools, bands and music education have continued to adapt to the needs of schooling. In most cases this has meant promoting such ideas as “intellectual development,” “well-roundedness,” and more recently “aesthetic education” and “cognitive development” (e.g., the Mozart Effect). The concern with achieving educational validity, however, is ever-present. As I will articulate more fully...
below, the band’s history as entertainment has been and continues to be a source of insecurity within the band world.

**But is it Educational?**

Serving both as education and entertainment, marching and concert bands are now a firmly established part of school and university curriculums. (Bryant 1975, 39)

Unlike other areas of the curriculum, the band serves a dual role. It is not only a learning situation, but it also serves as a school and community service organization. This dual role, while it must be kept in proper balance with the music education in the prime spot, does put added responsibilities on its members. (3:2, 3)

John Philip Sousa was approached by a high school band director who stated he wished that his band could entertain folks back home just like the Sousa Band had done that day. When Sousa asked him what kind of band he had, the admirer replied that he was the director of a high school band. Whereupon Sousa remarked, “then your job is not to entertain, but to educate.” (8:3, 12)

If the band program can prove that it does have substance and is not just show and entertainment, then it will no longer be considered a luxury, but will be a vital and meaningful entity in the total scope of music and education...If we can do this, then we will have band programs that educate as well as entertain, and where there is no dichotomy between the role of the Director of Bands, and that of the Teacher of Music. (8:3, 29)
“Does the band contribute anything of real value in the educational sense?” asks Goldman (1961, 15). Indeed it is this question, more than any other that is an undercurrent within both the band world and the music education world. Articulating the educational benefits of the band program is described as “the truly fundamental question” in early volumes of the *CBJ*. What, an author asks, should the instrumental program “produce?” “What should be its main thrust, as well as its secondary benefits in addition, if any?” (7:4, 10). If there is one feature of the discourse that stands out with respect to the educational potential of bands, it is the suspect status of entertainment—which, as discussed previously, has been an ongoing source of tension for bands in schools owing to both their historical roles as entertaining ensembles, and their continued, albeit more limited engagement of such purposes. “Today’s band cannot ignore or deny its past, or future, in service oriented roles... The entertainment role does serve as an important function but is of no more importance than the educational aspects” (17:2, 30). Another writer advises a more pragmatic approach, but in so doing implicitly acknowledges that service obligations stand in opposition to learning activities: “musical performances should never be subservient to the needs of athletics, public relations, and community entertainment; but on a par—there is a value judgement—the time
consumed in preparation for such activities often interrupts or negates the musical development of the students involved” (5:1, 5).²¹⁰

Other writers are more emphatic; all things entertainment are anathema to education. A CW author writes of a situation where a high school teacher’s working conditions make it difficult to get the students to play beyond their current level. “The bands might make great sounds that entertain the community, and students might have a feeling of ‘fun’ from their playing experience, but such a program is clearly an educational disaster because of the lack of learning taking place” (2/2, 86; emph. added). Apparently it is educationally insufficient to make great sounds, enjoy making music, and provide enjoyment for others. All three of these aspects do not constitute “learning.” As another author puts it,

> when all is said and done, we cannot escape the fact that entertainment values do not necessarily coincide with educational ones...This, of course, raises at once the disturbing and irritating question as to whether...the use of school monies, time and effort can be justified in activities of doubtful or little educational value, however entertaining they may be. (7:1, 6; emph. added)

Although the first two epigrams above acknowledge the potential dual role of bands to be both education and entertainment, much more frequently entertainment and education are presented in dichotomous terms. This

²¹⁰ This discourse is not unique to CBJ/CW. On the expansion of high school bands in Canada, Green and Vogan write: “This flowering of interest was often owing to the efforts of enthusiastic principals or teachers who were amateur musicians prepared to sponsor these clubs and activities...These ensembles enjoyed support from principals and boards because of their utilitarian rather than their educational value” (1991, 167).
entertainment/education distinction takes two primary forms. In one, entertainment is entirely opposed to education; in the other more common position, entertainment is considered present but insufficient. According to one author, “entertainment may properly be employed in education...but it can only be a part, and a relatively small part of it, and carefully used at that. Never should it be confused with education as a whole, or taken in place of it” (12:4, 10). In choosing repertoire, suggests another author, “we are looking for music that has value beyond the entertainment it provides” (5/1, 44; emph. added). A different writer states the problem in pastoral terms, positioning music educators as responsible for the souls of children. “How many musical souls have been lost on our watch?...Was it because we placed too much emphasis on entertainment rather than education outcomes for our students?” (3/1, 46). Entertainment is in effect cast as a sinful distraction from what should be the real purpose of music education.

The entertainment/education dichotomy can be viewed as the result of tension between the service role of entertainment and the “autonomous” role of learning (and of art music), but it can also be interpreted as a tactic to assert the superiority of particular musical values, as is the case in this statement:

Let us not make the mistake of attempting to justify the marching band program as an integral part of the music education program, affording it the same high standard and place as that of concert music which, by its very nature, is something much more demanding and quite a bit different than
entertainment music, however entertaining it, too, may be. (9:3, 5-6)

Here, “concert music” is acknowledged as potentially entertaining, but is put on a higher plane (suitable for music education) than the kind of music played by the marching band, due to the former’s more demanding nature.

Musical learning, then, is cast in terms of intrinsic (musical) and extrinsic (non-musical) values, the former—personal, inward looking, and intellectual—a product of the music itself, the latter—social, outward looking, and non-intellectual—a product of visibility. The point is captured nicely by Goldman, who admonishes, “Our concert bands today want to believe that they exist for musical reasons. But why then do so many of them still wear uniforms?” (1961, 7). Goldman is writing circa 1960, and his comment is really directed at traditional marching/military style band uniforms popular at the time, not the more current trend, notably exhibited by the Eastman Wind Ensemble, of emulating the formal wear of the symphony orchestra.

While sartorial choices do communicate significant meanings—formal wear does suggest an artistic orientation that the marching uniform typically does not—it is the inescapable visibility of performance that is problematic for music education. The tuxedo or gown is only a pretense to mask the social or “non-musical” aspects—those that are apparently non-educational—of the performing event.
But is it Artistic?: Worlds Colliding

If we are truly aesthetic (music) educators, our preparation of music must evolve from a mechanical to artistic performance if we are to achieve the desired outcome... Our performances must embody the intangibles of 'perception, conceptual images, and expressive qualities.'

—“Why is Music Basic: The Value of Music Education” (14:2, 15)

The distinctive aesthetic values of music education, in order to be understood by the public, must first be understood and accepted by music educators themselves. (Green and Vogan 1991, 368)

It must be emphasized that [the early band movement] was a popular movement with little educational methodology and modest aspirations toward artistic quality. (Maloney 1986, 43)

In order to resolve the crisis of justification for bands in schools, music and bands have been claimed to have value beyond entertainment. This value, often left undefined by many writers and simply called “educational” (or “musical”) is made more explicit by others, who stipulate educational music means music-as-art: “the deeper we can connect our students to music as art can edify, not just entertain, the human soul, the greater the possibility that they will regard art as an important aspect of life” (21:1, 16). Therein the matter is laid bare: art is educational because it is an edifying aspect of life; music education must involve art music. In order to distinguish educational (art) music from non-educational (non-art) music,
musical values are positioned in opposition to social (entertainment) values. The issue is thus deflected from visibility itself, to the kind of knowledge embodied in the visibility of performance. The label “entertainment” was and is used by those within the Art music world to tactically discredit musics not sharing similar musical tastes and values. “The real question,” suggests one classical composer, “is whether [marching band] activities could and/or should be considered ‘educational’ in the sense of contributing to the student’s musical training and development...at public expense” (9:3, 5; emph. added). The addition of ‘at public expense’ serves to highlight that entertainment is not necessarily bad, but it cannot be justifiably supported in public schooling since it is not educative. Activities serving the public good deserve public support, but only activities serving the goal of ‘learning’ can occupy a place in education. This composer emphasizes his point, as well as downplaying the visibility of performance, in another article, writing: “marching bands and show bands exist because there is a legitimate need for the ‘products’ and services, if I may so call them. Only let us make certain that we call those products and services by their proper ‘name’ entertainment, and not music education....[T]here is comparatively little [in marching/show bands] that will result in the broadening of soul and spirit, intellectual growth and enriched experience in the one art where sight, movement and display are of little, if any, use” (12:4, 10). Entertainment music, in other words, does not broaden the soul or provide intellectual
growth, two aspects fundamental to curricular inclusion. Moreover, by casting aspersions on the visual—what might be considered a social or functional aspect of the performance—the autonomy of the music itself is asserted.

Knowledge is thereby use ‘for cutting’: only music proclaiming itself as primarily non-entertainment shall qualify as legitimate knowledge. This move, however, brings the activity of bands into direct conflict with itself. The band needs to renounce its former claim to be “of the people, for the people,” since one of the underlying premises of public education is that curricular matter not be “common” or easily obtained knowledge. Most arguments for curricular necessity in schools maintain subject matter be, at a minimum: (a) necessary in some way for the individual and/or society; and (b) not acquirable through informal means. If band performance is only about “entertainment” and/or the performance of vernacular, or “non-special” music, and if one can perform it without specialized instruction or guidance, its place in formal education is open to scrutiny. To be considered as music education, musical performance in schools has no choice but to distance itself not just from the band’s history as entertainment, but from all aspects of music associated with an entertainment function. Ergo, if bands

211 Having established these two conditions one then proceeds to argue for one’s place at the educational table on the basis of which subjects are more necessary for the individual and/or society. Note also the concurrence of the rise of music education as a legitimate subject (replete with legitimate knowledge) and the rise of “discipline-based” instruction through the 1960s.
schools are to function as music education, which they must if they wish to maintain their place in the curriculum, they have no alternative but to embrace music claiming to embody autonomous, timeless, universal values; music proclaiming itself as Art—that which transcends the vernacular. Jorgensen describes such music this way:

Elite music is generally taken to be that associated with the great traditions, the so-called classical musics of the world. These musics have had widespread and continuing intellectual appeal across cultural and political boundaries. They express a sense of the extraordinary in their formal design and intellectual, emotional, and sensual impact and appeal. They exemplify such values as formality, refinement, restrain, spirituality, dignity, balance, contrast, expressiveness, and intricacy—values that contribute to culture, construed as the refined elements of human society. Even when they are intended to shock or dismay, to express the dark side of life and the evil in humanity, they may be transformative in their effect on their public. (Jorgensen 2003, 33)

It is hardly surprising, then, to find even the American Bandmasters Association claiming, “music, as performed by school bands, must have an artistic function. As such, it graces the participants with ideals and sensitivities that are crucial to continuing human existence and progress . . . The band program is, therefore, an academic fundamental within the school curriculum” (13:3, 2; orig. ellipses, emph. added). The impetus for the music-making activity is thus irreversibly altered: one does not make music to provide enjoyment, one makes music to receive the ‘transformative effect’ of ‘elite music.’
A fascinating example of a school band operating from an *service* rather than strictly *educational* ethic is the Edmonton Schoolboys’ Band. Formed in 1935 by T. Vernon Newlove, it operated under the auspices of the Edmonton Public School Board until 1969. The band performed constantly. “The concert repertoire was popular and practical, with most of it appropriate for parades and other community functions” (Howey 2003, 518). Newlove was often criticized for not programming music of a more “educational” nature, but the band’s concerts were well attended and its members apparently “displayed the qualities of citizenship he stressed in his
Indeed the degree to which the band fostered a particular kind of love for music making and community service is evidenced in the existence of the Edmonton Schoolboys Alumni Band, formed after a sixtieth anniversary reunion in 1996 drew over four hundred people. The average age of the band in the late 1990s was 71, with the oldest member listed at 87 (24:1, 21).

In Biesta’s notion that education rests on an asymmetrical relationship between a fully formed subject and a not-yet subject one finds an inherent tension facing music in schools. That is, the basis for teaching music is invariably a reflection of given conceptions of who we think we really are, or, more accurately, who we think we should be. Whereas the earliest instances of vocal music in schools were sustained by the visibility of singing in church—something viewed as a necessary lifelong skill in a predominantly religious society—an equivalent rationalization for bands only operates effectively to the extent such a visibility is part of the fabric of community life.²¹³

We all agree that we are music educators working in the field of band and band music. We know and believe in the value of our product. But, where “reading, writing, and arithmetic” are accepted as basic to education, the arts must seek exposure to enhance the public perception of viability. Do your bands play in

²¹² Newlove stated: “the Band aims for public service, better players, better boys, and better citizens” (Howey 2003, 409).
²¹³ For more on this line of reasoning see James Mursell, “Music in American Schools: Music in the Schools—The Substance of a Hope” (Mark 1982, 204-15).
public . . . beyond the school boundaries? Or, are they your community’s “best kept secret?” (20:4, 3; orig. ellipses)

The visibility justifying the presence of music in schools is also used to invalidate its necessity as a school subject, however.

Part of our problem stems from the fact that much of what we do as music educators fulfills our society’s needs. That is, we perform for ceremonies, celebrations, and other special events. In fact, most communities believe that it would be unthinkable to have these events without music. These events are non-curricular and our identification with these non-curricular events often causes us to be viewed apart from the schools [sic] essential function—education in the basics. I am not suggesting we abandon our non-curricular function but we must emphasize our curricular function. (14:2, 15)

That is, as discussed in the ‘Adaptation and Problematization’ section, to the extent music is present in schools, schools ultimately use it for their purposes. When music making in the community is no longer present or valued, other rationales are needed to sustain its place in the curriculum.

Green and Vogan speculate that the presence of the Edmonton Schoolboys’ Band (ESB) as an all-city option for instrumental music contributed to a delay in the introduction of music in Edmonton high schools (1991, 383).214 This is likely true, but I would counter the success of the ESB can be understood as a reflection of the values of the community from the 1930s

---

214 To clarify, the band’s relationship to the Edmonton Public School Board was complex and unconventional. The Board supplied facilities, and academic credit was given beginning in the 1950s, but the band operated largely as an independent organization. This sort of ancillary relationship between schools and school bands is not anomalous in Canada. I personally experienced a similar relationship as both a student and teacher in Brandon, Manitoba. There too, a ‘city-wide’ band preceded the introduction of band programs in individual schools.
through 1970.\textsuperscript{215} The implementation of individual school bands in Edmonton through the 1960s and 1970s can be understood as the logical result of calls for a more “educational” approach to the study of music, and a reduction in the valuation of community performances.

With the decline in community bands following the Second World War, instrumental music making in schools could no longer be sustained on the basis of a preparation for a lifetime of community music making (Biesta’s fully formed subject). While many may consider large ensemble music making a pleasant experience, the performing event itself is essentially ephemeral. The applied value of such learning as lifelong preparation is therefore specious. Modern society demands accountability for instilling long term values (skills and knowledge) that performance itself is hard-pressed to supply when performance does not extend beyond high school graduation.

The discourse shows a turn away from performance and towards an overriding concern with what are implied to be \textit{lasting} values. As one writer puts it, “the long-term value of music education in the lives of our students is more important than the short-term rewards” (3/1, 45). Another remarks, “the way we are operating today, we generally teach music, not the value of music” (21:1, 15). Yet another concurs: “music education means teaching music, and not just how to play music, if it is to have any real educational

\textsuperscript{215} Both Howey (2003) and Green and Vogan (1991) acknowledge the band was a success by many measures, considered possibly the largest band in Canada through the 1930s and 1940s.
value whatever” (17:2, 7). The implications of such statements are clear: music education must be about something other than the musical performance itself if it is to be of service to the child’s future. The subjectivating force, in other words, shifts from the audience’s enjoyment to the music itself.

Whereas in the 1930s and 1940s, groups such as the ABA and CBA were concerned with the development of a canon of repertoire in order to sustain the viability of bands in the world of culture in response to changing conditions in society, more recent pedagogical concerns with repertoire center on the musical object as a source of edification and lasting value. It is not, as this statement quoted earlier makes clear, the study of how to play music that is primarily important, but the study of the music itself: “Do we teach music as an activity rather than an Art? The latter can only be accomplished through quality music, selected carefully” (8:1, 2). As another author comments, “there is a fine line between the provision of lasting values and the achievement of short term goals, education and entertainment” (17:2, 30). The performance, in other words, is short term and entertaining, the music itself is educational and long term. A composer writes: “the trick here is to write music that is not only suitable for performance by a certain age group, but also to write music that communicates something of lasting value” (8:3, 12). Great music (art music) apparently “communicates” timeless values. Not surprisingly, the
ABA suggests the “vital artistic/academic mission of the school band program” depends on the “study and performance of great artistic literature from periods of western history” (13:3, 2).

The focus on paradigmatic literature is consistent with academic rationalism positing education should be about the study and perpetuation of the greatest achievements in (Western) society. One outgrowth of this approach is the inevitable high art/low art distinction. Here, for example, a writer euphemistically distinguishes between “good/significant/important” (art) and “appropriate” (functional or entertainment) music:

Much of our band music has little redeeming value except for it’s [sic] appropriateness, e.g., specific events or experiences. As long as we do not confuse music of significance or importance with music that is merely appropriate there is no ax to grind. When hearing festival performances in which time, talent and money have been invested in the performance of literature that is virtually devoid of inherent musical value, you have to wonder if the teacher-conductors are capable of discerning the difference between “good” and “appropriate”, much less “important.” (11:1, 25; emph. added)

An intrinsic/extrinsic dichotomy is used here to both entrench the centrality of certain music as more valuable, and to place the subjectivating force within the music. To be educational, students must “develop a sense of value of the intrinsic components of the music” (19:3, 20).

---

See, for example, Lawrence Levine, Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of a Cultural Hierarchy in America (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).
Repertoire

We, as band directors and teachers have an irrevocable responsibility to choose literature of high quality and plan for its performance with great care. It is central to the educational process and to the development of music literacy and aesthetic sensitivity.

(17:1, 22)

So we come face to face with the final truth for the moment, and that is that... the ultimate success or failure [of music education]...must inevitably rest with the music chosen to be played, not just how well it may be played, or by whom.

(12:4, 10)

Finding those special works that will broaden horizons, have the potential to educate, expose, interest and stimulate could be the most important task of the band director.

(13:2, 32)

Band director: “Let me put it another way...Do you have any idea why that sounded so awful?”
Student: “Well, for one thing I don’t think this piece is very well written!”
—Funky Winkerbean (21:3, 21)

Whitwell writes that to be recognized as “an aesthetic medium” the conductor must “build a consistent image” (1972, 77). He claims “the conductor who programs novelty and light numbers must accept full and personal blame if his [sic] public calls him an entertainer rather than a musician” (ibid.). Although Whitwell’s concerns center more on the professional and university band worlds rather than the school world, his concern with repertoire is found throughout the CBJ/CW discourse.
“Programming” is presented as a vital responsibility, both musically and educationally: “the choice of programming in all such instances constitutes the single most important aspect of a teacher/conductor’s task. Nothing can be more important than the choices of what we play and how we will play it; everything else must be secondary in this regard” (20:2, 9).\textsuperscript{217} Notably, that this responsibility should lie solely in the conductor’s hands is never questioned.\textsuperscript{218} A prominent university band conductor observes, for example, that “every year that we teach and conduct, we are challenged by the inevitable process of making decisions about the repertoire that we will share and explore with our students” (3/1, 45; emph. added). Other comments in the discourse confirm that “the job of searching out, reviewing and selecting repertoire” is of utmost musical and educational significance, and “one which the conductor/director must do for himself [sic]” (13:2, 32).

Repertoire in school bands functions as the primary teaching tool (23:2). “Selecting repertoire is... about defining a curriculum” (3/1, 45)—or as a well-known university conductor proclaims: “the repertoire is the curriculum!” Another university professor writes, “while teaching music through performance in band, we must seek repertoire of the highest artistic value and strongest compositional craft” (5/2, 105). While one might have thought jazz, with its emphasis on processual and improvisational aspects

\textsuperscript{217} See also: “the conductor’s most important responsibility from a purely musical point of view still lies in his [sic] selection of the music his group is to perform” (24:1, 22)

\textsuperscript{218} I must reiterate: it is \textit{never} questioned.
that historically downplay the importance of the “raw material” (the choice of tune) might have escaped such a viewpoint, a university professor’s comments underscore that even in jazz education repertoire controls not just the nature of the experience, but its educative potential: “The selection of jazz ensemble repertoire by music teachers impacts directly on the quality of the educational experience provided for music students. The repertoire controls the quality of the performance group and the resulting quality of education” (19:3, 7). Another university professor writes, “the music in an ensemble’s folder is a direct reflection of what we believe is musically valuable, and it is a waste of valuable time to expend energy on a composition that is not worthy of detailed study” (5/2, 106; emph. added). Because musical values are claimed as educational values, it follows that using the best music increases the educative potential. This means it is more important, ultimately if not immediately, to play the right kind of music...even if it cannot be played “perfectly”...than to play the wrong kind, even though it can. Because this is really “where it’s at,” where it always has been at, and will continue to be at. The proven fact that it is the quality, the worthiness, of the music as a valid and striking artistic experience that alone can justify the enormous investment of time, effort and money in its study and performance. (12:2, 9-10)

The question this raises is what is the “right kind of music?” The answer is, unequivocally, music-as-art: “personal taste, musical depth, and musical intelligence are the result of our direct experiences with great art, great music, and great artists” (3/1, 46). Music-as-art provides “primarily an intellectual experience” (20:1, 9) requiring a “contemplative attitude.” Real
music, we are reminded, “has withstood the test of time” (22:3, 6). Very clearly, the subjectivating force lies in the music itself. The needs of performers and audience are either inconsequential or assumed to be best served by contact with the right music—the music directors select.

But one dissenting voice to the view that all should be subservient to “great” music was found. A school teacher writes it is wise to choose music based on the “suitability to the group in question” and “based on a broad plan of program development” (24:2, 32). This author continues, suggesting,

a great way to approach the whole problem of literature is to choose a variety of literature to have in the folders. Then, the band director becomes the judge of what literature to work on, in order to meet the needs of the group on an ongoing basis. In this way, the pieces are being chosen that fit in with the overall development of the group. (24:2, 32)

This conception of repertoire selection does not preclude the chosen pieces coming from the wellspring of great literature, and still places ultimate control within the hands of the band director, but, importantly, the choice of music is determined by the needs of the students (or “group”). There is at least an admission, however small, that some music might be better suited to the needs of students at particular times and places rather than other music, casting doubt on the transcendence of paradigm literature. If this is so, then the possibility must be entertained not all great music is necessarily educative for all students at all times. This does not mean, of course, the students do not need ‘great’ music, but it does mean repertoire selection
cannot be done irrespective of the students in question as suggested in the first epigram above.

Rarely in the discourse is a concern voiced about what students might want or need in repertoire. As one university professor writes, “It is tempting to select repertoire that will quickly be successful with the students and audiences, but never overlook pedagogical value. If we select repertoire only because we think students will ‘enjoy’ it, we are missing an important point. Students will enjoy music of outstanding quality because they will recognize musical value and dedicated instruction” (5/2, 105). Quite clearly, we know what is best for them, even though there is an acknowledged risk “the music we select may not always resonate with what students, parents, and administrators believe to be the purpose of a band program in an academic setting” (3/1, 45). 219 This risk should not dissuade directors, however, since they are reminded they “serve their players and their listeners when they program the finest of the available repertoire” (17:2, 18). This repertoire is not “what is the current fad and readily playable” but that which “we want students to remember” (15:2, 32)—that which “communicates something of lasting value” (8:3, 13). Educational music is “serious music” (9:4, 5) which artistic band conductors must be able to identify.

219 On the factors to consider when choosing music one author asks, “Will the audience enjoy listening to it (and should this be a consideration)?” (6/1, 9).
There are very few changes in the discourse between the *CBJ* and *CW*. One notable one, however, is an ongoing feature in *CW* that publishes concert programs from ensembles from across the country (with Canadian compositions highlighted with an asterisk or other marking). Note that this move further helps to shift the subjectivating force in musicality from the relationship between player and community to the musical object (the composition). The printing of concert programs in each issue of the journal makes a statement about the priority in music making. It is not about where the band played, whom they played for, or under what conditions—let alone what they might be learning. A concert is a concert, and since the repertoire is the curriculum, the publishing of concert programs is presumed to be indicative of what is being learned. Additionally, the printing of directors’ names attaches a degree of educational/artistic accountability to what is being played. Rather than simply publishing a list of repertoire played across the country, an emphasis is placed on the repertoire choices being made by specific individuals. As a result, the focus is squarely on what is being played by whom. (Note it is always the conductor’s performance, not the students’). This practice supports a decontextualized notion of music making consistent with an art music orientation that implies great music is autonomous, not subject to conditions of time, place, or space, not to mention who, for whom, and under what conditions. Great repertoire is great repertoire for all.

---

220 In *CW* there are regular and explicit features on Canadian repertoire, something missing in the *CBJ*, but consistent with *CW*’s nationalist emphasis.
students regardless of socio-cultural background or specific musical interests or needs. It is the conductor’s responsibility to ensure the repertoire chosen is “great.”

**ETHICAL SUBSTANCE**

**Standardization and Formalization**

A new profession is coming into existence, equipped with sound and practical techniques for teaching music better, in the main, than it has ever been taught before. —James Mursell (Mark 1982, 205)

The processes of professionalization and institutionalization relating to bands are complex and many. Following Foucault, it would be a mistake to deduce direct causes from, or imposed syntheses on, history. Rather, events should be viewed as a series of actions and reactions, some purposeful and some not. That is, while the desire for standardized instrumentation was certainly intentional, the consequential loss of individuality among bands was likely unintended and unforeseen. Another example of this is bandstand design. Whereas the original circular design facilitated interaction and circulation (and sometimes dancing) among those in attendance, the change to the semi-circular or amphitheater-style design, often with fixed seating, made the musical event one resembling an indoor concert with clearly
defined spaces for performers and audience. The half-shell design no doubt improves acoustics in terms of focusing the sound directionally—aiding perhaps in the auditory perception of tonal balance—but it also physically fixes the audience, reducing social interaction. One no longer attended a band performance in the park to socialize with others, one attended to sit and listen to the music. This change in design could be interpreted as an act of power on the part of the musicians, who desired to be listened to rather than talked over. One of the results, however, was to place greater emphasis on what the band played and how they played it, since the audience was now, presumably, really listening. Although the musicians may have achieved their objective, removing their functional role placed bands more in direct comparison with the “solely artistic” aims and activities of the symphony orchestra, a musical medium with a clearly established canon of art music at its disposal. The resultant “inferiority complex” is one from which bands have arguably not yet recovered.

Other examples of contingent factors changing the nature of banding include the move towards more “individualistic forms of entertainment” such as the phonograph and radio. “For many citizens,” write Hazen and Hazen, “it was no longer necessary or even desirable to congregate in

---

221 See, for example, Hazen and Hazen (1987).
222 I am alluding here to the frequent references in the discourse where authors feel they need to defend the band as an ‘artistic’ medium.
223 Hazen and Hazen point out radio was the number one “amusement” in every study on leisure from 1920-1940 (191).
central places for recreational activities” (195). As well, competing activities, such as cars and motion pictures diversified leisure, contributing to the segregation of leisure. Whereas the town band used to be an intergenerational affair, new forms of leisure and communication, and inter-town communication aided this fracturing into age-identified activities (ibid., 193). Radio alone, for example, made it possible for people to identify with others outside of one’s immediate community in a way never before possible.\(^{224}\)

Radio also made it possible for higher profile ensembles to be heard far and wide. The Waterloo Band, for example, broadcast to every province and into the United States as early as 1929 (Mellor 1988). Bands could now compare themselves against something of a “national” standard of performance. The growing ‘music appreciation’ movement, too, was aided by the ability of radio to reach a wide, and in the case of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, national audience.\(^{225}\) Between the proliferation of recordings aimed at the ‘music education’ market and the use of radio as a medium for music education (making music education available to smaller centers without the means to support a full time music teacher), further emphasis was placed on listening, and hence the musical object. That the

\(^{224}\) Newspapers, I suggest, do not carry the same kind of immediacy or presence.

\(^{225}\) See Green and Vogan (1991) on the CBC’s involvement with music education and music appreciation.
music appreciation movement was undoubtedly based on art music further entrenched particular ideas of what constituted *good* music.

Although the aforementioned examples are fairly well known, a lesser-known observation is that the presence of bands in colleges and universities pre-date bands in schools (McCarrell 1971; Sydorenko 1987). Early university bands (and other music ensembles), however, were associated with extra-curricular activities and school spirit, making them much closer in nature to community bands.²²⁶ Only later—much later in the case of Canadian universities—did such ensembles become the concern of schools, departments, or faculties of music.²²⁷ Early college and university bands, in order words, functioned under an ethic of community (the university community in this case) rather than as academic (artistic) pursuit. As ensembles became the purview of ‘schools of music,’ however, the emphasis changed in response to the demands of the institution of the university. This shift, while gradual and widespread, is exemplified best in the formation of the Eastman Wind Ensemble, for here was a prominent university wind band devoted exclusively to artistic performance. From a Foucaultian perspective, universities are participants *par excellence* in the power-knowledge

---

²²⁶ The most important instrumental ensemble at the University of Toronto through the 1920s and 1930s, for example, was the Canadian Officers’ Training Corps band, established in 1914 under future CBA president, Captain John Slater (Sydorenko 1987, 22).

²²⁷ Many ensembles at the University of Toronto, for example, did not came under the auspices of the Faculty of Music until the 1960s, and were instead administered by the Students’ Administrative Council (Sydorenko 1987, 29).
environment. They are in most cases the ultimate arbiters of legitimate and illegitimate knowledge. By establishing the wind band as a curricular entity within the academic institution, one whose aim was the sole pursuit of artistic performance, all other activity came to be disqualified as non-educational. With the transfer in teacher training responsibilities from the provinces to the universities in the 1960s, university priorities of proper wind band performance became the unmistakable ‘regime of truth,’ contributing to the shift in ethical substance in band performance from enjoyment to Art.

As abundantly obvious in the *CBJ/CW* discourse, the concerns of the school band director are assumed to be synonymous with the concerns of the university band director. The overwhelming majority of authors in the journal are not school teachers but university professors, and the conclusion is clear: school bands should model their practices (conducting, curriculum, repertoire, rehearsal) upon university practices. It is not surprising the message does not significantly change in cases even when the authors are school teachers, since almost all school band directors are a product of the university band world. This shift in the university band world, coupled with the transference of teacher training responsibilities has resulted in a self-reinforcing process where students of the universities become teachers who promulgate the values and priorities of the universities. The values of both are reciprocally validated: schools point to the universities as models of
legitimate knowledge; universities point to the schools as examples of legitimate practice.

**From the Situated to the Universal: The Need for a Canon**

The lack of clearly established guidelines [instrumentation] has caused many composers to resist writing for the medium. As a result, the lack of a broad base of quality repertoire has limited audience familiarity with and attraction to the collegiate wind-band. (Manfredo 1995, 2-3)

The desire for a canon of repertoire similar to that of the orchestral world is yet another contingent factor in the change in *rapport a soi*. Hazen and Hazen suggest prior to the standardization of band instrumentation and readily available sheet music in the 1930s and 1940s, most bands were reliant on their bandmaster or band members for compositions and arrangements: “a lot of bands had to write their own parts...[with much] arranging of piano scores (126). This was not often a serious problem, since many musicians could not read music notation. In such cases, “non-readers learned by rote or just made up ad-lib harmonies” (ibid., 127). It is clear from the rather informal and haphazard nature of such practices the emphasis in the music-making experience was not on the composition, but on its participatory nature. The goal was not to honour the intentions of the

---

228 As early as 1875 one finds publications for bandmasters such as *Practical Guide to the Arrangement of Band Music* (Hazen and Hazen, 126).
composer, but, rather, play along with the group. Moreover, there was a
close connection between repertoire and community, as suggested in this
recent review of two pieces of early Canadian band music:

Both *Canadian Patrol* and *Characteristique Overture* are
historically accurate reflections of the era and musical milieu
from which they emerged. They were products of a band
tradition where composers, performers, and audiences were
closely connected. Bandmasters wrote music to be performed by
the ensembles they themselves conducted, which came from the
communities that formed their primary audiences. The
integration was complete. (5/2, 77)

Growing professionalization in the 1920s and 1930s brought with it a
growing recognition that reproduction of bands was dependent upon such
things as stability, uniformity and canonization. For example, as Hazen and
Hazen point out, “the unstandardized state of band instrumentation in
conjunction with the diverse nature of band programming seriously
undermined the efforts of most bands to build up their music libraries”
(126). Indeed, there was a growing consensus that instrumentation, which
in the early days of bands consisted of whatever players happened to be at
hand, represented a potential source of weakness for bands. Without
standardization it was argued, composers would be reluctant to write for the
medium and publishers would have no incentive to publish band repertoire.
In fact, instrumentation continues to be cited as the source of status issues
for bands. Manfredo quotes a 1971 study involving the College Band
Directors National Association that states: “the primary reasons for the lack
of the band’s artistic growth can be attributed first to the fact that it has,
even to this date, failed to achieve a fixed instrumentation” (1995, 2). Manfredo also quotes Mark Hindsley, former Director of Bands and the University of Illinois, who similarly suggested in 1992 that instrumentation was the “greatest reason” for a lack of acceptance in the musical world (ibid., 9). The argument, apparently, is that “acceptance” and “artistic growth” are based on the existence of artifacts in the form of a canon of repertoire written by well-respected composers.

To clarify, in the orchestral world instrumentation has always been adjusted to the music. The needs of the music are placed before the needs of individual members of the orchestra. In the participatory ethic of the band world, however, the music was (and often still is) adapted to the players at hand. This was relatively easy in the early days of bands, since most pieces were locally composed, arranged, and/or copied (by the band director or band members). Importantly, the repertoire was an immanent aspect of each band; it was personalized and individualized. Through the 1920s and 1930s, however, there was an increasing move in the direction of universality. The National Band Contest had a minimum instrumentation requirement when it began in 1924, with famed instrumental music educator, Joseph Maddy, recommending to the Music Supervisors National Conference Committee on Instrumental Affairs in 1927 the standardization of instrumentation in order to better perform orchestral transcriptions and
provide good balance and tonal colour (Manfredo 1995, 3). Note here two very distinct concerns. Given the diversity of band instrumentation existing at the time, the requirement of minimum instrumentation can be seen as an effort to increase comparability among bands. Maddy’s interest, however, focuses on the music itself. His desire for standardization stems from the need for good sound. A still different concern is present in the original constitution of the ABA, which stated: “To this end the Association shall strive to secure the adoption of a universal band instrumentation so that band publications of all countries will be interchangeable” (ibid., 4). Here the concern is with uniformity in order to facilitate ease of exchange. Presumably, standardized instrumentation would facilitate ease of publishing (encouraging the production of repertoire), facilitate the acquisition of a library (which adds stability to bands who are no longer subject to the whims of changing personnel), and encourage professional composers to write for the medium since there was a greater possibility of monetary rewards.

What standardization also did, however, was diminish the individuality of bands and their intimate connection with their communities. Bands were no longer distinctive, but interchangeable since they ended up playing the same published pieces. The standardization of instrumentation, and
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229 Maddy, it should be noted, was very involved with orchestras.
230 It likely goes without saying the publishing industry benefited greatly.
subsequently repertoire, was part of a process where the practice of ‘banding’ became a more generic activity. This universalizing of the band experience altered it in another important way. Since each band no longer performed repertoire distinct to it, the emphasis shifted from the individuality of the band to the recreation of the object. By facilitating immediate comparisons between groups, the question was no longer, ‘Which band is better?’ but ‘Which band played that published piece better?’ The criteria for success were no longer to be found in the community (the audience), but in the music itself. And so the question changed from ‘How can we best entertain the audience?’ to ‘How can we perform the best rendition of this piece?’ In an earlier era the answer was obvious: the music should be played the way the bandmaster wants it (since he, and it was almost always a he, was the composer/arranger). The bandmaster was then accountable to the public. Lack of enjoyment on the part of the audience was the result of poor playing or an unsuccessful composition or arrangement. Professionally published music, however, brought with it the presumption there was a right way to perform it. (Why else would anyone publish it?) In the absence of the composer/arranger, one had to infer intentions. The conductor’s job changed from supplying the music to interpreting the music of others. The music, or more precisely, the composer held the answers. Subjectivation—the source of the moral code in music
making—ultimately changed from community to art object as the ethical center shifted from satisfying the community to satisfying the music.

The ethic of community responsibility has not disappeared completely. It is still found sporadically throughout the current band world, particularly among those with a community or military background. Writing in tribute to a former longstanding band director (who happened to have a military background) and his principal, one author describes the practices exemplifying this entertainment orientation:

Both Guy [the principal] and MacKay [the director] believed that bands were meant to play for audiences, and they took every opportunity to show off their new product. Everywhere they went, Guy spread the word of the value of “his” band to the overall life of his school. MacKay’s approach to repertoire was “to play something the band could play well, and that the audience could enjoy, and that would provide a challenge for the players something for them to really have to work at.” (5/2, 63; emph. added)

Observe that the “product” in this instance was the band, not the repertoire. It was not what they band played, but how (“play well”) and why (a challenge for the players, enjoyment of the audience). Furthermore, the band was valuable to the life of the school, just as the town band had been valuable to its community. A similar orientation can be found in a tribute to respected Canadian military band leader Colonel Clifford Hunt, where it is clear the musical emphasis was on playing music well and entertaining the audience, regardless of whether the repertoire consisted of marches, Broadway show tunes, or an arrangement of the 1812 Overture (23:4,
To cite another example of this entertainment orientation, when asked about what he found most satisfying about his own contributions as a composer, Howard Cable replied, “actually keeping an audience happy—seeing my audiences enjoying themselves and telling me after that they liked it. It’s not that I want the praise; it’s just the fact that they enjoyed it” (4/2, 75).

A very different orientation—one emphasizing the abstract, universal, timeless principles of art—is more typical among recent discourses. For example, when asked how important it is his music be accessible to the audience, composer Michael Colgrass answered:

Most of all, it has to be accessible to me and to my performers. Audiences can be anything; you never know. How can you write for an audience? I do wish and hope they will like it. That is to say, that they will respond—I’m trying to put some kind of feeling down on paper... But it’s more important for me to hear a musician say, “He knows how to write for my instrument. I feel that he understands my instrument.” This is another way of saying “He understands me as a musician. He gets inside my instrument.” I think that would be the nicest compliment. (3/2, 59; orig. emph.)

Rather than write for a specific audience, Colgrass, in the tradition of the modern classical composer, writes according to the timeless principles of art—or at best, the musical sensibilities of the professional musician, whose identity is inextricably linked to her or his instrument. The attention is turned inward to the instrument and the performers. The connection is not
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232 Hunt was the second Canadian president of the American Bandmasters Association.
between performers and audience but between composer and performer. The musical act is primarily concerned with the realization of the composer’s work and the satisfaction of the musicians, not the enjoyment of the community.

Aspiring to Art

Band, as an art form, is in its infancy. We have not always made wise decisions and the growing pains have been many.

(15:3, 50)

WASBE wants to promote the wind band as a serious and distinctive medium of musical expression and cultural heritage.

(8:1, 17)

The purpose of the [Sudler] competition is to encourage the composition and performance of wind band music of superior quality at the international level and to enhance the wind band as a serious medium of performance on the concert stage.

(8:4, 17)

The resultant growth in the number of university music schools and the higher performance standards of high school, college, university, civic, and professional wind ensembles has sparked widespread interest in the medium among Canada’s finest composers.

(Maloney 1986, iv)

“The concert or ‘symphonic’ band,” writes Goldman, does “represent a genuine contribution to musical culture; it is still essentially popular, but it also has the potential of elevating the level of popular taste and musical
enlightenment” (1961, 15). Although early wind bands were often promoted as a culturally-elevating musical medium, this sentiment can hardly be said to be universally shared. Preeminent historian of Canadian music, Helmut Kallmann, for example, writes, “musical culture depends as much on the existence of an intelligent audience as it does on professional performers. The formation of both begins with education. In public and high schools the music programme has been expanded vastly... and school choirs and orchestras provide pupils with a practical insight into music-making” (Kallmann 1960, 269). It can hardly escape notice Kallmann fails to mention the band, despite the fact that by 1952 bands had overtaken orchestras as the most common instrumental ensemble in schools in Ontario, Kallmann’s home province (Brault 1977, 529). Kallmann is not alone in overlooking bands as a source of musical cultural. Despite their significant presence in Canadian life in the first half of the twentieth century, bands receive strikingly little attention from esteemed figures within the Canadian musical establishment, such as MacMillan (1955), McGee (1985), and Walter (1969). This anti-band bias is present even in Green and Vogan, who, to

\[\text{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{233}} As son of band leader Edwin Goldman, Richard Goldman (who succeeded his father as leader of the Goldman band) understandably has a positive evaluation of bands.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{234}} Green and Vogan (1991) cite this date as 1955. There has likely been some inconsistency in reporting, due to the uncertain status of music groups in schools vis-a-vis curricular versus extra-curricular.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{235}} It should be pointed out bands were no insignificant occurrence. In 1955, 72 bands competed in the Waterloo band contest, with an audience of}\]
cite but two examples, fail to acknowledge the important role of the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association in teacher certification efforts in Ontario in the 1930s, and refer to the Canadian Band Association as the Canadian Band Directors’ Association, despite the organization having changed its name in 1984. Moreover, they are almost dismissive of the CBA (or CBDA as they refer to the group) in suggesting they, like groups such as the Royal Canadian College of Organists and the Canadian Association of Music Libraries, have “all dealt periodically with aspects of music education in the country” (1991, 425). To suggest the efforts of a group representing the largest aspect of music education delivery in Canadian high schools is on par with organists and music libraries speaks volumes about the perception of bands in schools—or perhaps more accurately, about the perception of bands as a medium of artistic (and therefore educational) musical delivery.\textsuperscript{236} Despite Goldman’s assertion, and the legions of band enthusiasts in the early twentieth century who may have believed they were 50,000, and participants numbering over 1000. The grand finale included Walter Smith (cornet), Sigurd Rascher (saxophone), Leona Smith of Radio City Music Hall, and William Bell (tuba with the NBC orchestra) (Mellor 1988, 88). MacMillan was certainly aware of bands. A very well attended band competition at the Canadian National Exhibition operated from 1921-1981. As well, MacMillan conducted a performance of the Waterloo band in 1949 (ibid., 134).

\textsuperscript{236} Green and Vogan’s values are exposed repeatedly. Their notion of “progress” in music education is quite clear. They write, for example, the appearance of community orchestras indicate “the prairie cities were cultivating a more sophisticated palate with respect to instrumental music” (1991, 146). On certain band activities in Saskatchewan they remark: “that is not to imply that all of these activities were educational or even intrinsically musical in nature” (ibid., 390).
participating in a practice representing “culture,” bands have rarely been accepted by what I will loosely call the musical “Art” world in Canada, as represented by figures such as Ernest MacMillan, Arnold Walter, or Helmut Kallmann.\(^\text{237}\)

The Goldman Band is often acknowledged to be the first band aspiring toward the goal of “artistic” performance. This is not to suggest famous bands such as those of Sousa or Gilmore did not play well. It is only to observe the activity was pursued under different aims—aims indicative of different ethical centers. As Whitwell argues, Sousa saw himself as an entertainer whose primary goal was to keep people happy, not an ‘artistic director’ whose primary goal was to present music aspiring toward the level of Art. Commenting about the conductor of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Sousa remarked, “He gave Wagner, Liszt, and Tchaikowsky, in the belief that he was educating his public; I gave Wagner, Liszt, and Tchaikowsky in the hope that I was entertaining my public” (qtd. in Whitwell 1972, 78). An asymmetrical positionality is inherent between educating and entertaining. The former implies superiority; the educator is always placed in the more powerful position, since the presumption is that the object (the audience or learner) of the activity (the performance) is in need of what is being offered. In the latter, the entertainer is placed in the subservient

\(^{237}\) Maloney (1986, 48-49) also asserts the “Canadian musical establishment” has not supported the band world’s “quest for musical ‘legitimacy.’”
position, since the entertainer’s success or needs (economic, attention, engagement) are dependent upon the object’s (audience’s) support.\textsuperscript{238}

Herein lies an excellent example of not just differing positionality, but also ethical substance. For the conductor of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Art defines a relationship to music; for Sousa, one has a relationship with music in order to entertain.

To the question, “Why is the contemporary band not fully accepted as cultural force in the nation?” Whitwell offers two answers: one, the failure of the band to define its aesthetic goals, and two, what Whitwell considers a misdefined history (Whitwell 1972, 74). Whitwell’s query raises several important issues. It must be asked why, and precisely who within the band world desires the band to be accepted as a “cultural force.” From the epigrams above, it seems clear that contemporary band directors do aspire towards band as an art form (an aspiration apparently in its infancy as late as the 1990s). When the College Band Directors National Association launched their research journal its mandate was to focus on “professional issues of concern to the artistic band conductor” and to publish “manuscripts on the state of the band conducting art” (9:1, 14). It may also be the case

\textsuperscript{238} Historical precedents for this power dynamic are not difficult to find: the move from patronage to independent artist in the world of nineteenth century classical music in Europe, for example, or the artistic/cultural movement of bebop in the 1940s in the United States, where jazz musicians struggled to achieve status of artists whose music was solely for listening (rather than in support of dancing) and whose musical decisions were intended as independent from the desires of the audience.
that university band musicians, operating within institutions promulgating Western art music as the pinnacle of musical achievement (Nettl 1995), share in this desire. It is less clear that artistic aspirations are the concern of community band musicians (or marching band members), for whom the aims of the activity differ considerably from that of artistic pursuits.

The question of why the band world desires to be a cultural (read artistic) force is more problematic. Why have certain constituents of the band world attempted to distance themselves from particular aspects of the band’s history? Why is it necessary to “rise above” the perceived image of the band? Why, for example, do so many contemporary wind bands eschew the label of “concert band?” There are now wind ensembles, wind orchestras, wind symphonies, symphonic bands, and symphonic winds. The former name of the CBA’s journal, the Canadian Band Journal, changed to the ‘band-less’ title, Canadian Winds. As one author explains, the “concert band” is viewed as an ensemble connected with an undesirable past, one associated with entertainment rather than artistic pursuits. For composer Libby Larsen, the adoption of names such as ‘wind orchestra’ by wind bands is a desirable move, since it more clearly identifies the intent to pursue “artistic endeavors” (ctd. in Hansen 2005, 482). The question remains,
however: Why has the band world has so wholeheartedly adopted Art rather than the vernacular as its goal?²³⁹

Rather than rename the ensemble in attempt to sever connections with the past, one author argues instead for a celebration of the artistic and educational potential of the concert band. This important passage is worth quoting at length:

The word “Band” creates numerous images. Most are influenced by the functional and service oriented role of the band which is well instilled in our roots. From the turn of the century a band was the community’s pride and joy,” performing concerts, in parades, and at dances. Today’s public image of the band is influenced by this historically based functional and service oriented pose. Mention band and images of military, athletics, school and public events come into play. This image is still the dominant one held by the general public. The band’s historical image as a service oriented organization does not meet the current role that the band seeks to fulfill for itself in today’s world. Even with the development of school music programs, band has, over the years, established and perpetuated this image, weakening the band’s position in the dialogue where the arts in general, and music more specifically are facing a period of self-justification within society. Even though we attempt to disguise the name (Symphonic Winds, Wind Orchestra, Wind Ensemble, etc.) we only serve to confuse the public...Those of us charged with the responsibility for a band must not portray the title “Concert Band” as something inferior. After all, “a rose by any other name...” It is important that we review our image and place it in proper perspective... [W]e must recognize and promote our bands as concert organizations fully capable of achieving performances that are just as aesthetically and educationally justifiable as any other performance media. The entertainment role does serve as an important function but is of no more importance than the educational aspects. (17:2, 30; emph. added)

Three key ideas are revealed in this passage. One is the clear acknowledgment bands originally existed in order to serve. Although Whitwell may be correct that historically European wind bands were at times intended as concert organizations designed to perform art music, North American practices establish a very different history and identity. It is as if Whitwell would have the world conveniently forget or ignore over one hundred years of community and military band performance in North America. Second, bands continue to provide an entertainment (service) role—often in spite of the desires of some who would prefer to eschew this function entirely. Finally, and most importantly, the band world desires to be viewed as an aesthetic/artistic organization to justify its existence. Outside of something like the marching band performing at half time shows, bands are no longer needed by communities in the same way they were before the advent of modern communication and transportation. There are now alternatives to fill the roles bands used to serve. As a result, the band world has, of necessity, adopted different strategies, such as the practice of presenting “concerted music” in order to perpetuate its interests.
ASCETICISM

“Educating” (Creating) the Audience

One of the real tests of the success or failure of our music education in the public schools is concert attendance. (13:2, 30)

And if there is one thing that all of us: composers, conductors, and performers alike, have had to learn during the past 200 years or so, at times bitterly, it is that when there is nobody out there in the audience, very soon (and today almost immediately) there is nobody up here on the stage either. (12:4, 10)

‘Educating the audience’ is a popular theme found throughout the corpus. Sometimes the theme takes on political overtones (see ‘Sustaining the Western Mind’); at other times it expresses a kind of hegemonic relationship between performers and audience (see ‘Aspiring to Art’). A third use of this phrase is in conjunction with the reproduction of particular musical/artistic values. The development of “taste,” or what might be termed a “higher-order desire” for certain kinds of enjoyment is something that must be carefully nurtured: “As conductor educators, if we carefully plant the seeds now art can flourish because we’re cultivating good consumers, lovers and supporters of the arts” (21:1, 16). Note the concern here is not for the students, but for “art”—something at risk of dying without “good consumers, lovers and supporters.” Stemming perhaps from the
music appreciation movement of the early twentieth century (see, for e.g., Mark and Gary 2007; Green and Vogan 1991) and certain aspects of aesthetic education of the 1970s and 1980s (e.g., Reimer 1970, 1989), this part of the discourse dichotomizes consumers and producers.

[Teachers need be sensitive to the] effect of the choice of music...on both performers and audiences alike...with special reference to the student performers who are not merely learning to play an instrument or sing a vocal line, but also to grow in their musical development and become, ultimately, music “consumers,” members of that very same audience on whom all of us: writers, players, singers, conductors and teachers, rely for our continued support and success. (10:2, 5)

In this case it is clear that “all of us” (the producers) are ultimately reliant on them (the consumers), and that teachers need to ensure they are “educated” in a way that guarantees they continue to support us.

As early as the 1930s one finds rationales for the inclusion of bands in schools as developing “an intelligent body of art lovers” (13:1, 16). This is considered a challenge which dedicated music teachers must embrace, since, apparently, the public is not by nature given to loving art. In the 1930s we find the following admonishment to the constituency of bandmasters:

“GIVE TO PUBLIC WHAT IT WANTS” is perhaps good business, but music is primarily an art, not a business. Giving the public what it wants is easy, maintaining a high standard of achievement is difficult. There is no good reasoning that I know of why a musician should not make a good living at music, but I maintain that the making of the living should not be the dominant purpose to which the standard of the actual music should be subservient. (18:1, 19)
Thus an acknowledged tension is present between the practices of Western concert performance and the natural desires of people. Music (as art) and commerce are in effect positioned oppositionally. It is implied in the statement above that the public inherently prefers music of low quality, and musicians (specifically bandmasters in this case) must be proactive in preventing the debasement of artistic standards. Note also the implication that attending concert performances of the type characterized by “intelligent art lovers” is not something people do naturally (the public, one assumes, wants something else); such a desire must be developed.

Attempting to perpetuate the interests of performers and composers is evidenced in the multitude of statements claiming the ultimate purpose of music education should be audience development. As one writer rhetorically asks, “Isn’t that one of our ultimate goals in music education, to create good audiences?” (23:3, 27). Another, lamenting the low attendance of students at classical music concerts, asks how “several hundred thousand young high school musicians can annually prepare and perform music in our contest events and still not be ‘turned on’ to music?” (13:2, 30). The author makes clear the mere making of music is not sufficient indication of being “turned on” to it; one must also attend classical music concerts. A composer states this in no uncertain terms: “Yes, it is true that the greater goal of all music education is, hopefully, to produce more and larger educated audiences, not just more players” (22:4, 5). Consistent with the tactic positioning
supporters as people who know and understand, “good” and “educated” audiences in these cases are audiences supporting the general practices of Western concert performance. Those failing to support such practices are positioned as people that simply do not understand, and are, by default, uneducated. “It seems that kids are not given enough exposure to classical music to develop an opinion of it, much less to understand it,” writes the executive director of the Association for Classical Music. “While the schools are expected to teach students to read, write and compute on a level that will prepare them either for college or a job, there is much less emphasis on preparing them to understand or appreciate the arts in general and classical music in particular” (10:3, 21). Persuading people to support the practice of Western concert performance is cast as an educational and professional obligation: “The responsibility of training future audiences falls to today’s music educators, and a festival setting is a great place to start cultivating the desire in students to hear concert performances” (24:2, 13).

In order to entrench its desirability and value, Western concert performance and the arts are, in a move recalling Nietzsche or Bourdieu, associated with high status (good) knowledge. “The appreciation of good music is often a developed taste…[Good music provides] a quality

240 See The Genealogy of Morals, where Nietzsche claims that the very definition of good and bad are derived from class distinction. Anything association with nobility is considered good, everything with the peasant class as bad. See also, Pierre Bourdieu (1984) Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste.
experience at the *highest level of human understanding*” (17:4, 16; emph. added). Good music is always implied as Western classical music, the kind connected with the pinnacle of human achievements. To develop an appreciation of such music requires the intervention of teachers dedicated to the preservation/cultivation of the values connected with this particular music: “We are in need of devoted music educators who are enthusiastic about leading young people along the journey of musical awareness; music education” (17:4, 16). This manipulation of subjectivity in music in favour of the interests of the upper classes (aristocracy, nobility, intelligentsia, on so on) is not something unique to the present. One finds similar statements as far back as Plato’s ‘sovereignty of the best’: “The standard by which music should be judged is the pleasure it gives—but not the pleasure given to any and every auditor. We may take it that the finest music is that which delights the best men [*sic*], the properly educated, that, above all, which pleases the one man who is supreme in goodness and education” (Mark 1982, 21). Ergo, the preferences of the best-educated are deemed of the highest order of desirability. Ensuring the survival of these preferences is the task of education.

With the advent of public schooling in North America in the nineteenth century, the imposition of “good taste”—that of the well-educated—shifts from a private to a public concern, as a 1946 address to the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association by a guest speaker makes clear:
Where does the *public taste* just mentioned come from? It cannot come from other than the training received in early years, formative years. Whatever is familiar in early years has permanent and paramount influence in maturity. There is great truth in the dictum, “Train a child early in the way he [sic] should go, in the later years he will not depart there from.” It would seem that the future of music…what we are primarily interested in... lies in the children of today. The place to get at the children is in the schools in the school curriculum. If it is of value in the development of the young mind it should be there. If it has no value it should not be there. (18:1, 19; emph. added, orig. ellipses)

Education in music consequently becomes the reproduction of elite musical tastes—ones cast as synonymous with the development of the mind. It is no longer sufficient for this taste to exist among the elite, but must be made common to everyone. One finds a similar tactic employed by the aforementioned composer, who situates the development of proper taste as not just vital to the individual, but in fact to the progress of society:

    Above all else, [the music education student should] become an educated music consumer of taste and judgment, able and willing to support those professionals who will supply the highest possible quality musical ‘goods and products’ she will demand for herself and for her children, and thus help create that informed, educated body politic, that ‘great audience’ otherwise known as a society on which the true and lasting progress of a country depends. This is the contribution that music education can make, and that justifies its cost, even were it five times as great as it is. (12:4, 9; emph. added)

Music education, in this view, is thus responsible for the producing an “informed” populace, one willing to support (that is, consume), through the exercise of “educated” judgement, the practices of professional artists.
Let us look at the philosophical basis for our educational system...Our society compels children to go to school because the fundamental purpose of a compulsory, free education is to civilize them: to mold children into responsible, cooperative, law-abiding, peaceable, contributing citizens. When that truth sinks in, the relevance of music education to this central purpose is obvious and striking. (17:3, 8)

In ‘Sustaining the Western Mind’ I discussed ways in which music has been used to perpetuate Western values, and how those connected with music and the arts have attempted to further their interests by capitalizing on this perceived connection between music and the concept of the ‘well-rounded mind.’ In this section I provide examples of how bands have been connected with State management by those who draw connections between large ensemble music-making practices and the need for docility and lawfulness among the population.

Schools have historically been a target of State attempts to control subjectivity (see Curtis 1988; Kennedy 2006). With its goal of communal music making and its physical and performative subservience to a central “leader,” it is not surprising large ensemble music making has been capitalized on as a practice reinforcing the social reproductive needs of the State. “Nothing else,” proclaims one author, “requires the willing suppression of individualism for the common good to an equal extent as
engaging in the performance of concerted music” (18:1, 24). The author of
the epigram above states the point in no uncertain terms:

The school band teaches children to live and work together in a
community with a spirit of peace, friendship, trust, cooperation,
and harmony; to be willing to discipline and accommodate one’s
individuality to the legitimate needs and concerns of the
community for the betterment of all its members; to play one’s
proper role in the life of the community; to respond honestly and
enthusiastically to the rightful urgings of the leadership; to learn
the laws the community has established to govern itself and to
peacefully abide by those laws. And to do all of this in the
knowledge that the result will be far richer than the individual
can achieve by himself [sic] alone. In a band, just like in a
civilized community, the whole is far greater than the sum of the
parts. (17:3, 8)

Indeed the theme of cooperation is prominent in the discourse. As one writer
puts it, “as music educators and students of music, we have a tremendous
responsibility and a great opportunity to see that the key for making our
‘game’ valuable to the players is through cooperation” (6:3, 23). Another
cites research (by the Gemeinhardt Corporation, a major instrument
manufacturer) indicating, “a most significant reason parents had for wanting
their students in the instrumental classroom was to have them learn to work
together within a team.” The author continues, suggesting, “the music
ensemble classroom may well be the best place within North American
schools where large groups of students learn to cooperate in order to
succeed at something they value: making music!” (24:2, 29).

There is, however, a blurring between cooperation and self-sacrifice.
One writer points out, “the band member is just that—a member of a group.
For the group to function, its members must give of themselves. Time and energy in private practice, group practice, and in school and community service” (3:2, 3). Indeed the sense of service is so central to the idea of early bands it is a theme that continues to function as part of advocacy messages for bands in schools. A noted wind band leader and educator is found promoting the idea that in addition to individual growth, “band, orchestra, and chorus can also foster the responsibility of living in a community… We learn responsibility to a group. It is the only discipline that deals with large group behavior” (24:2, 27). Note the inherent tension between individual growth and one’s responsibility to the group. What is good for the group is good for the individual.

The role of the individual in the context of large ensemble music becomes a problem when the activity occurs in formal educational institutions. Large ensemble music making undoubtedly has effects on the individual. Outside of formal education, however, there is no demand to report these effects. Schooling demands individualized evaluation. The purported “benefits” of music instruction must be observable and measurable on an individualized basis. As the following statement makes clear, however, there remains a tension involving the exact nature of these “individual” benefits:

The merit of ensemble experience should be measured by its value to the individual, not the other way around. Team effort, cooperation, and esprit de corp are cherished benefits our concert bands rightly foster, but these do not deserve priority
over the individual’s [sic] developing a concept of characteristic

tone, awareness of his or her role in achieving ensemble musical
effect, and sensitivity to style. (15:2, 32)

In this statement one observes that ensemble participation is expected to

benefit the individual. (It is unclear why team effort and cooperation are not

considered valuable to the individual.) Somewhat paradoxically, however,

two of the stated benefits desired are the developing of “characteristic tone”

(a normative skill), and an awareness of one’s “role” in achieving the

ensemble’s aims. One concludes the value of large ensemble music making
to individuals is in recognizing their proper place by “moulding them” in the

way described in the epigram above. Also of note, social benefits

(cooperation, esprit de corp) are situated lower than supposed

musical/educational benefits. One’s service or obligation is to the music, not
to others or the community.

**DISCUSSION: “SELLING” THE BAND AND THE VALIDITY PARADOX**

Every one of you must do a good selling job to parents,
colleagues, to administrators, and to students who have
fewer electives these days.

(15:4, 28)

Our communities need bands...make your program a part
of the community...so they refer to it as “our” band.

(14:2, 3; orig. ellipses)

One of our challenges for 1986 is to increase the visibility
of bands in our schools and communities. The band
program must play an active role in community functions
so it is seen and heard on a regular basis by the general public. Too often we sit back and wait for someone to invite us to perform. Perhaps the public’s lack of awareness may create an oversight which affects us. The onus is on us. Get Visible!

(10:3, 4)

What are the educational benefits of a music program?

(4:2, 5)

In an article entitled, “Music is Essential: Advocating Music in the Schools,” the claim is made that, “in order to benefit from a music education, children must be taught by a qualified musician who knows what quality bands, choirs and orchestras sound like, and knows how to teach students to perform that way” (24:2, 5). There is, however, an ambiguousness surrounding bands, music, and “the arts” in the discourse. Although the band profession appears to endorse the company of the other “arts” when it serves their purposes—all the arts are proffered as good for people—apparently “no other art form enriches the human spirit or instills an appreciation of the subjective element of beauty as music does” (16:4, 19). Indeed, music is asserted to be “the pinnacle of all the arts” (12:2, 11). Not surprisingly, while some of the discourse seeks to promote bands themselves (recall ‘Canadian Band Week’), a more common tactic appeals only to the idea of “music education” to support the ongoing presence of bands in schools, leading, perhaps, to the reminder: “we are in the business of music, not just in the business of band” (20:2, 3). Band directors are encouraged to establish “regular communication that includes statements
about the value of music education” (24:2, 15). Band directors are also encouraged to “publish a monthly music department newsletter or have articles in the school newspaper or newsletter.” They should “include things like the results of studies on music and reasons why one should be in music” (ibid.). The studies alluded to, funded to a large degree by the music products industry beginning in the 1990’s, attempted to put the weight of “science” behind rhetoric, dating back to Plato, about the value of music. “Significant research clearly indicates how valuable the study of music, within all its delivery avenues, can be for the human brain” (24:3, 29). The authors believe that “continued research will lend even further credence to the value of music education for people of all ages” (ibid.)—suggesting, of course, that “common” or “everyday” knowledge about the value of music is subservient to scientific knowledge, which is the ultimate source of truth. With the weight of scientific evidence behind music and the arts, an article byline boldly asks, “What parent or child wouldn’t want the benefits of music

241 For example: there is a “mounting wealth of scientific evidence” confirming music’s miraculous benefits, “information which must be made available to our school administration at every level” (21:2, 2). Published in the “world’s renowned scientific publication Nature,” this evidence, which reinforces “the fact that music within a school’s curriculum significantly impacts a child’s ability to learn,” was announced by the Chief Executive Officer of the National Association of Music Merchants (21:1, 3). Not only does music participation “increase a child’s ability to learn basic math and reading,” but “students who participate in music programs score significantly higher on standardized tests while at the same time developing crucial skills to be successful in life: self discipline, teamwork and problem solving skills.” Moreover, “students involved in music are also less likely to be involved in gangs, drugs or alcohol abuse and have better attendance in school” (24:3, 32; see also: 21:1, 3; 24:2, 14).
education?” (17:4, 25). As the validity of some of these claims came into question, the tactics can be seen to change towards rhetoric (described in benevolent educational terms as “teaching”): “Instill in your students and their parents a pride in your program, and teach them the value of music as a unique, universal, and powerful form of human expression. Students and parents who have been touched by the power of music become your best advocates” (3/2, 62).

“Selling” music education as band performance brings about what I call the validity paradox in music education, a paradox brought about by the problem of visibility. Without performance—what Foucault might call the ‘parade’ or the ‘spectacle’ (DP)—knowledge is not demonstrated, something vital if music is to be considered part of the school curriculum. The demonstration of musical knowledge, however, tends to produce enjoyment, something associated or, for some, synonymous with entertainment—and entertainment is considered to be not educational. This can be viewed as another example of what I previously described as schools using music for their purposes rather than the reverse. It is schools that need to demonstrate learning has taken place, not bands. What is more, the kind of

---

I am alluding here to the so-called “Mozart Effect” studies. The term came to prominence in the mid-1990s as a result of a 1993 study by Frances Rauscher and associates. The media subsequently exaggerated the original modest findings of the research—that listening to Mozart for 15 minutes before a test could raise scores of spatial reasoning—claiming that listening to Mozart could actually make people smarter. Subsequent research has, to date, failed to confirm such claims.
visibility desired by the public is often at odds with the kind propagated by
the legitimate knowledge of the universities. Musical performance is thereby
a double-edged sword, one that, in the opinion of some, is a visibility not
indicative of learning: “Schools do not need bands for public relations.
Telling administrators that the band is good public relations detracts from
the intrinsic value of music. The focus is shifted from education to the
performance of the band. Good music programs are more than just
performance” (24:2, 5). In another move, a writer emphasizes that the
educative force resides in the music itself: “The subject is music and the
medium which we use as the instructional vehicle is ‘band.’ The aim should
not be a performance, though that too is important, but rather to teach the
love of music through the building of insights, values, and attitudes” (8:1,
2).

The function of the symphony orchestra has always been clear: one
never imagines such a group on the football field or marching down the
streets of town. Bands, however, continue to participate in, and in fact are
an expected part of such activities, leading to confusion about the “true
nature” of the wind band. One author suggests “that such a rethinking of
just what a ‘band’ is, does, and produces might help us to understand and
cope with the realities of contemporary musical life and, also hopefully,
become more productive in our efforts to achieve the twin goals of artistic
and educational validity” (6:4, 5; emph. added). As a result, the band world
continues to face the challenge of distancing itself not just from its past but its present as well, setting up a potential conflict between practitioners in various spheres. That is, achieving artistic and educational validity can only come about through the rejection of all that is deemed non-artistic and non-educational (i.e., entertainment). Conductors of bands performing ‘art music’ (autonomous music) must consider themselves more valid than (which is to say superior to) those who perform non-art (functional) music. An inescapable hierarchy results: the symphony orchestra conductor is superior to the wind band conductor, the wind ensemble conductor is superior to the marching band conductor, the university band conductor is superior to the school band conductor, and the school band conductor is superior to the community band conductor.

School bands are then placed in the conflicted position of having to justify themselves in the eye of the public through their visibility, but this same visibility must be carefully balanced, a dilemma reminiscent of this social and philosophical paradox of schooling described by Elliott: “what teachers aspire to do because society says they should is compromised (or negated) by what schooling is obliged to do because society says it must” (1995, 304). Note the following:

The band director must be educationally accountable, providing today’s students with a meaningful experience relevant to the educational, performance, and aesthetic expectations of society...The band must be perceived as a valuable and balanced program meeting the artistic, educational and service
expectations of our respective communities. (17:2, 30; emph. added)

All scheduled performances can and should be educational in nature. Activities should be consistent with the goals of music education, and with *sensitivity to community expectations*. (American School Band Directors’ Association, 19:4, 3; emph. added)

The problem is this: communities want their school bands to entertain, but schools must be about education and entertainment is not educative. This problem is further exacerbated by the presence of community bands and university bands, neither of which face similar expectations; community bands are not expected (but are still permitted) to perform “art music,” university concert bands are not expected to “entertain.” Is the school band to be like the local town band, that model of democracy and community participation society desires, or like the university band, the exemplar of artistic performance representing valued knowledge society demands?

---

243 I am unaware of any Canadian university schools of music operating marching bands. My understanding is there is a fairly clear demarcation between marching bands and wind bands performing “concert” music.  
244 To be clear, performances might be considered entertaining, but the criteria for the success or lack of success are assumed to be artistic, not the enjoyment of the audience. The audience is, after all, being “educated” through their presence at the performance.
SUMMARY

The reality is that we must present the values of music education from two perspectives, the intrinsic and ancillary value.

(14:2, 15)

[Perform] in a place with minimal distractions where [the audience] can more fully contemplate the works being performed.

(21:1, 20)

A number of contingent factors have, slowly and almost imperceptibly, ‘coagulated’ over the course of the twentieth century, leading us to believe current emphases on the correct way to do bands is natural and ineluctable. One still finds occasional references to ‘banding’ and ‘banders,’ but usually only in the community band world, where I posit some musicians may still operate according to an ethic of music making based on interpersonal enjoyment—an ethic quite removed from the prevailing ethic today. It is important to remember there are really three primary band worlds: one within formal institutions (e.g., schools, universities), a second made up of amateur bands (e.g., community), and a professional world (e.g., military, Hannaford Street Silver Band, Dallas Winds, Kosei Wind Ensemble; historically: Sousa, Gilmore). Although the professional world of military bands has existed for hundreds of years, it operates today in a very distinct sphere somewhat removed from the concerns of my research. Similarly, contemporary professional wind bands constitute a relatively small sphere of
activity, undertaken by a small proportion of wind band participants. It too is somewhat removed from my research concerns. What I have argued throughout this chapter is that the sense of musicality developed in and through contemporary school/university band participation is considerably different than that developed in early bands—and is likely different too from the sense of musicality developed through amateur (community) bands participation. That is, the ethics of doing music in bands has changed over the course of the twentieth century due in part, I suggest, to increasing standardization, codification, and institutionalization.

In Chapter Four I described various ‘regimes of truth’ operating in the pedagogical band world as they appear in the discourse of CBJ/CW. In Chapters Five and Six I have provided a reading of how these ‘regimes of truth’ have come to be. As an analytic device I have framed my interpretation in term’s of Foucault’s conception of ethical existence as rapport a soi, arguing one’s ethical relationship, or sense of musicality, fostered in discourse has changed over the course of the twentieth century. Originally, one had a relationship with music in the pursuit of interpersonal enjoyment. Importantly, banding was a form of leisure; it was an activity, one often undertaken out of a sense of civic responsibility, owing to the enjoyment afforded to all concerned. The music performed was vernacular and immanent to the band, concerned primarily with celebration (time/space/place).
The relationship fostered in discourse has changed in response to a series of power-imbued moves intended to perpetuate the interests of those most completely invested in bands. That is, as Foucault explains, power may be understood in terms of the desire to maintain privileges and the adaptation to circumstances. Many changes in society—technical and non—resulted in an ongoing process of standardization, codification, and institutionalization, all of which have affected the ways in which bands are understood and enacted. Appeals for bands were, depending on the circumstance, rationalized and promoted in various ways. Sometimes the participatory nature was emphasized, but more often, and increasingly, bands were defended on the grounds of “music education.” Music, it is claimed, is central to being fully human. As a result, everyone deserves an education in music, which eventually became understood as the right to study the music itself.

The turn to the study of the musical object—the music itself—can be understood from two perspectives. First, it was the logical response to a situation where school bands faced the dilemma of visibility. Given the presence of active community banding, school bands like the Edmonton Schoolboys’ Band could be considered to be preparation for a lifetime of community service. By adopting a service role and supplanting the community band, however, school bands could no longer be considered a

245 The Kitsilano Boys’ Band is another famous example (see http://www.kitsband.com).
preparation for life. That is, itslastingletvalue was open to question.\textsuperscript{246} And while the visibility of the school band as a functional entity heightens public awareness, the embracing of “common,” non-curricular activities exposes to attack the school band’s status as a vehicle for curricular learning—as in the Edmonton Schoolboys’ Band example where Newlove’s repertoire was criticized for not being educational enough. This kind of visibility led to the question, ‘Is the band educational?’ The obvious solution to this question was to focus not on the visibility of performance, but on the lasting effect of the music itself on the mind of the individual. The second perspective is one that sees the turn to the study of the music itself as a strategic opportunity among those wishing to impose particular musical tastes. By casting certain music as common, everyday, and lacking in substance—the kind ofentertainingmusic frequently used at service events—those valuing Western European Art music (such as the universities, for example) could promote concert music as a kind of music embodying specialized, serious, edifying (that is, legitimate) knowledge. The kind of music, in other words, that

\textsuperscript{246} In an example illustrating a certain irony, a respected university and community band leader makes the appeal for forming community bands to address this very issue: “Many of your present high school band members will not enter college. A community band will provide a place for them to continue playing as they become working citizens, and the prospect of community band membership could give these students the motivation to do better while still in high school” (11:3, 8). Whereas community bands had once been the impetus for justifying bands in schools, the situation was now in need of the reverse.
imparts lasting values. The deciding question thus becomes, ‘Is the music Art?’

*CBJ/CW* is filled with statements where all things social are dichotomized from both the ‘musical’ and the ‘educational.’ Educators, for example, are encouraged to know the role of music in contemporary society in terms of its “extrinsic (social) values” and its “intrinsic (esthetic) values” (6:2, 19). Students are encouraged to attend summer music camps for their “social and educational values” (6:4, 13; emph. added). Similarly, educators are encouraged to select literature on the basis of “intrinsic educational and artistic value” (6:2, 13). Indeed, it is telling that in a review of a 1988 dissertation entitled, “The Meaning of the High School Band Experience and Its Relationship to Band Activities,” the author remarks, “it is a disservice to the potential music education experience of band if, whether intentional or implicit, nonmusical outcomes become the prominent rationales for band” (Bundy 1993, 60). In all cases, the music is positioned as intrinsic and valuable and sociality is positioned as extrinsic and lacking value.

Viewed as part of a reproductive strategy, this tactic of situating musical and social (non-musical) values as intrinsic and extrinsic is entirely understandable. In order to defend its unique status in the curriculum, music educators in the band world, faced with competing claims for curricular inclusion, cannot rely on rationales available to other subjects. That is, while the Boston School Committee was successful in selling music on its physical,
intellectual, and moral benefits, and advocates for school bands one hundred years later pointed to the camaraderie, teamwork, and democratic, egalitarian aspects of the band, none of these benefits are distinct to music. Other subjects can potentially claim similar benefits, often provided more efficiently and less expensively—something of increasing importance in the post-World War II and post-Sputnik eras where the educational curriculum has come under greater scrutiny (Mark and Gary 2007). In addition, educational priorities have changed, making many earlier rationales now irrelevant. The solution in the past half-century or so has been to ground advocacy efforts in the one thing which other subjects cannot challenge: the music itself. In so doing, however, the ethical substance of one’s musical relationship (one’s musicality) changes from the well-being of people (the “extrinsic,” social, non-musical aspects) to the aesthetic properties of the musical object (the “intrinsic,” musical and therefore educational aspects). Concomitant with this shift in ethical substance, the criteria determining the success of the activity (subjectivation) has changed from the situated, mutual satisfaction of band members and their community to the universal standards of Art.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

This study deals with the problems of disciplinary practices and subject formation in instrumental music education, specifically in school bands. It was premised on the suspicion, subsequently verified through analysis, that the discourse of school bands constructs a particular kind of musical relationship, one rooted in modernist assumptions of the ‘subject’ and of teaching and learning. School band discourse produces musicality as a relationship to music; music is considered something to study and know rather than an activity with which to engage for the sheer enjoyment it affords the performer and audience member alike.\textsuperscript{247} Accordingly, the teaching and learning of music is conceptualized like the schooling process itself, the goal of which is to move the ‘not yet’ subject towards full subject status—the autonomous individual. The fully formed subject, possessing the well-rounded Western mind, knows the truth of the world and can function as an independent, rational entity. For music education, this usually entails ensuring students will know (recognize and be sensitive to) beauty (defined

\textsuperscript{247} A reminder that this discourse, while possessing a degree of autonomy, must be considered a part of other discourses in music, the arts, education, arts education, and music education.
in terms of Western art music) and will become lifelong supporters of the arts.

In this chapter I provide some final thoughts on this study of disciplinary discourse of school bands as music education. First I provide an overview of what I consider to be my ‘Foucaultian’ reading of the discourse. Next I include some brief observations on the journals of the Canadian Band Association, a recognition of the issue of silence, a recognition of my motives for conducting this study, and some implication for the music education profession, especially that part of the profession involved with school bands. I conclude with recommendations for further study and some final thoughts.

**A FOUCAULTIAN READING: STYLIZING LIVES**

[The role of the intellectual is to] counter the prevailing regime of the production of truth through which local forms of knowledge are rendered illegitimate and disqualified.
—Foucault (qtd. in Smart 1994, 13)

In Chapter One I argued the merits of employing a Foucaultian framework. First and foremost among the many reasons for using the work of Foucault is he shows how “one can question the discourse of disciplines and institutions and their practices” (Besley 2002, 3)—something central to my research problem: "What ‘regimes of truth’ are fashioned in school music (bands) discourse, how did they come to be, and what are their potential
effects on the subject?” I have not drawn explicit attention at every turn to how Foucault’s work has informed my method and analysis, since I have wanted the spotlight to be on the discourses, not on Foucault. Nevertheless, it should be clear that Foucault’s shadow looms large throughout this study. Specifically, Foucault’s presence can be felt in four areas: knowledge, power, ethics, and history, the first three of which I will briefly review here.

**Knowledge**

[The arts] provide us with insight and wisdom that enlighten our understanding, making it deeper and more comprehensive. (21:1, 15)

Why, asks Nietzsche, has “‘the truth’ been given this value” and why we have placed ourselves “absolutely under its thrall”? (qtd. in Prado 2000, 124). Why, echoes Foucault, are we so attached to the truth rather than lies or myth or illusion (ibid.)? Why is it we believe the world to be “just one way,” and why do we accord so much value to achieving “the uniquely correct perspective on things” (ibid.)? In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* Foucault introduces the term *episteme* to describe an overarching set of discursive relations in a given time period. The episteme, he writes, is “something like a world-view...which imposes...a certain structure of thought that men [*sic*] of a particular period cannot escape” (AK, 211). The point is
not that there are multiple interpretations of the world, but that there is no world independent of how we “take it to be” (Prado 2000, 124). This is why, May explains, the limitations on what can be said [and done] are epistemic, not legal or physical (2006, 38). Unacceptable things simply are not recognized. To illustrate, May provides the example of a spectator rising in a courtroom to pronounce guilt or innocence. Such a gesture is simply not viewed as an allowable move within what Foucault calls, in The Order of Things, “the positive unconscious of knowledge” (qtd. in ibid., 39)—resulting in what May calls the “archaeology of the silencing” (ibid., 40). Part of my analytical concern has involved the structurings or frameworks that occur within the epistemological field of the pedagogical band world. It is these frameworks that determine how “(1) the participants in discussion recognize one another in their proper role as participants and (2) the statements of those participants are recognized as contributors to a particular discussion, or as establishing certain points, or as making certain claims, or as performing certain acts” (ibid., 39). My concern has been to focus on those aspects of discourse that determine why and how people come to believe certain things as true about themselves and about music.

For Foucault, practices are how we produce knowledge. My analysis demonstrates that as bands were institutionalized, especially in schools and universities, knowledge production changed—which is to say our relation to truth changed. Band participation became something different than it had
been in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This is not to suggest what bands today do has changed in significant ways. Rather, the ways bands are understood—the ‘regime of truth’ about bands—has changed. As previously mentioned (Chapter One), one of Foucault’s major insights is anything can be “made to look good or bad, important or unimportant, useful or useless, by being redescribed.”248 The practices of bands in the twentieth century are an excellent example of this. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries bands were promoted on their basis of their capacity for “cultural uplift.” Today, however, the cultural aspects of early bands are now redescribed in pejorative terms: “The modest artistic aspirations and unsophisticated nature of most 19th- and early-20th-century band music suited the internationally accepted roles for wind bands (e.g., pageantry, entertainment) and the general audiences and outdoor venues for which it was intended” (1/1, 32). In his dissertation, “Canadian Wind Band Repertoire,” Maloney champions the emergence of a “new” repertoire for wind bands written by some of Canada’s “finest composers,” a repertoire that “[embraces] works of art-music for the traditional band instrumentation...a repertoire vastly different in style and approach from the traditional band literature of ‘light’ concert material and patriotic marches” (1986, iv). Our relation to the truth about bands, in other words, has changed.

248 This quote is Richard Rorty’s appraisal of Foucault (Prado 2000, 47-48).
Foucault also argues anything not conforming to “science” becomes subjugated knowledge—science, in this sense, referring to formalized, theorized knowledge. It is therefore not surprising the practices of early bands (“banding”), unconcerned with theorizing or elaborating their practice in terms of “education” or “aesthetics” became a form of subjugated knowledge. Bands today probably do many similar things to bands a hundred years ago: the band attempts to match a pitch given by some member of the ensemble, the leader names a piece a music and raises her or his hands to begin the selection, the ensemble plays until the leader indicates for them to stop, they proceed to work on any musical/technical problem(s), and then they begin the whole process again with another piece of music, repeating this routine until the rehearsal ends. The way this particular musical practice is understood, however, varies markedly from a century ago. That is, the kind of knowledge produced by this practice has changed, with the former knowledge becoming “subjugated.” Foucaultian analysis helps to show this.

According to Foucault, the workings of practice are often masked from its participants. By examining the CBJ/CW corpus, I systematically organized a set of statements—what Foucault might describe as a discursive formation—based on a set of objects (e.g., concepts such as conductor or

---

249 Foucault writes that schools have become a site where pedagogy “functions as a science” (DP, 187). I suggest aesthetics is really an attempt to legitimize artistic knowledge by casting it as a ‘science of beauty.’
teaching). From these statements I developed a set of questions designed to investigate what made such a discursive formation possible. That is, I examined the conditions leading to the production of particular ‘regimes of truth’ in the discourse. Unlike Green and Vogan, who suggest, “music education has survived bureaucracies, apathies, and other adversities, primarily because of outstanding musicians and teachers devoted to a common cause” (1991, xvi; emph. added), my analysis suggests musicians and teachers have not at all been devoted to a common cause. Rather, various stakeholders with desires for social reproduction engaged in ongoing struggles to perpetuate their own interests. By documenting the ‘regimes of truth’ in the discourse and tracing the conditions making certain knowledge possible at certain moments, I have endeavoured to ‘unmask’ the workings of practice, showing how current practices, as manifested in and through discourse, may not be serving the interests of students in the ways the music education profession intends or believes.

Power

The future of music is in the hands of the young, present and future. What those young people develop into, what

\footnote{Green and Vogan, it should be noted, attempt to observe regional differences while simultaneously viewing music education “as a national movement” (1991, xvi)—something my research suggests is part of a strategy to portray greater homogeneity than actually exists.}
they become and what they later demand, depends upon what we have done with them, where we have led them.
—CBA address, 1946 (18:1, 24)

For Paras, Foucault’s concept of ‘power-knowledge’ was intended as a “corrective” to ideology, a concept Foucault often found wanting: “Every point of exercise of power is at the same time a site of formation: not of ideology, but of knowledge” (2006, 113). In other words, “power produces knowledge” (DP, 27). At the same time, however, power does not exist outside of knowledge: “There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations” (ibid.). Knowledge, therefore, is always a political matter. “Where knowledge is concerned...one abandons the opposition between what is ‘interested’ and what is ‘disinterested’” (ibid., 28). In Paras’s reading, prior to the existence of disciplinary institutions and their discourse, the ‘individual’ did not exist in the way we think of today (2006, 104). That is, the individual ‘emerged’ in history as the result of the disciplines (ibid., 103). Thus, power-knowledge is constitutive of subjectivity.

Understood as the ‘will to knowledge,’ the imperative to produce knowledge must come from somewhere. The study of disciplinary discourse is important because it is disciplines that produce experts who determine what we are and how we should act. This is an important but nuanced point, because for Foucault there is no “subject” of knowledge. Instead, it is
discourse that produces subjects and objects, making us believe in the existence of ‘things.’

There is no denying, for example, the score is a real artifact. Discourse is what generates power-produced truth that the score holds meaning beyond the black and white symbols on the page. That is, discourse leads us to believe studying the score will produce “findings” which we can then share with members of the ensemble. Through their involvement in this kind of teaching-learning process, students are led to believe in the existence of latent meanings within the score. As May summarizes: “by our participating in these practices, we ourselves become embedded in relations of power, even when we resist them. We become what those relations orient us to become, and we pave the way for others to become it as well” (2006, 85).

As Foucault explains, education is about managing others as well as teaching others to manage themselves (GE, 277). This acting on others conditions, or ‘fashions,’ subjectivity. As argued in Chapters Four through Six, the managing of others in school bands has helped to construct a specific kind of musicality, or musical relationship. At one point in The History of Sexuality Foucault addresses his methodological goal. The central issue, he writes, is “to account for the fact that it is spoken about, to

---

251 Veyne writes: “Far from inviting us to judge things on the basis of words, Foucault shows on the contrary that words mislead us, that they make us believe in the existence of things, in the existence of natural objects, of governed subjects, or of the State, whereas these things are only correlatives of ‘the corresponding practices’” (1997, 157).
discover who does the speaking, the positions and viewpoints from which they speak, the institutions which prompt people to speak about it and which store and distribute the things that are said. What is at issue, briefly, is the over-all ‘discursive fact,’ the way in which sex is ‘put into discourse’” (HS, 11). Chapters Four through Six represents my efforts to describe the way musicality has been put into the discourse of bands. What was once an organic social practice within communities (effectively “owned” by no one) has now been appropriated by institutions. Unmistakably, the interests of the university determine the “discursive fact” of school bands. University professors do the majority of the speaking about the nature and value of bands, music and music education. Not only do the universities produce the knowledge, its workers—unlike the workers of schools—are rewarded (through promotion) for disseminated the knowledge. It is no overstatement to suggest “we” are, at least in formalized music making, the kinds of people universities want us to be.

**Ethics**

The problems of school music are many...What solution can be proposed which will preserve the social values for which music is used in the schools and at the same time achieve acceptable musical standards?

To experience limits as universal or obligatory is to experience a form of subjectivity (Owen 1999, 33). I have found Foucault’s concept of rapport a soi extremely fruitful for conceptualizing subjectivity in music, since ethics is really a matter of limits, and discourse determines these limits. Performing in school bands enacts a particular kind of subjectivity in music. Every selection of music and every act of rehearsing instills in the student a specific understanding of right and wrong in the making of music. The limits of our musicality are determined to an overwhelming extent by school music, insofar as schools represent legitimate knowledge. This holds for both students and teachers, since teachers are the products of both schools and the quintessential legitimate knowledge—that of the university. As discussed in Chapter Four, it is the composer and conductor who determine the limits of large ensemble music making. The universal standards of art constitute success or failure in the music-making endeavour, not the mutual satisfaction of musicians and audience.

Submitting oneself to the urgings of the conductor is a form of truth-forming, insofar as musicians relinquish their own musical impulses and adopt those of the conductor. Although this practice was undoubtedly part of early bands as well, the important distinction is that in early bands the deference was to authority, not to musical truth. One obeyed the bandmaster because he (or, in very rare instances, she) was in charge, not because he or she knew the truth about music. By “responding
appropriately” to the conductor, today’s school band members internalize the power-produced truths of their teachers. As a result, students form a new kind of relationship with themselves in music, one I have described in this study as a relationship to music. One must love the music—love being defined as a form of subservient worship (one must “study the score,” for example).252 One must, in other words, be truthful to the music, and by extension, to our inherently musical selves. To clarify, although Foucault believes there is no essence to the subject—no truth to know—this does not mean the subject does not believe in truth about themselves, or, more precisely, that they are unable to express the truth. It is precisely this belief in the truth about ourselves that Foucault identifies as our modern form of subjectivity, which he defines as the subject’s relation to her or himself (Paras 2006, 110).

The modern confessional is an example of this truth speaking. Occurring today not just in the church, but in many sites such as the school, the hospital, or even the media, McLaren explains that this confessional process is subjecting, not cathartic:

252 The theme of “love” is found throughout the discourse, although it is never clarified or defined, begging the question of what, precisely, it means “to love music.” What seems clear is that, for the authors (the teachers), learning to love music means learning to adopt similar musical tastes and values. Recall the plea from a Chapter One footnote where an author bemoans that thousands of students could participate in music festivals and still not “be turned on” to music—meaning in this case attending classical music concerts.
Confession is an example of the reversal of the traditional relationship between truth and power. Instead of being freed, the one who confesses contributes to her own subjection by articulating the truth about herself... Individuals participate in their own self-constitution through confession, but simultaneously they produce themselves with reference to the demands of power to speak the truth about themselves. (2002, 58)

Although occurring in non-discursive form, band performance is an analogous example of this kind of truth telling/making. Exposing what we believe about ourselves and our involvement in music has been a major objective of this study. As McLaren explains, when one examines “how we came to think, do, and be what we are with the possible goal of no longer doing, thinking, and being in the same way—one engages in a practice of freedom” (2002, 166). We must, suggests Foucault in an epigram I used in Chapter Two, “promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries” (SP, 336). In the case of school bands this imposition has been decades. Hopefully the exercise of freedom in school music will not have to wait centuries.

THE CANADIAN BAND JOURNAL AND CANADIAN WINDS

In many ways, band is a microcosm of life, and our band community is nothing more than a reflection of the people who make up the ensemble. (18:2, 7)
My research question addresses the ‘regimes of truth’ present in the pedagogical discourse, not specific aspects of the journal of the Canadian Band Association. A few brief comments on the two journals should be made, however, since they have constituted the corpus used for generating statements. Due to the CBJ having been edited and produced by one individual for its entire run from 1978-2001, I originally suspected the journal might have reflected particular biases of that individual. My early analytic efforts attempted to identify significant changes in the discourse between the CBJ and CW. As my concordance analysis (Appendices B and C) shows, however, little change in the discourse is evident between the two journals, indicating the pedagogical discourse of school bands is, save certain topical items such as ‘The Mozart Effect,’ relatively constant. In fact, that pedagogical “how to” articles all saying more or less the same thing appear repeatedly year after year (articles on percussion instruction are especially popular) likely suggests the primary purpose of the journal is to provide a forum for national conversation rather than information per se.²⁵³ As the opening editorial of CW remarked, with the demise of the CBJ, the CBA “lost the one national journal that served the wind band profession in Canada. In effect, we lost our collective voice” (1/1, 2).

²⁵³ That pedagogical articles of this type continue to appear in the internet age might be attributable to force of habit—since such information really is not needed in a journal—although their repeated appearance might also derive from the insistence of universities for their faculty to publish articles.
This collective voice does show evidence of change between the two journals. The CBJ editor, for example, commented, “The Canadian Band Journal, for the past 21 years, has endeavoured to help us know who we are within Canada...bridging the gap east through west, so to speak. In addition, we have worked to show that we, in Canada, are not alone in our causes, while telling the world that we are here. In providing this ‘broader perspective,’ the Canadian Band Journal has, over the years, made a sincere effort to bring a national as well as an international perspective to the world of Canadian band and band music” (21:2, 3, ellipses in orig.). The editorial direction of CW, however, has moved in a decidedly nationalistic direction, eschewing much of the cosmopolitan and North American aspects of the CBJ. CW does not mention Phi Beta Mu, or the NABDCC.254 As mentioned in Chapter One, I could identify only three non-Canadian authors in CW (2002-2008), whereas the CBJ included many non-Canadian (specifically American) writers. That the discourse has remained constant between the journals further suggests Canadian school band practices do not differ substantially from practices in the United States, despite CW’s overtly nationalistic tone.255

255 This assertion is based on the eschewal of American authors and spellings (to the point of substituting the British use of ‘s’ rather than ‘z’ in words like organisation, or the use of the word programme) and the explicit emphasis on Canadian repertoire and culture. The editorial for the first issue proclaimed, “Canadian Winds is uniquely Canadian” (1/1, 2).
Having studied the journals so intensively I am struck by the extent to which CW seems to dictate rather than discuss wind band practices. Whereas the CBJ endeavoured “to help us know who we are within Canada,” the tone in CW reads as telling the readership who it should be and how it should practise music education. Witness, for example, any of the study guides or the articles on repertoire or conducting, all of which are presented with the unmistakable voice of authority and the dogma of “method.” To cite but one small example of this authoritative tone, a frequent contributor advises, “As band teachers across this land, we are facing major challenges. However, I know that playing in a band offers incalculable benefit, not only for a music education but also for those extra-musical effects which we all know about” (2/2, 56; emph. added). The value of music education and how to practise it, in other words, has already been decided; there is no need for further discussion.

SILENCES

As discussed in Chapter Three, many of the interesting interpretive questions are not addressed to the text itself, but to what the text omits. Indeed, a good part of postmodern sensibility is the recognition that issues of omission are inextricably bound up in webs of power, interests, and

\[\text{\textsuperscript{256}}\]

I provide this example reluctantly; I will not provide other examples out of respect for the authors.
politics—issues that have historically been ignored (intentionally and not) by those who focus only on what is present. Ignoring issues of omission, as many feminist, postcolonial, and poststructuralist scholars have demonstrated, masks the insidiousness of omission by portraying ‘the way things are’ (the status quo) as correct or naturally occurring. My research problem focuses on the truth claims present in the journal of the Canadian Band Association. As such, my aims have not been to interrogate the issues of exclusion and omission. The analysis offered in Chapters Four through Six instead traces how the present ‘regimes of truth’ have come to be. My efforts have been directed at showing the potential effects of these ‘regimes of truth’ on our relationship in music. The “our” in question, however, presupposes a homogeneity glossing over matters such as race, ethnicity, class, gender, and sexuality. I am, in this sense, guilty of perpetuating the view that participating in school bands is the same kind of experience regardless of subject position. Moreover, my analysis presupposes the presence of individuals who participate in the very act of exclusion. That is, simply being a band student is to reproduce the norms of maleness, whiteness, middle classness, eurocentricism, and heterosexuality—the kinds of iterations Butler (1990) refers to as “performativity.” I have included this short section in order to highlight just a few of the issues of silence in the CBJ/CW discourse, and to suggest examining issues such as race, ethnicity, class, gender, and sexuality is a valuable next step in this research. I
reiterate, however, that important though these questions and issues are, they are not my specific research problem.

**Gender**

Hazen and Hazen state that early bands were “unabashedly masculine organizations” (1987, 55). They point out that of over 1200 pre-1920s photographs housed at the Smithsonian Institution, only around 20 women’s bands are represented, and these are almost always directed by a man (ibid., 56). Although there were some all-women bands, there were almost no ‘mixed’ bands. With the band’s military history and associations, this should not necessarily come as a surprise. What is more difficult to explain is the longevity of the band’s sexual divisions, witnessed in such things as the continued use of the term “bandsmen.”

Recall, for example, this epigram from Chapter Five: “with ability to play in the band there comes to each bandsman [sic] a sense of citizenship, of belonging to an organization which is considered necessary to the success of public enterprises, of pride and importance in having a part in civic affairs” (Graham 1952, 179)—the implication being that bands, as an activity connected with the public sphere are properly a male domain; the place of females—generally and certainly in

---

257 Promotional material for Expo ’67 in Montreal proclaimed one of the featured acts was composed of 35 of the “best bandsmen in Canada” (Theatre and Bandshell: Performances 1967, 4).
music—is implied to be in the domestic, private sphere.\textsuperscript{258} Although early bands were a celebration of community, they were unmistakably imbued with overt gender divisions, with men providing the public musical/cultural leadership for the community.\textsuperscript{259}

The masculine bias in the discourse is both overt and subtle. In \textit{CBJ} 22:2, for example, an article by the ‘Mozart Effect’ researcher, Frances Rauscher, appears under the male spelling of “Francis.” An apparently well-meaning editorial from 1990 intended to highlight the increasing presence of women band directors provides another example:

I can name only three women who hold university conducting positions in Canada. Yet, the membership roaster [\textit{sic}] of the Canadian Band Association presents a membership of women band directors averaging above fifty percent.

Many can remember when there were no recognized women band directors in the Canadian school/community band setting...and the speculation that arose when that first lady conductor appeared. We have come a long way in recognition and qualification. The significance of the contribution being made by our woman band director/conductor counterparts can not be ignored. (14:3, 38; orig. ellipses)

Although the language here is subtle, the use of “lady” and ‘our woman counterparts’ cannot escape notice today. The author is clearly addressing

\textsuperscript{258} Singing, most likely in church, being a possible exception. 
\textsuperscript{259} Although I have not considered it in my analysis, this idea certainly opens up the intriguing thesis that bands, with their martial celebration of masculinity, served as a vehicle through which men could assert their authority in an area, such as culture, generally considered at the time to be “feminine.”
and centering himself and other male band directors, portraying the female band director as the exceptional other.

Other usage is more overt, such as the use of “mankind” (14:2, 3; 18:3, 5; 17:3, 26), or the continued use of “bandsmen” (e.g., “Certificate & Pin Also Available Suitable For Presentation To Community Bandsmen” (7:2, 20)). The concept of the “bandsman,” although the product of the band’s military history, extends beyond mere language, as evinced in the existence of so many “Boys’ Bands” in Canada through the 1930s, 40s, and 50s (up to 1970 in the case of the Edmonton Schoolboys’ Band). A question raised at the 1934 meeting of the Canadian Bandmasters’ Association specifically addressing the issue of Boys’ Bands makes clear that for many in the community band world in the first half of the twentieth century, banding was intended as a strictly male activity: “Taking into consideration, the fact that boys have a right to learn and it is our duty to help and encourage them as the musicians of the future, what would you suggest as a means of keeping their interest?” (12:3, 18).260 Although Boys’ Bands were typically a community and not school activity, Howey (2003) points out that in the case of the Edmonton school system, the success of the Edmonton Schoolboys’ Band prevented the widespread growth of school bands in Edmonton, and

260 The minutes from a 1945 meeting of the CBA reinforce the male-only nature of the organization “The formation of a Ladies Auxiliary was discussed for CBA. The meeting decided that such an organization would not be of practical value at the present time” (16:3, 21).
hence limited opportunities for girls as late as 1970 (388; see also: Green and Vogan 1991, 170).

An obvious question is whether gender bias has decreased over time. As shown in Appendix G, although certain gendered language usage has decreased, gendered pronoun usage does not differ as significantly as one might expect between the CBJ and CW. And although CW has a greater female presence than the CBJ, women authored only 32 of 108 CW articles, with one of these authors accounting for no less than 10 of the 32 entries.\(^{261}\) This, however, does represent a substantial increase from the CBJ, where only one woman had any substantial presence.\(^{262}\) Although I have not included it in my formal analysis, a photograph analysis shows a very large disparity in the balance of male and female images in the CBJ. For example, there are 559 male-only and 29 female-only images, and 103 male-leader and 24 female-leader images. Although CW does not publish photographs as the CBJ did,\(^{263}\) it does include biographical photos, something that, due to the disproportionate number of male authors, tends to reinforce the image of male authority in the band world. Suffice it to say that despite the

\(^{261}\) To clarify, it is sometimes difficult to determine what constitutes an article. My numbers should be considered only an approximation.

\(^{262}\) This presence lasted for approximately five years.

\(^{263}\) The number of photographs printed in the CBJ declined noticeably after volume 15.
relatively equal number of male and female school band directors, men continue to dominate the discourse.

Other Silences

Unlike gender, which presents itself more readily in language, omissions of race and ethnicity are less obvious to discern. Although I did examine the total list of words (approximately 175,000 unique words, three letters and more, in the corpus) in order to identify infrequently occurring words that might have been expected to occur more often in music education discourse, I did not include this examination in my analysis since the results fell outside of my research question. My examination does suggest an assumed whiteness permeates all facets of the discourse. For example, unlike other recent music education discourses that often show some “multicultural” awareness, such awareness is glaringly absent in the CBJ/CW discourse. The words “multicultural”/“multiculturalism” appear a

264 This figure is based on names found in the 2006 CBA Directory. Provincial breakdowns exhibit some disparity (e.g., very few female members in the British Columbia Band Directors Association), but nationally the numbers are approximately equal. [Note: gender is not specified in the directory. I calculated numbers based on names only, excluding from the tally any names where gender was uncertain.]

265 See for example, both Elliott (1995) and Reimer (2003). My use of scare quotes is to recognize the term multicultural is itself problematic, in that it tends to imply a centrality of whiteness with “other” cultures on the periphery. I use it only because it is the word used in music education discourse. I personally do not consider the current replacement term “world
total of four times in *CBJ* and two in *CW*, however only once in these six appearances of the word is it in any way discussed: “A multicultural approach [to selecting repertoire] could include music with a variety of scale patterns and modes, and may incorporate unusual percussion instruments, compositional techniques, or singing” (5/2, 106). Apparently singing, “unusual percussion instruments” (presumably unusual to the band world) and unusual compositional techniques constitute going beyond the norms of whiteness and eurocentrism.266

**Summary**

Before closing this section, I must acknowledge the possibility my decision to employ a Foucaultian practice of omitting authors’ names may participate in exclusion. Has, for example, my deliberate avoidance of stating the gender of the authors helped to ameliorate the gender bias in the band world, or does it mask it? On the one hand, the use of a ‘genderless’ or ‘raceless’ text might leave the reader with the impression gender and race are unproblematic in the band world. Conversely, my continual citation of music” much of an improvement. For the record, the words “world music” appear eight times in the *CBJ* (not once in *CW*), although only once in the sense the term is used today, and this one occurrence is in reference to “world music” percussion equipment.

male authors might have reinforced existing gender differences. On the other hand, while there was in my analysis only one woman cited from the *CBJ*, several *CW* citations were from women. Perhaps if I had included a more explicit reference to gender, the Canadian band world could be shown to be becoming more (if only slightly more) gender equitable. If anything, I am hopeful the frequent appearance of *sic* in Chapters Four through Six, particularly in the *CBJ* citations, has helped to show that gendered language has been, and continues to be problematic in band discourses. The matters of race and class are more difficult to address, since they do not present themselves in language in quite the same way.

The lack of awareness of issues of silencing exhibited by the *CBJ/CW* does not bode well for change in these areas any time soon. While the increase in the number of female authors in *CW*, three of whom are university band directors, does hint at changes in the profession towards gender equity, the same cannot be said about other equity and diversity issues. This, I posit, could be due to the failure to distinguish the practices of school bands from that of music education. Bands, as a medium performing music of the Western European, and particularly Western European art,

---

267 And Chapter Two, but Foucault’s problematic gender biases are a different matter.
268 Or rather, they do—but not in the explicit sense of gendered words. Analyzing issues of race and class (in addition to gender and sexuality) in the discourse is vitally important, and I am hopeful that others more qualified in such areas will examine these issues.
269 Two others work in positions of authority within the band community.
tradition cannot necessarily be faulted for being what they are, anymore than one can fault Ghanaian drumming for its lack of clarinets. If school bands are to be the primary medium for music education in schools, however, one should expect they be held accountable to the expectations of public schooling—one of the most important principles of which is that public schools are to be for everyone. The possibility school bands will adapt to the needs of an increasingly diverse socio-demographic is unlikely, I submit, because the discourse suggests school teachers see themselves as band directors first and music educators second. This is hardly surprising, given current teacher training practices where band students go the university to learn how to become band directors who then produce more band students ad infinitum. Practices of social reproduction are effectively a closed loop, leading to statements such as one I included in a Chapter Four footnote where the author impresses upon the reader, in reference to multiculturalism, the importance of selecting repertoire from different countries and proceeds to list Japanese, Austrian, British, and Dutch composers as examples of diversity (5/2, 106).

AN ACT OF RESISTANCE?

Disciplines are precisely the dangers from which Foucault is trying to help us save ourselves. (Gutting 2005, 4)
What we seem to have forgotten is that our major mission is to “educate” in the process of making music, not to make music in the hopes that some education might take place. (8:3, 12)

I began Chapter One with a story about being chastised by a festival adjudicator for not supplying a score for a piece the students had created on their own. Scores, of course, are almost always a mandatory part of the festival experience (concert band or jazz), making abundantly clear the point of the activity is to faithfully reproduce the score’s markings. According to Deleuze, Foucault was “fascinated by what he saw as much as by what he heard or read, and the archaeology he conceived of is an audiovisual archive” (1988, 50). Attending a band festival provides an excellent example of this. The spectacle and pretense of the event seem to render opaque the very reasons bands—or even music for that matter—came into existence. Whereas in early bands the musicians learned in order to entertain and make music, today the school musicians make music in order to experience a state of ‘knowing-ness’ said to be associated with art music, and in order to demonstrate their learnedness to others. Maloney, writing in full support of this latter position, observes:

Festivals having “eminent judges” contributed to a shift away from traditional philosophies and concepts of band repertoire and performance toward the realm of art-music. Accompanying this

---

In my own work as an adjudicator I frequently engage in an act of resistance by either not referring to the score, or by referencing it only as a guide.
evolution in philosophy were changes of concert venue from outdoor to indoor, of audience from general to particular, and of goals from entertainment to educational. Succeeding generations of band directors and students have become more musically sophisticated and technically advanced, enabling and challenging composers to write music of higher quality for wind groups. (1986, 48-49)

As Veyne points out, “a practice actively fills the void left by neighboring practices; it actualizes the potentialities that these neighboring practices prefigure in hollow form” (1997, 163; orig. emph.). The practice of banding has, in schools, been supplanted by the discipline of music education. Music is now made in order to educate through the use of high quality art music. This education, however, can only be ascertained by reference to the score.

Prado writes, “genealogy’s struggle is necessary to prevent established disciplines from gaining total hegemony over subjectivity and eventually obliterating differences among subjects” (2000, 109). For McLaren, the exposure of social norms and disciplinary practices “helps to empower those who are disenfranchised and opens up possibilities for resistance” (2002, 156). Although I had not conceived of this project in emancipatory terms (a very un-Foucaultian idea, since one can never escape power), I must acknowledge a definite element of Foucaultian resistance is present. Although this resistance is directed at what I consider the suffocating effects of this particular disciplinary practice, I must clarify these effects are likely experienced as much by the music teachers as the students themselves, for it is the discipline that determines what teachers are permitted and not
permitted to do. And yet, it is ultimately the students who are the objects of music teaching practices, and it is they who experience its effects. Succeeding generations are now the product of current practices in music education stylizing lives according to the ‘regimes of truth’ present in the discourse. The question music educators must ask is if the current ‘regimes of truth’ really serve the best interests of society and the profession.

**IMPLICATIONS**

As I have stated repeatedly, my analysis of the discourses must be considered nothing other than a reading. It is a reading with significant implications for music education, however. I did not fabricate or ‘cherry pick’ the statements from the journals. I also have done my best not to misrepresent the context of the selected statements. According to the Foucaultian framework employed in this study, readers do not have to agree with the statements appearing in the journals, but one cannot contest their validity. The statements are utterances that appear under the guise of authority since they have been published in the association’s journal. They represent, in other words, legitimate statements about the teaching and learning occurring in school bands. A better understanding of the discourse holds the potential to better understand “what our doing does” and, hence, holds the potential for a reevaluation of what music education does and
why.\textsuperscript{271} What follows are some possible implications for music educators generally, but specifically for those who direct school bands.

\section*{Making Music}

One gets the impression that the singing school was more an activity than a learning experience, more a social occasion than a musical event. (Green and Vogan 1991, 47)

More often than not, music penetrated the life of the school because of its universal appeal as entertainment. (Green and Vogan 1991, 172)

The tensions surrounding the visibility of performance are problematic. On the one hand it is difficult to marshal public support for music programs if the public does not have an idea of what they are supposed to support. On the other hand, it is difficult to defend the value of performance in and of itself if it is not perceived as possessing lifelong skill or knowledge. The investment of public monies in schools has the historical expectation of fostering skills, knowledge, and/or values that persist beyond high school graduation. I know I was not the only band director who was informed by a parent that their daughter or son would not be continuing in the band program because their child was not going to “go into music.” The perceived

\textsuperscript{271} Recall Foucault’s line from Dreyfus and Rabinow, \textit{Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics}: “People know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don’t know is what what they do does.”
value of school band participation in the eyes of many, in other words, is confined to the present. There is nothing lasting about it.

While the political reality of visibility for various stakeholders in education is perhaps understandable, the equivocal approach to performance on the part of music educators is less so. For example, as one writer puts it, “the ultimate proof of success in any musical project is in the performance” (15:4, 4). Another concurs, suggesting “adjudicating and clinic work provides a bird’s eye view of the musical achievements of school music programs, community bands, and conservatories that, of all my professional activities, yields the best picture of music education common practice” (15:2, 5). For others, however, “the long-term value of music education in the lives of our students is more important than the short-term rewards.” That is, “the process of teaching and exploring music is more important than producing concerts or participating in contests and festivals...The educational outcomes for our students must be emphasized over the residual entertainment value that is often a high priority of administrators and parents” (3/1, 45). Administrators and parents, in other words, seem to find value in the immediacy of the performance some band teachers do not. For many music educators, there are apparently educational outcomes outside of performance (rarely defined, and so one typically assumes this means things like sensitivity to and appreciation of beauty) that are to be the true object of pedagogical practice.
There is no “answer” to this dilemma, but it seems unacceptable that this tension goes unaddressed in the discourse. Music education simply does not seem to recognize its existence. I am not suggesting philosophy can be apolitical, but it is as though music educators have blurred the distinction between advocacy and philosophy. Or perhaps the music education profession has simply found it easier to construct new philosophical positions to compensate for the fact current practices do not seem to result in lifelong participation. That is, if doing is not an overt lasting value, then knowing (of some fashion) must serve as a surrogate.

The Music (Repertoire)

The discourse is unequivocal on this matter: bands must perform music of the highest possible quality. What is absent from the discourse is any substantial discussion of why this is so, or any questioning of the basis on which “quality” music is determined. The pedagogical band world is continually bombarded with lists of what are taken to be the best music, from numerous festival syllabi to books that announce The Best Music for Young Bands, and more recently the Teaching Music Through Performance

---


273 Including the CBA’s own “sanctioned list” (see, for example, CW 1/2).
series. In almost every case, however, these lists are constructed by, or at least heavily influenced by, university wind band conductors (who create the discourse advocating the use of “quality music” in the first place). The needs and concerns of the school band world are assumed to be synonymous with that of the university. The implications here are problematic, insofar as it is difficult to imagine any escape from this paradigm since universities instill their values in the teachers of school bands. Furthermore, as my own experience has taught me, the profession is extremely effective at ensuring the reproduction of its values.

There is no escaping that performing ensembles perform something. As a result, there is no avoiding the decision of what to play with school bands. While it is speculative, one wonders what might happen if school bands were to abandon the pursuit of the “highest quality repertoire” in favour of an approach where band directors were encouraged to write and arrange music in the spirit of early town bands. Although composing and arranging skills are necessary, and I am not downplaying the difficulty of these skills nor the time required for such an endeavour, current technology

274 Best Music for Young Band: A Selective Guide to the Young Band/Young Wind Ensemble Repertoire by Thomas L. Dvorak is just one of many such examples. To this one could add research studies compiling the most frequently performed compositions, typically by university wind groups.

275 For example, music festivals police the kinds of music deemed acceptable and not. The trophies do not go to those performing anything other than “the finest literature.” The current practice of publishing concert programs complete with the names of directors in CW aids in surveillance to ensure no one steps out of line.
now makes such an idea feasible, insofar as piano-style score writing can easily be “exploded” into a full score with transposed parts at the push of a button.\textsuperscript{276} Although such a practice places more curricular and instructional emphasis on teachers in their new role as the supplier of music, it also holds the potential to demystify the interpretive process in music performance. Instead of attempting to divine the intentions of this entity called the \textit{composer}, students would view their teacher, the creator of the composition/arrangement as a flesh and blood, fallible person just like themselves. Interpretive decisions would therefore not be understood as stemming from universal laws known only by the teacher—the possessor of specialized knowledge, but the result of the situated wishes of the teacher. Other ancillary benefits of course include the ability to tailor music to the personnel in the group, the potential for student input into the music chosen to be composed/arranged, and the possibility of involving students in the composition and arranging process.

As long as the educative substance of school band practices is considered to reside in the music itself (“the repertoire \textit{is} the curriculum”), and certain music is apotheosized as art as is now the case, the primary question in music education will continue to be \textit{What is} good music? rather than \textit{What is} music good \textit{for}? Not only does the former question place the emphasis on what the teacher does rather than what the students do, it has

\textsuperscript{276} Notation programs now often include such a feature.
more pernicious effects in that it places functional music on a lower plane than supposedly non-functional (i.e., art) music, dismissing much of the outside-of-school music that students love.\textsuperscript{277} “Quality music” supposedly serves nothing but its own interests.\textsuperscript{278} And because quality music serves only its own interests, the evaluative criteria for such music remains in the hands of “qualified” (the initiated) experts—those who already share the values of such music. From a Foucaultian perspective, this is an excellent example of the workings of power-knowledge, where the musical knowledge and tastes of students are subjugated to the legitimate knowledge of the university—the institution ultimately responsible for training teachers and determining what and how to teach.\textsuperscript{279}


\textsuperscript{278} In an example from a different context but which further underscores this point, Green and Vogan write how music used in Protestant churches in nineteenth century Canada was concerned only with worship; “there was little effort to attain purely musical or aesthetic goals” (1991, 45).

\textsuperscript{279} Technically, curricula are the purview of provincial departments of education, but in practice universities control teacher certification. In the absence of any form of provincial inspection music teachers are most likely to enact the kinds of curricular and instructional practices of their university teacher training.
Teaching, Learning, and Serving Interests

You cannot stay on the summit forever, you have to come down again. So why bother in the first place? Just this: What is above knows what is below, but what is below does not know what is above. One climbs, one sees, one descends, one sees no longer—but one has seen. There is a way of conducting oneself in the lower regions by the memory of what one saw higher up. When one can no longer see, one can at least still know. We live and love by what we have seen.

—René Daumal\textsuperscript{280} (21:2, 3)

The epigram above embodies what is believed by the band world (and perhaps the music education profession) to be the value of the ensemble experience: students participate in school bands in order to attain a “peak” experience which they then carry with them for the rest of their lives; there is no obligation or expectation to continue to climb mountains, as it were. Furthermore, one does not climb mountains for ongoing health benefits, but to see (or know things) not visible from lower down, thus metaphorically reinforcing the idea knowledge “at the top” (e.g., university or theoretical knowledge) is of greater value than that on the ground (e.g., lived or ‘practical’ knowledge). An instrumental logic permeates; climbing the mountain is a one-time event. As such it is also metaphorically comparable to the art—or aesthetic—experience of appreciation, although the discourse

\textsuperscript{280} René Daumal (1908-1944) was a French writer, philosopher and poet. I cite his name to indicate that this passage is not the work of a CBJ/CW author. It appeared under the caption, “Food for Thought.”
does include the added hope aesthetic experiences might be repeated beyond graduation by consuming the products of others.281

What is conspicuously absent from the discourse is any discussion of how music making can or should form part of the regular fabric of students’ lives. Whereas music education discourses from the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century made frequent reference to music’s value as a worthwhile use of leisure time, such references, one assumes, are deemed inappropriate today since public education cannot or should not concern itself with supporting leisure time activities. As a result, little connection is made between students’ in school and out of school musical involvement. It is not surprising, then, to find a reliance on the growth metaphor (Chapter Four), where teachers envision their task as feeding students a healthy diet—one defined as healthy by the use of “quality” music in order to prepare students for a lifetime of “loving” music. As long as students are exposed to the right kind of music, the argument goes, they will develop the appropriate musical tastes necessary for both appreciating and gaining knowledge and insight into the distinctly human qualities of beauty, something which will lead instrumentally to the development of the well-rounded Western mind. What is missing from this argument is any sense of compulsion. When learning is conceptualized in terms of content to be

281 “Let’s hope that we as educators can continue to find ways of teaching music that inspire our young students to value music in their worlds for an entire lifetime. After all, they are future concert-goers and arts supporters, and the future parents of more band students” (4/2, 111).
mastered, the engagement concludes when the content is considered “learned.” Although discussed in a very different context, Foucault’s discussion of truth and Descartes seems relevant here: the way students are taught music leads to a metaphorical situation where they ‘can know the truth and act immorally’ (see GE, 279). That is, the discourse shows no connection between knowing and doing.

Less easily explained are pedagogical discourses placing the conductor at the center of all music teaching and learning in bands. While there are no doubt potential advantages to having teachers as participants in the music-making process through their role as conductor, learning theories suggest that learning resides in the mind of the student, not the teacher. The faith in an osmosis approach to teaching and learning where it is assumed that students will become musical through their symbiotic relationship with the conductor seems questionable. It seems to stretch plausibility to the extreme to posit students will learn to become independent musical thinkers when the conductor assumes total ownership and responsibility for all aspects of musical learning. That is, while many instructional practices in school bands are extremely effective at training ensembles to produce exactly what the conductor wants, the discourse always assumes this is a good thing. It is understood that the ability of the ensemble to produce the

\[282\] I am not trying to suggest induction does not play a part in learning music.

\[283\] To reiterate a point made earlier, it is not uncommon for high school ensembles to perform music at a very advanced technical level.
sounds exactly the way the conductor stipulates (by responding appropriately to gesture, for example) is indicative of musical learning. And while the ability of the ensemble to perform what the conductor wants is indicative of the presence of specific skills and knowledge, what is problematic is the unexamined assumption that these particular skills and this kind of knowledge best serve the students’ interests.

I do not mean to downplay the significance of experiencing “well polished” music making. Perhaps the value of the ensemble experience does reside there, in which case the epigram above holds. Through their participation in this distinctive kind of group activity, students are part of an experience that will serve as a reminder to them throughout their lives of the possibilities inherent in collaborative work (led, however, by a significant individual possessing privileged knowledge). If this is the case, however, a

\[284\] Well, almost always. Infrequently (although notably never in CW) a statement appears to question the stimulus-response model: “It is entirely possible to train a band, choir, or orchestra to perform a major work of music to an extraordinarily high degree of excellence without the individual membership of that organization having any real understanding of the music itself beyond their own individual part” (13:2, 30). As the author continues, however, it becomes clear it is not the behaviorist aspects of teaching that are problematic, but the incompleteness of the content: “Oftentimes, background information pertaining to the composer, the musical style, historical significance, etc., are areas never touched upon in the rehearsal situation. Everything is geared to getting the individual part machined to perfection. When this approach is used, brought on usually by the pressure for superior rating, young people are often times ‘turned off’ rather than ‘turned on’ to music” (ibid.). Including information on the composer and the historical significance of the music, in other words, is proposed as a solution to the problem of individual musical understanding and turning young people “on” to music.
rethinking of how and why we do what we do in school bands is required, since at present the discourse promotes the view that ensemble participation holds value (in terms of skills and knowledge) for the individual both in the present and in future. This, it seems, is an untenable argument, since the discourse does not indicate any desire for the co-creation of musical meaning. As demonstrated in Chapter Four, the conductor studies the score to share her or his findings with the ensemble. The student is not a protagonist in learning, but the recipient of received wisdom. Again, nothing is “wrong” with this model of teaching and learning, but it does beg the question of whose interests are being served by it. While the discourse repeatedly invokes the importance of fostering a love for music, the exact form this love is to take emphasizes consumption over production. Repeatedly the discourse speaks of creating future audiences—ones that, if music education has done its job well, will consume not just music, but the right kind of music. In this case, the motives of music education are open to serious scrutiny since composers and (classical) musicians seem to benefit more than the students themselves. Ultimately, the music education profession must ask itself if its definition of a musical society is based on concert attendance and supporting the musical tastes of the artistic establishment or on active music making.
A Radical Proposal?

It did not take me long to realize that I was in the middle of an exciting new band movement; that of the beginning adult member. It is a concept that is simple, straightforward, and guarantees committed and enthusiastic members, and which exemplifies the purpose of a community band; the enjoyment of music. (14:3, 31; emph. added)

I would like to believe many of the students in the bands I directed enjoyed their music making. I suspect for many, however, their presence in the band room was likely motivated by more than just the potential enjoyment of the music. Although recreational music makers probably partake in their activity for a variety of reasons, their volitional engagement in the absence of such things as grades, status, or, I suspect, the belief they are developing insights into beauty and the human condition, points to a desire to involve themselves with “banding” because they believe it is time well spent. Of all the things they could choose to do, some people choose to make music. And while it is certainly true an element of habit is involved—people continue to do what they do because it is what they do—it is unlikely most people would continue to involve themselves in an activity they did not find enjoyable and believed was in some way good for them.285

---

285 This thesis touches on the area of preference formation. See, for example, Serena Olsaretti (ed.), Preferences and Well-being (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
As discussed in Chapter Two, the ancient Greek precept of *epimeleia heautou* (‘care of the self’) was an ethic permeating ancient existence. Living an ethical existence required caring for oneself in the pursuit of a beautiful life. One of Foucault’s observations is that in practice this ethic was closer to a medical than pedagogical model. While this is entirely speculative, I propose music education could be reconceptualized along medical rather than pedagogical lines, but to be clear, I am thinking salubrity not pathology. My experience as a school teacher leads me to understand physical education is taught in schools because society believes good physical health is important, not because physical education students are thought to be deriving particular insights into the human body, the art of sport, or to become professional athletes. To be clear, I am advancing the concept of health and well-being, not the potentially harmful effects of medical discourse that treats sickness as abnormality. Conceiving of music education in medical rather than pedagogical terms might emphasize the importance of music as part of the social fabric of living, and emphasize the importance of providing enjoyment to others through musical performance; the importance, in other words, of *doing* music rather than *knowing* it. The focus of such an ethic would resemble that, in other words, of banding in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This is not to naïvely suggest it is possible to return to an earlier era. Leisure and recreation options, 286 "Permanent medical care is one of the central features of the care of the self. One must become the doctor of oneself" (TS, 31).
among many other aspects of contemporary living, are vastly different. Nonetheless, it is not impossible to re-imagine musical engagement taught for its potential to improve well-being and quality-of-life rather than its potential for increasing insights into beauty and fashioning the well-rounded mind. A reconceptualization of music along medical (i.e., salubrious) lines would, I propose, stylize lives very differently from current practices, leading to a very different kind of musical society.

**FUTURE RESEARCH**

The conceptual and methodological approaches in this research study, while not unprecedented in other fields, have not, to my knowledge, been employed in music education. I believe this study demonstrates the potential for corpus-assisted methods to be applied to discourse analysis in music education research. I also believe the Foucaultian conceptual framework used holds the potential for understanding music education in ways not previously theorized. I do not believe school band discourses in the United States differ in substantial ways from the discourses examined in this study, but further research using American-based journals would help ascertain this.

---

287 I recognize the possible similarities here to Platonic rationales for music. The difference, I submit, is that I am not claiming music-as-music is good or bad for people. Rather, I am suggesting music-as-activity as a social practice is good for people. As Rufus of Ephesus states, “choruses were not invented just for honoring the deity, but also in view of health” (CS, 130).
assertion. More significantly, replication of this study could be conducted with journals representing different aspects of school music education, such as choral, elementary, and general music, with journals representing music teacher training, and with scholarly journals in music education.

Research is also needed that explores the material impact of discourses in music education. That is, studies are needed that examine the degree to which the ‘regimes of truth’ present in the pedagogical discourse are (or are not) manifested in the lives of school music graduates. While the thesis of this study is that pedagogical discourse attempts to stylize lives in particular ways, longitudinal studies of school music graduates might help ascertain the degree to which their lives actually reflect or fail to reflect the ‘regimes of truth’ in music education discourses. Another important area of research, mentioned in the ‘Silences’ section, concerns matters of omission and exclusion. Corpus-based methods would seem an extremely efficient way of examining such issues. Whereas this study faced the challenge of discerning ‘regimes of truth’ from an aggregate of words (a process involving introspection and downsampling), examining omissions and exclusions could involve a reverse process, generating a list of expected words in advance and then quickly searching and identifying them in the corpus. Given the

\footnote{Sim (2002) is one such important example. Sim’s work, while theoretically grounded and claiming to be a discourse study, is not corpus-based and does not fully explain the exact method used for data selection and analysis.}
growing interest in issues of social justice in music education, corpus-based or corpus-assisted methods hold tremendous potential.

One potential limiting factor to corpus-based and corpus-assisted research is its reliance on electronic corpora. Although electronic journals are becoming more common, this is a relatively new phenomenon, restricting the ease of acquiring electronic corpora to more recent volumes (JSTOR is helping to change this). Moreover, not all electronic journals are published in searchable form.\footnote{Due to copyright and proprietary concerns, I suspect many journals will be reluctant to release electronic source files directly to researchers. My requests for electronic files of \textit{CW}, for example, did not meet with success, necessitating the physical scanning of the journal.} Due to copyright and proprietary concerns, I suspect many journals will be reluctant to release electronic source files directly to researchers. My requests for electronic files of \textit{CW}, for example, did not meet with success, necessitating the physical scanning of the journal.\footnote{Hand scanning is time-consuming, and, as indicated in Chapter Three, often unreliable due to print quality and the relative effectiveness of optical character recognition software. Hopefully the trend towards online publication of searchable electronic files will facilitate future research efforts of this type.} Software does exist to convert files to searchable PDFs, but this does not circumvent the problem of OCR misidentifications.\footnote{I did not attempt to obtain electronic files of the \textit{CBJ} since the likely existence of such files was slim.}
FINAL THOUGHTS

Unlike those who are labeled ‘structuralists,’ I’m not really interested in the formal possibilities afforded by a system such as language. Personally, I am more intrigued by the existence of discourses, by the fact that words were spoken. Those events functioned in relation to their original situation, they left traces behind them, history, a certain number of manifest or secret functions. (WH, 289)

As I have argued in this dissertation, viewed historically the inclusion of bands in schools can be understood as stemming from the actions of various stakeholders rather than simply the natural outgrowth of something called “music education.” Nevertheless, the presence of bands in schools is now rationalized on the basis of, and conceptualized pedagogically as, music education. The institutionalization of bands (and music) has, I believed, transformed them in significant ways. It is no longer sufficient to just learn or do music; one must know it, understand it, appreciate it. By placing it within public institutions such as schools, music has become “public property.” Pursued with a somewhat different argument, Roberts (2004) provides, through a comparison with geography, an interesting examination of music becoming a school subject in the twentieth century.
“Using here the restricted sense of the word ‘government,’ one could say that power relations have been progressively governmentalized, that is to say, elaborated, rationalized, and centralized in the form of, or under the auspices of, state institutions” (SP, 345). This is to say that in many senses our lives have become increasingly governmentalized. By institutionalizing music, the needs of the State are the primary determinate of band and music practices.

Foucault’s varying conceptualizations of how we are made subjects have provided fertile ground for my study of subjectivity in music education. Veyne writes, “when we break the silence we can only speak a specific language” (1997, 154). Contrary to a unified consciousness dictating one’s way in the world, Foucault shows we are not free to think and do however we wish. There are constraints. The specific language we speak is determined by discourse. The goal of this study has been to show how practices in instrumental music in schools are not based on some inviolable essence of who we are or what music is, but rather the situated effect of historical processes. Veyne explains that “human phenomena are exceptional; they not ensconced in the plenitude of reason; there is empty space around the phenomena that we in our wisdom do not grasp; what is could be otherwise” (ibid., 147). My goal, in other words, has been to show both the contingency and surpassibility of the present. May summarizes this point well:
If who we are is a matter of our practices rather than of some human essence that determines us, then who we are is much more fluid and changeable than we are often taught. This is not to deny that the historical grip of our practices is a tight one. On the contrary, it is precisely the fact that our historical grip holds us so tightly that makes it seem to us that we cannot live otherwise than the way we do now, that we cannot be something other than what we are. How things are is not how they must be. By understanding our history we can intervene upon it. (2006, 21)

I am hopeful this study represents the first step towards intervening upon history. As May cautions, however, while Foucault “can reveal the contingency of who we have been told that we are...he cannot inflame the desire to be otherwise” (ibid., 23). That desire must come from those whose lives are being stylized by the discourse.
Appendix A - Journal Statistics

NOTES:

- French articles may have a distorting effect on CW statistics
- article and author tallies are approximate (some CBJ articles unattributed; definition of “an article” not always clear)
- the letters “Dr.” occasionally (but rarely) refer to a street name rather than a professional designation. “Dr.” appears in every issue of CBJ/CW, indicating the presence of authority
- 2 letter words used: as, at, be, by, do, go, hi, he, if, in, is, it, me, my, no, of, on, or, so, to, up, us, we
- total word count suggests CW is more dense on the page (confirmed visually)
- unique word count suggests CBJ vocabulary more varied (given greater OCR misidentifications in CW and the presence of French words in CW, CBJ should contain fewer unique words, not more)
- 2 letter word count suggests more OCR misidentifications in CW (confirmed visually). If 2 letter word usage is relatively stable, CW percentage should be in the 25-29% range (no. of pages; total words), not 23%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>% CW of CBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. of pages scanned</td>
<td>2512</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of issues (CBJ 4x/yr; CW 2x/yr.)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of articles (approx.)</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of separate authors (approx.)</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authors contributing 5 or more times</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of CBJ authors also in CW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearance of “Dr.”</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg. pages per year</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total words, 3 letters or more</td>
<td>977,079</td>
<td>285,890</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique words, 3 letters or more</td>
<td>95,857</td>
<td>85,413</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of 2 letter words</td>
<td>164850</td>
<td>37915</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B - Top 200 Rank Comparison (CJB/CW)

**NOTES:**
- Case sensitive, 4 letters and more
- Bold words = CBJ words not in CW top 400; CW words not in top CBJ 100
- Italics right-aligned: not part of normal text, French, or misidentified
- CBJ number in parentheses is CW ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBJ count</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>rank compare CW/CBJ</th>
<th>CW count</th>
<th>CBJ count</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>rank compare CW/CBJ</th>
<th>CW count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>32/26</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7747</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>33/23</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6286</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>musical</td>
<td>34/21</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5837</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Band</td>
<td>Band</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>wind</td>
<td>35/91</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4919</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Continued</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>36/25</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4819</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>bands</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>37/61</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4159</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>7/16</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>conodiens</td>
<td>38/--</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4033</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>Winds</td>
<td>8/--</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>39/--</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3813</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>40/94</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3328</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>Vents</td>
<td>41/--</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2817</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>11/7</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>42/32</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2594</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>43/22</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2572</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>44/20</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2348</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>14/17</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>years</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>45/31</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2212</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>15/11</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>46/39</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2107</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>16/14</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>47/33</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>17/27</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>sound</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>48/51</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>18/54</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>49/56</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>19/15</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>50/35</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>20/18</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>instruments</td>
<td>51/63</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>musical</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>21/47</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>52/65</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>22/41</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>(362)</td>
<td>53/44</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>23/52</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>54/69</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>24/19</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>concert</td>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td>55/265</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>conductor</td>
<td>25/88</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>56/169</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>26/12</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>playing</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>57/73</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>27/43</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>these</td>
<td>58/29</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>must</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>28/146</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>performance</td>
<td>instrument</td>
<td>59/79</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>these</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>29/30</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>playing</td>
<td>60/57</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>ensemble</td>
<td>30/83</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>jazz</td>
<td>61/90</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>31/34</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>Concert</td>
<td>62/149</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>instruments</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>tion</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>sound</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Festival</td>
<td>(246)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>musicians</td>
<td>because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>bands</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>(248)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>years</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>players</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>notes</td>
<td>through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>groups</td>
<td>(266)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>composer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>piece</td>
<td>find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>best</td>
<td>think</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>part</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>flute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>program</td>
<td>part</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>quality</td>
<td>(206)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>piece</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>played</td>
<td>(204)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>anodion</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>players</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>(212)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>instrument</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>There</td>
<td>style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>available</td>
<td>long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>being</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>does</td>
<td>(372)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>percussion</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>point</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>ensemble</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>young</td>
<td>Suite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>pour</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>(308)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>(211)</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>(1897)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>must</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>line</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>those</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>plus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>conductor</td>
<td>musicians</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>section</td>
<td>reed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>where</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>composer</td>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>jazz</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>ÒnOdÎøn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>wind</td>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>need</td>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>held</td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>made</td>
<td>(231)</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>(3987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>rehearsal</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>(485)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>director</td>
<td>while</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>under</td>
<td>(446)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>tone</td>
<td>ensembles</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>They</td>
<td>director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>every</td>
<td>(258)</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>percussion</td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>members</td>
<td>(317)</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>notes</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>while</td>
<td>still</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>(278)</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>(285)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>BAND</td>
<td>(447)</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>available</td>
<td>148/128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>(391)</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>146/125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>world</td>
<td>conducting</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>(416)</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>(285)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>player</td>
<td>where</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>available</td>
<td>148/128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBJ count</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>rank compare CW/CBJ</th>
<th>CBJ count</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>rank compare CW/CBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>149/661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Concert</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>150/243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>down (242)</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>151/181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>place (271)</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>152/363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>hear (300)</td>
<td>program</td>
<td>153/75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>Grainger</td>
<td>154/1589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>always (237)</td>
<td>printemps</td>
<td>158/--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Calgary (238)</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>159/153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>without (274)</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>160/100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>number (319)</td>
<td>Symphony</td>
<td>161/81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>162/115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>come (347)</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>164/255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Symphony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>163/584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>rehearsal</td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>support (515)</td>
<td>solo</td>
<td>164/255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>order (326)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>study (292)</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>171/283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>High (205)</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>172/277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>When</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td>orchestra</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>past (511)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>arts (579)</td>
<td>saxophone</td>
<td>176/424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td>those</td>
<td>177/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>times (379)</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>178/540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>When</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>179/489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>last</td>
<td></td>
<td>composers</td>
<td>180/137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td></td>
<td>group</td>
<td>181/70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>member (625)</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>182/224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>become (346)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Folk</td>
<td>183/1129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>information (254)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poll</td>
<td>184/--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>still</td>
<td></td>
<td>four</td>
<td>185/135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>before (426)</td>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>186/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>different (264)</td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>187/246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>should be</td>
<td>188/--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix C - Top 500 Alphabetical Comparison

**CBJ-CS–The Recorder**

**NOTES:**
- Some words shifted for ease of comparison
- CBJ bold words are missing from CW top 500
- CW bold words are missing from CBJ top 500
- Recorder bold words are missing from CBJ/CW top 500
- CW and Recorder right-aligned: not part of normal text, French, or misidentified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBJ ranking</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW ranking</th>
<th>The Best of The Recorder ranking</th>
<th>Recorder ranking</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW ranking</th>
<th>The Best of The Recorder ranking</th>
<th>Recorder ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>ability</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>back Bach</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>able</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Band</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>background 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>ability</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>able</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>balance 269</td>
<td>balance</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>able</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>BAND</td>
<td>Band</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>bands</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>BAND</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td>across</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>based</td>
<td>bands</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>ability</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>back Bach</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>addition</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td>399                         activities</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>basic</td>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>addition</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>basis</td>
<td>bars</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>addition</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>bass</td>
<td>based</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>adjudicator</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>bass</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>almost</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>become</td>
<td>bassoon</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>along</td>
<td>allow</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>beat</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>became</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>alto</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>begin</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>allow</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>beginning</td>
<td>become</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>being</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>annual</td>
<td>and cl</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>believe</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>another</td>
<td>another</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>another</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>best</td>
<td>beginning</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>approach</td>
<td>approach</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>better</td>
<td>being</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>area</td>
<td>around</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>best</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>areas</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>around</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>better</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>around</td>
<td>articles</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>arranged</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>arts</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>BORDER</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>arrangements</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>attention</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>Boundy</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>audience</td>
<td>author</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>articulation</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>brain</td>
<td>brass</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>available</td>
<td>available</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>brass</td>
<td>Brass</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CBJ | CBJ | CW | CW | The Best of The Recorder | Recorder | CBJ | CBJ | CW | CW | The Best of The Recorder | Recorder
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
216 | Brass | C00n0dln | 483 | brass | 172 | 100 | during | down | 242 | during | 403
399 | British | Cable | 427 | Brass | 272 | 42 | each | during | 278 | dynamics | 199
155 | Calgary | Calgary | 238 | breathing | 212 | 458 | Each | each | 87 | each | 25
266 | call | Canada | 17 | Canada | 124 | 407 | early | early | 196 | eand | 346
295 | called | Canadian | 15 | Canadian | 93 | 344 | Editor | Edmonton | 417 | Education | 135
27 | case | canadiens | 191 | case | 432 | 270 | Edmonton | education | 71 | education | 147
11 | Canadian | case | 354 | challenge | 273 | 92 | education | Education | 169 | Educators | 491
313 | CANADIAN | Centre | 179 | challenges | 433 | 355 | Education | educational | 382 | effect | 492
321 | cannot | century | 312 | challenging | 399 | 326 | educational | educators | 316 | effective | 200
359 | Capt | chamber | 464 | chamber | 480 | 368 | educators | elements | 493
466 | case | Chicago | 364 | change | 481 | 490 | effort | encourage | 366
489 | Centre | chart | 434 | 349 | either | English | 404
374 | certain | children | 299 | 382 | else | ensemble | 42
401 | change | chord | 482 | 366 | enough | Ensemble | 192
384 | changes | chord | 130 | 83 | ensemble | ensemble | 30 | ensembles | 226
341 | children | class | 40 | 211 | Ensemble | Ensemble | 55 | especially | 405
472 | City | classroom | 73 | 370 | ensembles | 96 | eth | 173
329 | clarinet | clarinet | 168 | clear | 434 | 454 | entire | especially | 270 | evaluation | 105
387 | class | clarinets | 440 | clinician | 483 | 315 | especially | eth | 449 | even | 121
164 | College | class | 224 | come | 181 | 60 | even | even | 189 | every | 159
450 | color | clinician | 448 | community | 344 | 333 | event | every | 258 | everyone | 438
163 | come | Coalition | 484 | composition | 400 | 303 | ever | example | 216 | example | 108
208 | community | College | 403 | concept | 484 | 97 | every | excellent | 339 | examples | 494
467 | complete | Collegiate | 371 | concepts | 485 | 383 | example | exercises | 450 | excellent | 227
137 | composer | come | 347 | concert | 317 | 125 | experience | experience | 146 | exercises | 439
300 | composers | community | 305 | conducting | 486 | 234 | fact | feel | 226 | expectations | 495
439 | composition | composer | 117 | conductor | 190 | 311 | feel | Festival | 246 | experience | 61
461 | concept | composers | 180 | correct | 365 | 108 | Festival | festival | 418 | fact | 193
55 | concert | composition | 294 | could | 94 | 316 | festival | final | 419 | family | 496
149 | Concert | concept | 489 | course | 213 | 256 | find | find | 118 | feel | 111
362 | concerts | Concert | 62 | create | 114 | 440 | fine | fine | 451 | festival | 300
485 | conducting | concert | 116 | creating | 487 | 47 | first | from | 195 | Festival | 497
88 | conductor | conducted | 387 | creative | 254 | 302 | five | first | 21 | festivals | 498
457 | conductors | conducting | 103 | criteria | 255 | First | 428 | find | 122
390 | Conference | conductor | 25 | critical | 435 | five | 279 | first | 48
412 | contact | conductors | 220 | currently | 256 | flat | 170 | five | 182
36 | Continued | conadiens | 38 | curriculum | 318 | flute | 122 | flat | 499
432 | continued | Conodion | 98 | cymbal | 436 | Folk | 183 | focus | 257
115 | could | consider | 465 | cymbals | 488 | Foll | 184 | following | 276
345 | Council | could | 162 | 317 | following | following | 373 | form | 150
416 | country | country | 277 | 279 | form | form | 340 | found | 142
240 | course | course | 388 | 371 | found | found | 383 | four | 160
500 | create | create | 348 | 135 | four | 185 | from | 12
141 | Deer | Dance | 389 | Dance | 401 | 297 | Frank | Frank | 329 | From | 347
451 | degree | Dances | 306 | demonstrate | 345 | 340 | Fred | Fraser | 429 | full | 137
299 | develop | dans | 140 | demonstrates | 274 | 8 | from | free | 392 | fundraising | 201
189 | development | David | 163 | develop | 191 | 294 | From | French | 365 | give | 167
187 | different | Dennis | 490 | development | 134 | 283 | full | from | 12 | goal | 348
95 | director | develop | 355 | different | 103 | 421 | further | front | 491 | goals | 367
102 | Director | development | 404 | difficult | 437 | 319 | general | full | 171 | good | 18
194 | Directors | different | 264 | District | 489 | 356 | give | give | 207 | Grade | 168
210 | directors | difficult | 390 | does | 120 | 193 | given | given | 452 | grade | 194
129 | does | direction | 338 | done | 275 | 350 | going | going | 492 | great | 51
391 | doing | director | 144 | down | 166 | 65 | good | good | 52 | group | 84
337 | done | Director | 391 | drum | 99 | 106 | great | Grade | 149 | groups | 228
150 | down | directors | 265 | Drum | 402 | 70 | group | Grainger | 154 | gthe | 258
236 | drum | does | 372 | dtthe | 490 | 116 | groups | great | 143 | guitar | 123
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>The Best of</th>
<th>Recorder</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>The Best of</th>
<th>Recorder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>half</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>learning</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>groups</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>least</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>leur</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>half</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>havea</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>levels</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>having</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>havethe</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>levels</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>harmonies</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>haveto</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>levels</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>heard</td>
<td>havea</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>hearing</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>line</td>
<td>line</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>held</td>
<td>having</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>help</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>lines</td>
<td>Linklater</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>line</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>help</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>listening</td>
<td>list</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>lines</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>here</td>
<td>held</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>literature</td>
<td>listen</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>list</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>help</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>horn</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>listening</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>listen</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>here</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>445</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>listening</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>listento</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>home</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>horn</td>
<td>Holst</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>however</td>
<td>horn</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>made</td>
<td>made</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>However</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>491</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>human</td>
<td>However</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>made</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>however</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>473</td>
<td>http</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>http</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>improvisation</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>454</td>
<td>include</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>include</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>information</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>marching</td>
<td>measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>instrument</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>485</td>
<td>instruments</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>means</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>instru</td>
<td>instruction</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>melodic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>melody</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>melody</td>
<td>melody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>member</td>
<td>members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>members</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>281</td>
<td>ment</td>
<td>might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>might</td>
<td>military</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>issue</td>
<td>296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>issues</td>
<td>431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>involved</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>move</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>itself</td>
<td>jazz</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>jazz</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>mouthpiece</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>jazz</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>joint</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>move</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>musical</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>musicand</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>musical</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>musician</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>just</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>musicians</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>398</td>
<td>musician</td>
<td>musical</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>must</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>kind</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>musicians</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>must</td>
<td>musician</td>
<td>486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>known</td>
<td>known</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>musicians</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>musique</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>must</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>later</td>
<td>later</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>learn</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>need</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>learn</td>
<td>learning</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>learned</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>needs</td>
<td>nconodiers</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>The Best of The Recorder</td>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>The Best of The Recorder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranking</td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td>ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>sense</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>these</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>shouldbe</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>sfor</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>These</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>There</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>simply</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>These</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>these</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>They</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>These</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>shouldbe</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>things</td>
<td>They</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>show</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>They</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sing</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>slow</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>solo</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>those</td>
<td>those</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>those</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>solo</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>solo</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>something</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>solos</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>sound</td>
<td>something</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>throughout</td>
<td>throughout</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>throughout</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>sounds</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>Ticheli</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Sousa</td>
<td>song</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>something</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>times</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>times</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>sound</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>song</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>tion</td>
<td>times</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>together</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>special</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>songs</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>tions</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>tone</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>stage</td>
<td>Spring2003</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>sound</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>today</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>standard</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>sounds</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>together</td>
<td>Trombone</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>standards</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>tone</td>
<td>together</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>trombone</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>tones</td>
<td>tone</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>trumpet</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stage</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>tuba</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>training</td>
<td>trombone</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>tune</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>start</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>trumpet</td>
<td>trumpet</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>turn</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>story</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>tune</td>
<td>tuba</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>under</td>
<td>under</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>understand</td>
<td>422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>until</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>studentsare</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>upon</td>
<td>Universityof</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>used</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>studentsto</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>used</td>
<td>until</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>using</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>using</td>
<td>used</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>usually</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>success</td>
<td>success</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>usually</td>
<td>using</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>successful</td>
<td>successful</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>styles</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>variety</td>
<td>valve</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>variety</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>success</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Vents</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>variant</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Suite</td>
<td>Suite</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>successful</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>Vents</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>summer</td>
<td>Symphonic</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>WASBE</td>
<td>vous</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>vocal</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Symphony</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Symphony</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>warm</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>Symphony</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ways</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>taken</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>taught</td>
<td>taught</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>task</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>teach</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>taught</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>teach</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Wher</td>
<td>where</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>where</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>technique</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>whether</td>
<td>while</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>technical</td>
<td>technical</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>While</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>where</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>tempo</td>
<td>tempo</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>while</td>
<td>Whitacre</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>tempo</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>whole</td>
<td>whole</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>whole</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>whole</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>wind</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>wind</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>theirown</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Winds</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Winds</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>where</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>There</td>
<td>There</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>CBJ</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>The Best of Recorder ranking</td>
<td>Recorder ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Winnipeg 178 within 469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>with 2 without 269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>within within 344 words 145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>work 22 works 209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>works 115 would 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>World world 424 written 149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>write write 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>year 80 year 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>years 67 years 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>York York 256 York 395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>your 14 your 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>Youth 487 Your 470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRUE**
Appendix D - Geographic Place Names

NOTES:
• Nova Scotia and British Columbia appear as separate words. The word British, however, also stands alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBJ rank</th>
<th>CBJ frequency</th>
<th>vol. /23</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>CW rank</th>
<th>CW frequency</th>
<th>issue /12</th>
<th>name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2817</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>CANADIAN</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Regina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>British *</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nova *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nova *</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Scotia *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Scotia *</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>British *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Columbia *</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CANADIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Columbia *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E - “Object” Distribution: CBJ Top 1000 Words

**NOTES:**
- some words fit more than one category
- italicized words are verbs and nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>freq</th>
<th>vol.</th>
<th>WHAT/WHO?</th>
<th>freq</th>
<th>vol.</th>
<th>proper nouns &amp; geography</th>
<th>freq</th>
<th>vol.</th>
<th>CONCEPTS/EVALUATION</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>freq</th>
<th>vol.</th>
<th>DOING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6286</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2819</td>
<td>23 Canadian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>23 time</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5837</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Band</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>23 Canada</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>23 musical</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4919</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>23 Association</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>23 work</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3328</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>23 Alberta</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>played</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>23 University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>22 sound</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>23 John</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>23 year</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>bands</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>23 National</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>23 good</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>concert</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>23 Ontario</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>22 tone</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>22 world</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>23 level</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>performance</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>23 Mann</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>22 notes</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>perform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>instruments</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>23 Calgary</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>22 important</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>23 College</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>23 piece</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>program</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>23 Toronto</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>23 best</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>players</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>23 American</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>22 note</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>instrument</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>23 March</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>23 works</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>ensemble</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>23 North</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>23 quality</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>conductor</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>22 Saskatchewan</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>23 experience</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>jazz</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>23 Keith</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>22 possible</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>wind</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>18 SOUTH</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>23 need</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>23 Sousa</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>23 down</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>tune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>director</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>23 Robert</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>22 support</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>members</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>18 BORDER</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>23 right</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>BAND</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>22 Reed</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>23 information</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>22 Symphony</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>23 development</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>23 United</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>23 written</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>player</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>22 Edmonton</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>23 basic</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Festival</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>22 World</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>23 style</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>believe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>22 Orchestra</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>22 instrumental</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>brass</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>23 Frank</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>23 better</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>conducting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>musicians</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>23 Youth</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>23 together</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>22 Manitoba</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>22 bass</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>groups</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>23 CANADIAN</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>23 sounds</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>tuning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>young</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>23 States</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>23 fact</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>designed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>composer</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>20 Regina</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>22 pitch</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>percussion</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>parts</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>solo</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Concert</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Capt</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ability</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>special</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>rehearsal</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Boundy</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>form</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>orchestra</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>success</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>arts</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>problems</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nova</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>opportunity</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>member</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>audience</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>mouthpiece</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>rhythm</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>programs</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>technical</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>result</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>WASBE</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>piano</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>directors</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>problem</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Brass</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>melody</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>schools</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>training</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>drum</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>stage</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>tones</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>trumpet</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>range</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>results</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>performers</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>melodic</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>composers</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Scotia</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>successful</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>organization</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Boosey</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>festival</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Suite</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>proper</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>educational</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Yamaha</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>concept</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>clarinet</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>MusicFest</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>tempo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>published</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bach</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>score</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>original</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>concerts</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pearen</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>educators</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>ensembles</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>reed</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>class</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank</td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>WHAT/WHO?</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>proper nouns &amp; geography</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>CONCEPTS/EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>publication</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>musician</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hawkes</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>rhythmic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>literature</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>saxophone</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>brain</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>marching</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>unique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>repertoire</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>composition</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>performances</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>horn</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>conductors</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>human</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>embouchure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Percussion</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>recording</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>technique</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>award</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>show</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>scale</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>career</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>tour</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>grade</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wilfred</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>list</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>McKinnon</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>material</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Forces</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>membership</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>method</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sudler</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>album</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>chord</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>march</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Symphonic</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Conductor</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Eklund</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>vocal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Marching</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>MacKay</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>exciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>instruction</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>PERCUSSION</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>texture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>military</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>beat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>business</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>pieces</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>standard</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank</td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>WHAT/WHO?</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>proper nouns &amp; geography</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>CONCEPTS/EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>finest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Saxophone</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>rehearsals</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>breath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>woodwind</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>photos</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ludwig</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>blend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>selection</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>effective</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>passage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>traditional</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>dedicated</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>truly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>artistic</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>production</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>mental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>classical</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>soon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>performer</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>model</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>contemporary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>answer</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>passage</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>truly</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>string</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>mental</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>expression</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>flute</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>soon</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>contemporary</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>snare</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>choir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>artists</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>festivals</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>money</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>difference</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>goals</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>conference</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>himself</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>timpani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>choir</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>society</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>soloist</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>classes</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>cost</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>patterns</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>scales</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>exercises</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>awards</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>recordings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>recordings</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>society</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>soloist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>cost</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>scales</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>scales</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>awards</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>compositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>compositions</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>chords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>chords</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>colleagues</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank</td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>WHAT/WHO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>clinics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>keys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>mallets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>trombone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>953</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>passages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>tuba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>provincial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>rhythms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F - Introspection List

**NOTES:**
- Asterisk denotes wildcard extensions (e.g. enjoy* also returns enjoying, enjoyment)
- Words derived from CBJ top 1000 word list, as well as journal differentials (where word rankings differed unexpectedly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully examined list</th>
<th>Explored list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>art*</td>
<td>appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know*</td>
<td>goal*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achiev*</td>
<td>attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn*</td>
<td>growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience</td>
<td>basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love</td>
<td>hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care/caring</td>
<td>believe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musical</td>
<td>help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communit*</td>
<td>better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parent*</td>
<td>hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct*</td>
<td>breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform</td>
<td>improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribut*</td>
<td>change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play*</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop*</td>
<td>research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper*</td>
<td>children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct*</td>
<td>learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repertoire</td>
<td>right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educat*</td>
<td>consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result*</td>
<td>listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiv*</td>
<td>control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious</td>
<td>make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoy*</td>
<td>correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service</td>
<td>model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entertain*</td>
<td>create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach*</td>
<td>need*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulfill</td>
<td>dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>train*</td>
<td>opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understand*</td>
<td>outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importan*</td>
<td>designed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valu*</td>
<td>potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruct*</td>
<td>effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>success*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>encourage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>problem*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>truly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wrong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G - Gender

NOTES:
• case insensitive
• not intended to be comprehensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBJ</th>
<th>CW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>421  she</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2870 he</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572  her</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2754 his</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13  female</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  male</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46  woman</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 man</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 women</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 men</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 herself</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 himself</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 chairman</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 chairmen</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0  chair</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 chairperson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  mankind</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


