

Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

I S S N 1 5 4 5 - 4 5 1 7

A refereed journal of the



Action for Change in Music Education

Volume 13 Number 2
July 2014

Vincent C. Bates, *Editor*

Brent C. Talbot, *Associate Editor*

Looking In from the Edges: A Journal Analysis of Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education

Jody Stark

© Jody Stark. 2014. The content of this article is the sole responsibility of the author. The ACT Journal and the Mayday Group are not liable for any legal actions that may arise involving the article's content, including, but not limited to, copyright infringement.

Special Features: When this document is open in Adobe Reader, endnotes and citations can be viewed by placing the cursor over the corresponding number or date.

Looking In from the Edges: A Journal Analysis of *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*

Jody Stark
University of Alberta

Abstract

This paper is a reflection on the stance, concerns, and rhetorical style of the MayDay Group (MDG) and its journal, "Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education." The theoretical assumption is that MDG constitutes a community of practice (Wenger 1998) with collective histories, agendas, and discursive practices. After discussing the workings and ethos of MDG, the article examines writing style and rhetorical moves used by ACT authors such as strategies to establish credibility, disagreeing with other scholars, and how authors negotiate tensions between loyalty to the community and originality in their writing. Rather than a cohesive 'ACT style,' this analysis shows that the uniting feature of articles in the journal is their intersection with MDG's Action Ideals and that ACT provides a great deal of latitude for originality in thought and writing. Keywords: Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, MayDay Group, journal analysis, rhetorical style, community of practice

In sum, music education's official philosophy... neglects the epistemological significance of music making. It fails to acquit the art of music. Due to its myopic focus on music as a collection of isolated and autonomous objects, MEAE [Music Education as Aesthetic Education] overlooks the more fundamental and logically prior consideration that music is something that people do and make. Put another way, music is a verb as well as a noun.

David Elliott (1991), Charter member of MDG

Just as curriculum theorists have reconceived of curriculum as a verb (Pinar 1975), many scholars in music education have reconceived of music as human activity: something that people do as opposed to a product that people make. This move towards a praxial conception of music marks a sharp departure from the notion of music as work of art embedded in the grand narrative of aesthetic music

education, or Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE). MEAE has dominated the field of music education since the 1950s (Wheeler 2006) both in theory and in practice, so much so that those who embrace a praxial conception of music education in many ways have positioned themselves as critical theorists in their field.

Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education (ACT) was founded in 2001 by such a group of international scholars who called themselves *The MayDay Group*. The group first met on May 1, or May Day, 1993, and the name was chosen to commemorate the date of this first meeting as well as to sound a distress-call for the field of music education. The name was also chosen as a nod to May Day's association with renewal and fertility rites and to celebrating revolutionary action in certain countries; accordingly, the MayDay Group states that part of its mandate is to incite renewal for the profession through action (MayDay Group 2011).

This paper is an analysis of the stances, concerns, and rhetorical style of the MayDay Group journal as a discourse community, looking in from the outside. The theoretical assumption is that the MayDay Group (MDG) constitutes a community of practice (Wenger 1998) with its own collective history, agenda, and discursive practices. Selected articles will be analyzed for both underlying and overt beliefs about music education, key topics of the MDG's collective discourse, and rhetorical style. Articles were chosen for this inquiry in an attempt to include different genres that are regularly published in the journal (book reviews, philosophical inquiries, research reports), articles from different time periods from the life of the journal (early, mid, and late), and articles where the authors have used different and interesting rhetorical styles. Each of the articles included in the review were also personally interesting to me because of their topics and because of the excellent writing, which I should note is a salient feature of every article I have read that has been published in ACT. In order to situate the discourse of the journal, I will first examine the unique stance of its parent discourse community.

Action Ideals and Epistemology of the MayDay Group

(The MayDay Group's) analytical agenda is to interrogate traditional and status quo conceptions of music and music education from the perspectives of critical theory, critical thinking and research from all relevant disciplines. Its positive agenda is to inspire and promote action for change, both concerning how music and musical value are understood in the contemporary world of music and in the institutions responsible for music in society, particularly music education.

Thomas Regelski (2002a), Co-Founder of the MayDay Group

Like many academic associations, the MayDay group is founded on explicitly stated principles, but the group's official charter clearly conceives of its seven "regulative ideals" for action as provisional (MayDay Group 2011).¹ Dialogue seems to be a key value of the MayDay Group. In contrast to many academic conferences, a large amount of time at MDG colloquia is set aside for formal discussion. This commitment is also evident in the journal where authors are encouraged not only to write thought-provoking articles, but to respond to past articles in ACT. The organization's website has many eColumns on topics as varied as community music, social justice, policy, curriculum, and urban and rural music programs where members and the public can leave comments about each post, although there is very little action to date. Although not all columnists have taken advantage of the feature, each eColumn also potentially has a number of links to blogs on that topic as well as a link to podcasts (although these links are not active at the time of writing). In addition, the organization used to have a discussion forum for connecting members and currently has a Facebook page meant to serve a similar function (Vincent Bates, personal communication, April 29, 2014).

The MDG website states that membership in the organization is free and open to anyone in the world from any field, provided they are "interested in contributing to discourse that challenges unexamined assumptions about music and music-making, and who wishes as well to help address the MayDay Group's guiding ideals for music education practice" (MayDay Group 2011). Even though some have contested the implication that the MDG is a completely open group, there seems to be general agreement that it provides an important discourse space in music education.²

The MayDay Group has grown significantly since its inception. The majority of members live in the USA, but MDG is definitely an international organization with

adherents from Japan, Ghana, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Austria, Hong Kong, Sweden, Belgium, New Zealand, Cyprus, Portugal, England, Germany, Finland, Ireland, Greece, the Philippines, Costa Rica, Brazil, and China. Members are predominantly academics in music, arts, and education but also include graduate students, and secondary and elementary teachers. Like the journal, the MDG website is open-access, although the steering committee has recently agreed to make the membership list available to members only in order to safeguard personal information.

MDG does not use titles, list degrees, or provide links to personal websites of its members, and the organization is run by a steering committee that acts without a chair and meets annually at the MayDay Colloquia. The editor of ACT is a member of the steering committee, but the steering committee has no direct responsibility for the journal. Rather, members of the ACT editorial board serve in both review and advisory capacities. Both the association and the journal are run by volunteers, and in order to ensure autonomy, neither have an institutional home. As is clear from these logistical arrangements, the principles of equality, autonomy, democracy, and equal access are core commitments of the group.

The MayDay Stance

As the quote at the beginning of the previous section and the title of the journal *Action, Criticism and Theory for Music Education* suggest,³ critical scholarship is the MDG's central tenet and reason for being. The MayDay Group's Action Ideals correspond to varying degrees with Agger's (2006) seven features of critical social theory: opposition to positivism; a distinction between an imperfect past and the present, and a vision of the future free of oppression, exploitation, and domination; an attempt to highlight the place of societal institutions in perpetuating unjust social arrangements; an emphasis on personal agency in transforming false consciousness; a belief in the importance of free will; a dialectical view of structure and agency; and, the conviction that people must be responsible for their own personal liberation. More specifically, the MayDay Group's Action Ideals seem to have been drafted as an alternative stance to the 'grand narrative' of aesthetic and performance-based music education.

As mentioned in the introduction, it appears that a core difference between the MayDay Group and the dominant music education community relates to how music is conceived: music as practice (praxial) or music as object (aesthetic), with MDG tending towards the praxial end of the spectrum in contrast to many if not most other music education organizations. The “practice turn,” as Thomas Regelski (2002a) calls it, corresponds to a general shift in education and the social sciences away from the fixed ontology and naïve realism of positivism. The implications of this turn for music education are significant. Music’s very nature and value are re-imagined by members of the MayDay Group as being relative, constructed, and situated. Music is defined as *human activity* that has meaning for specific people in a specific culture.

As a result, MayDay’s Action Ideals call for music education that is socially and culturally located (Ideals 2 and 5), a conception of music as a living and evolving practice (Ideals 3 and 6),⁴ and music making seen as a reflective practice (Schön 1983) and consisting in a dialectical relationship between theory and action (Ideal 1). Ideal 1 is a direct assault on the dominant culture of music education in which performance is the supreme (and often only) goal. Ideal 4 suggests concern for deconstructing the power of the institutions of music education. The organization’s orientation toward action, both in how it re-conceives of music and in how it proposes to approach the field of music education, are key tenets of MDG. At first glance, Ideal 7 does not seem to fit either with critical social theory or a non-positivist view of education. The explanation under Ideal 7 ends with the following statement: “Thus a consensus on curricular standards—the criteria of effective teaching and learning—needs to be as strong a part of the preparation and practice of music educators as are the standards of musicianship.” Although the idea of standards and consensus may seem out of place in an organization that so clearly espouses a non-positivist and critical epistemology, this statement is included most likely as a response to the 1994 National Standards drafted by the Music Education National Conference (MENC) and the view of the MayDay Group founders that issues of methodology have remained unquestioned and rooted in traditional methods and practices. For example, Thomas Regelski (2002b) goes so far as to write of rampant “methodolatry” in music education.

In conclusion, the foundational epistemology of the MayDay Group is in direct

opposition to the dominant positivist/aesthetic view of music as a fixed object and the ensuing Cartesian dualism between music and person. Consequently, MDG is opposed to a view of music education as one of helping students to uncover and appreciate a fixed and universal meaning. The MayDay Group also clearly stands in opposition to the dominant narrative of music education as simply performance and hopes to bring about action and change in the field by deconstructing and reconstructing music education; uncovering issues of power, social injustice, privilege and other issues in the practice of music teaching; and by questioning current teaching practices and their underlying philosophy. As we shall see, all of these values and concerns are clearly evidenced in the group's journal.

The following section outlines the organization of *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* and provides a brief summary of topics addressed by several authors in the journal, both of which will provide helpful context for an examination of rhetorical style and writing.

Action for Change in Music Education

1. Musical action that is fully mindful of musical results is the necessary condition of music-making and, therefore, of an effective music education.
2. The social and cultural contexts of musical actions are integral to musical meaning and cannot be ignored or minimized in music education.
3. Since human musical actions create, sustain and reshape musical cultures, music educators can and should formally channel this cultural process, influencing the direction in which it develops and the individual and collection human values it serves.
4. The contributions made by schools, colleges and other musical institutions are important to musical culture, but these need to be systematically examined and evaluated in terms of the directions and extent of their influence.
5. In order to be effective, music educators must establish and maintain contact with ideas and people from other disciplines.
6. The research and theoretical bases for music education must simultaneously be refined and radically broadened both in terms of their theoretical interest and practical relevance.
7. An extensive and intensive consideration of curriculum for music education is needed as a foundation to greater professional unity and must be guided by a sound philosophical process.

Original Action Ideals of the MayDay Group

Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education

Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education (ACT) is a peer-reviewed on-line journal “seriously committed to issues of open access” (MayDay Group 2011). Submissions are blind reviewed, and according to the website, the journal had an acceptance rate of approximately 35% for 2008-9, although it has recently been lower (Vincent Bates, personal communication, April 29, 2014). Due to a commitment to interdisciplinarity (see Action Ideal 5), ACT is a forum for scholars not only from music and education, but from philosophy, sociology, history, psychology, curriculum theory, and other disciplines. The editorial board is made up of international scholars in music education as well as one philosopher. Of the 22 members, six are American and five are Canadian. The remaining members hail from various European countries (Finland, Germany, Sweden, and the UK), and there are two members from Australia. Five of the editorial board members are women. The journal is published between one and four times per year, and there have been four editors to date—three of whom were original signatories to the MayDay Action Ideals. As of this writing, the journal has been published 26 times. Even though an editor and associate editor are appointed by the MDG steering committee, editorial duties seem to be passed around regularly between editor, associate editor, and guest editors, although editorial control remains with the editor (Vincent Bates, personal communication, April 29, 2014). The editor for half of the issues from 2002 to 2012 was Canadian Wayne Bowman who has served in all three of the above roles. Preceding Bowman, the first editor was MDG co-founder Thomas Regelski, an American residing in Finland who edited seven issues. Following Bowman was Canadian David Elliott, who served as editor for three years. Vincent Bates, an American scholar, has now taken on the role after serving as associate editor and being on the production team for many years. Five special issues over the lifetime of the journal have been coordinated by guest editors (including Wayne Bowman), all of whom have been MDG members, and one issue was edited by Australian David Lines who was assistant editor at the time. An interesting aspect of the journal’s relationship with its authors is the fact that articles remain the intellectual property of the writers who are the sole copyright holders for their contributions. This arrangement stands in sharp contrast to that of many academic journals where authors are asked to sign copyright over to the journal and

consequently must ask the journal's permission to reprint their own articles (see for example Inderscience Publishers or Taylor and Francis for their copyright policies which ask authors to sign a copyright release form).⁵

A glance through past issues of the journal shows that there are regularly articles by authors from all over the world. Although English is the preferred language, ACT states that it will accept submissions in languages other than English providing that the editor can find reviewers that are competent both in the language and the subject area, and that a detailed English abstract is included. To date, all articles published in the journal have been in English. Submitting authors are asked to address themselves to an international audience, framing their research "in terms that are relevant and interesting to readers in other countries or situations," as the journal is reportedly read in 160 countries (MayDay Group 2011).

ACT has published articles on music and post-structuralist philosophy, pragmatism, ideology, professional development and teacher training, identity, race issues, queer theory, feminist perspectives, social justice, democracy, ethics, curriculum reform, informal learning, social and learning theory, embodiment in music, urban music education, and music education as praxis. Several early issues of the journal are organized as "symposia" around a specific book under review with critical responses to the book and a response to these articles from the book author, and many issues include articles based on papers given at MDG colloquia. Content is diverse, stimulating, reflective of the seven Action Ideals, and stands in contrast to the conversation going on in many other music education discourse communities.

Because ACT is an on-line journal, length is not of issue,⁶ and this sometimes impacts the kind of content that is included in the journal. Issue 1(1), for example, has an article that is 43 pages in length. It is a "study article" on the topic of music education and other disciplines (Ideal 5) that was used to incite conversation at an international conference to which all of the other articles in the issue respond. This is another example of how the MayDay Group has configured the organization's practices to facilitate discussion.

After this brief look at the organization and content of ACT, I will now move onto the third part of my inquiry, an examination of the writing in the journal.

Rhetorical Moves and Style

Hyland (2004) suggests that academic writing seen through a discourse community framework is in part a negotiation of the tension between “originality” and “humility to the community” (21).⁷ Authors must find a balance between conformity and innovation in order to have their work accepted for publication. I wondered how ACT authors navigate this territory, especially given that the community has positioned itself as critical of the dominant music education conversation and, as Vincent Bates points out, thinking differently is important to the group (personal communication, April 29, 2014). Secondly, I was curious to examine rhetorical conventions such as citations, how authors establish authority, and the use of appeals (Mick 2011) as a way to explore how ACT articles might be similar in writing style. Lastly, in negotiating the conformity/originality continuum, how do members of the MDG community disagree? I decided to analyze one of the ‘symposium’ issues for rhetorical moves used to express disagreement. These special issues are designed to elicit discussion and critical evaluation, and therefore I felt it likely that there would be differing views expressed.

As mentioned above, symposium issues are usually designed around critical interactions with a particular book to which the author then responds. It is important to note that none of these articles were blind reviewed. Instead, the reviews were solicited, and were usually written by authors from various fields or backgrounds, presumably to engender discussion. These are not traditional book reviews as Bowman (2003) makes clear: “the primary concern of these reviews is not, in other words, the promotion or vilification of the book under consideration. Reviewers will be encouraged to approach the task in ways that initiate thoughtful dialogue on issues germane to our understandings of music, our approaches to curriculum, and our strategies for practice” (2). None of the ACT ‘book reviewers’ summarizes the book to any great degree. These articles are more aptly thought of as thought-provoking conversations between reviewers and the author, perhaps similar in tone to critiques of articles that might be found in other journals in the social sciences.

The short answer to the question, “How do authors disagree in ACT?” is “respectfully,” at least in the articles I examined.⁸ I was surprised to discover that often the critical book reviews add to and round out the perspectives of the authors

instead of simply critiquing the author's ideas. At first I found this baffling especially since ACT cites critical discourse as one of its main aims, but upon further examination, I discovered that the books chosen for review often align with the MayDay Group ideals and that they are therefore not controversial within this community per se. Once again, I am reminded that "(t)hese are not the typical 'academic' reviews that are...crafted with the purpose of recommending (or not) that the book be read by other academics" (Bowman 2003, 103). The interactions around the new edition of Bennett Reimer's 2002 book are fascinating and it is to this cluster of articles I now turn.

Volume 2, Issue 1: Symposium on Bennett Reimer's Philosophy of Music Education

As discussed in the first section of this paper, MDG was founded as an alternative discourse space in music education, which had been dominated by an aesthetic conception of music and music education (MEAE). While there was evidence of a praxial shift beginning in the 1980s (e.g. Alperson 1991, Elliott 1983, Sparshott 1983), the momentum for a praxial reconception of music and music education seems to have been provided primarily by David Elliott's 1995 book "Music Matters." In it, Elliott critiqued the dominant MEAE perspective and the work of MEAE proponent Bennett Reimer. A heated public debate ensued between these two scholars⁹, and in 2003, Bennett Reimer reworked his influential book "A Philosophy of Music Education" (1970) in response to Elliott's critique.

When it was published, ACT journal editor Wayne Bowman arranged a symposium issue to discuss Reimer's revised book. Articles were contributed by Jürgen Vogt, a German scholar of aesthetics and music education, Harvard philosopher of education Vernon Howard who was a singer in his private life but not a music educator, Pentti Määttänen, a Finnish philosopher, and Eleanor Stubley, a Canadian music scholar and conductor at McGill University who has written and taught extensively on the nature and value of music. I should note that all authors are MDG members except for Vernon Howard.

In brief, the German scholar uses his distance from the North American debate as a rhetorical move to criticize Reimer on the level of logic and philosophical

definitions; the Harvard philosopher as an outsider and philosophy of education expert very directly criticizes Reimer's foundational belief that a well-articulated philosophy of music education will make a substantial difference in music education practice; the Finnish scholar takes exception to one chapter on musical meaning which is more within his area of expertise than in Reimer's; and the conductor/teacher of philosophy writes about her experience of reading Reimer's book three times in each of its three editions throughout her student and academic career, which is a rhetorical move in and of itself.

In all of these articles, no one but Vogt mentions David Elliott's name or work, and he does so very carefully, trying to show that he is not biased in Elliott's direction. For example, after laying out the key points of Elliott's philosophy of music education with a statement in brackets behind each point casting doubt on its truth or completeness, Vogt writes, "Bennett Reimer is more careful in this respect" (5). He then proceeds to sketch out and critique Reimer's main points. Earlier in the article Vogt also adds a footnote to inform the reader that he has published a critique on Elliott's work and has read an article that critiques both Elliott and Reimer. A final example of Vogt's attempt to distance himself from Elliott's work is found in a later footnote where Vogt writes, "This critique applies for Elliott's concept of musical experience as a 'flow experience' too" (Footnote 12). In spite of these moves to distance himself, Vogt very clearly communicates that his views align with the MDG discourse community by referring to works of several praxial philosophers and members of the MDG. For example, amongst his references, besides himself and Bennett Reimer, are ACT editor Wayne Bowman and music philosopher Philip Alperson who is credited with coining the term *praxialism*. He also cites Thomas Regelski, a MDG signatory, and MDG member Heidi Westerlund.

Vogt, it turns out, does not 'throw stones' at Bennett Reimer to communicate his membership to the group. Instead, he very carefully sets up his essay in an attempt to show that there is common ground between praxial and aesthetic philosophies, neither of which he names outright. He claims to be talking about the whole international field of philosophy of music education (PME) in approaching his critique of Reimer, and maintains that there are differences in music education philosophy between German, Anglo-American, and other European conceptions of

PME and it is difficult to find commonality. Vogt treads gently. Before he sets to critiquing Reimer, Vogt writes that he will not present an “extensive essay-like review” of Reimer’s book but will instead “try – if this is an excusable way to read and to treat it...” to use Bennett Reimer’s philosophy to show how difficult it is to “find the common ground, and to demonstrate the urgency and necessity of seeking this ground” (30). In spite of this disclaimer, the article is clearly a critique, and his euphemistic rhetoric does not fool Reimer who responds quite forcefully to Vogt in his reply.

Vogt, Howard, and Määttänen establish their credibility and argue various points with Reimer by using their credentials as philosophers. This strategy corresponds with what Mick (2011) terms a *logos*-based appeal whereby authors use logic and reason to make their case. All three authors also employ *ethos* appeals, carefully building their credibility and suggesting they have a certain reputation and trustworthiness (Mick 2011), sometimes by discrediting Reimer. While Vogt mostly argues on the level of philosophical definitions and terms, Howard attacks the foundational premise of Reimer’s philosophy, and Määttänen argues on territory that he knows well as a philosopher. In fact, Määttänen is the only author to whom Reimer concedes defeat on some level, admitting that Määttänen is right about a thing or two and confessing that he sees things now that he didn’t see when he wrote his book. Reimer goes on to comment that he finds any failing on his part “frustrating” (13). Reimer, Howard, Määttänen, and Vogt, all use a characteristic philosophical style of writing that favours integral citations where authors’ names are included in the body of the sentence instead of in parentheses when cited, use summaries rather than direct quotations of others’ work in support of a point, and employ a high frequency of reporting verbs suggesting cognition such as think, believe, conceptualize, view, argue, and claim (Hylands 2004). Furthermore, these three evaluations of Reimer’s book are largely critical, a common characteristic of philosophical book reviews (Hylands 2004). Vogt uses the most mitigation strategies, using limited praise, personal opinion, and praise subordinated to a criticism in the same sentence (Hylands 2004) to soften his criticism. Because of the unique rhetorical strategy used by Eleanor Stublely in critiquing Reimer’s work, I will now turn to an in-depth examination of this article.

Stubley's contribution to the symposium issue is a very well-constructed article in which she manages to levy significant criticisms at Reimer without him taking exception. The first sentence of Stubley's article is a brilliant opening move. She writes, "Normally, I approach the books I review as bounded texts" (2), a statement which serves to tell her readers that a) she has reviewed many books before, thereby establishing her credibility, and b) what follows is not a standard book review. She then writes of Reimer's new book:

It was as if Reimer's opening gauntlet, in positing value in the relative stability of his vision across the years, made visible the way in which the details and shadings of my own biographical self shaped what it was that I found in the text. I doubted my capacity, as such, to be objective. Yet I also worried that, given the sameness of the vision, I might end up falling into the trap of saying only what had been said before (2).

Stubley manages to buy herself some grace by suggesting that she cannot help but be biased because her reading is inextricably linked with her biography and at the same time tells us that Reimer's thinking hasn't changed over the years, which is really a veiled criticism. Her move works: Reimer's response to her article, as we shall see, is quite gentle and positive unlike his response to the other three articles.

I find it interesting that, unlike Vogt, Stubley does not overtly mark her membership in the ACT community, leaning instead toward the side of originality on the continuum of allegiance/originality. She demonstrates her belonging more subtly. It is really only in teasing out and then critically examining her covert criticisms of Reimer that it becomes clear that she is on the praxial side of the argument.

Most of Stubley's citations come from the world of literary criticism (Barthes, Iser, Feagin, Ruthrof, Ong) and she also gives a nod to Merleau-Ponty. She is, after all, writing about her *experience* of reading Reimer. Her use of the literature is practical, but it is also effective at distancing her from either side.

Stubley divides her narrative into three "tales," each the story of her reading one of Reimer's three editions of his book at different times in her life. In the first tale, she describes a favorable reading of the book, suggesting that Reimer captured her experience of meaning-making in music, and describes a dialectical relationship between her younger self and the book which would likely be flattering to Reimer.

As she describes her second reading of Reimer, Stubley actually becomes quite critical but because it is juxtaposed against the first "tale," the criticism does not seem

threatening or substantial. Stublely prefaces her criticism by suggesting that it is only natural that she be critical of the second edition. She had changed and thus so did her reading of Reimer. In fact, she almost pleads, she had to be critical due to the place where she was in her life as a young academic seeking tenure. Her criticisms are embedded in the narrative of her experience of reading and are constructed in such a way that they are almost imperceptible. Her veiled criticisms are as follows: a) Reimer's thinking hasn't really changed except that he uses cognitive psychology as part of the framing of his philosophy this time; b) this cognitive framing is mostly a strategy of "using the prevailing scientific vocabulary and educational jargon" (4) to make the same case, c) Reimer's philosophy contains "logical conundrum(s)" (5); and d) Reimer's cognitivism leads to a dualist and objectivist ontology. These are actually substantial criticisms of Reimer's work but because they are mediated by Stublely's experience of reading, they do not seem nearly as biting. The following example gives some sense of the effectiveness of Stublely's use of narrative in her criticism:

But as I turned the pages, the fit became increasingly uncomfortable, and I found myself beginning to question the principles and assumptions through which the concept of the aesthetic worked¹⁰... To follow the allure of the cognitive, however, was also to become enmeshed in objectivist conceptions of intellect, intelligence, and music as idealized work that, drawing attention to my absent body, seemed only to distance me from the living reality of the music that defined the essence of my time (5).

This is but one example of Stublely's effective use of personal narrative in her criticism of Reimer.

Stublely's account of reading the third edition of the book opens with a description of her cynicism: "I knew from the Wittgenstein citation emblazoned across its first page that the plot of the story would be the same... I also expected that the storytelling would unfold, like it had in the second edition, through a lens defined by the issues and pre-occupations of the day" (6). But, she writes, she was surprised by something new. The mitigating rhetorical move of coupling criticism with praise softens her criticism. It works. Reimer doesn't seem to notice that she is not really praising *him* when Stublely writes of feeling "the tingle of possibility pulse through my veins" (6) which, upon closer examination, is not brought about by Reimer's writing, but an idea she has while reading Reimer.¹¹ This is another veiled criticism. The possibility Stublely sees is a post-structural and enactivist stance for a philosophy of

music education and the corresponding collapse of Cartesian dualism between music and musician in arguing for music as a way of knowing. Her insight, she acknowledges, is “a twist to the plot of the story that Reimer himself would probably not have intended” (7). Her masterful description of coming to Reimer’s third edition filled with cynicism, being pleasantly surprised at a new direction in Reimer’s work, and then criticizing Reimer as not moving far enough away from positivism is effective; Reimer is disarmed. He writes, “So I’m left, at least by the first three [articles], with a kind of unsatisfied appetite, in that I had hoped that while some of its trees would be examined for their weaknesses the forest would also be viewed and debated” (2), leaving Stubley completely off the hook when she had, in essence, critiqued the “forest.” Reimer writes of Stubley’s work:

Stubley’s paper was indeed a surprise...I had no idea she had been so affected by the previous two editions, so that she was able to respond to this one as the most recent in an ongoing journey of growth, both in her own and my understandings. How moving this was for me, to see my developing and changing interests and insights, and the central thread that has held them together...both reflected in and personally transformed by her individuality of development (22).

Reimer does not argue a single point with Stubley. He simply goes on to offer his own narrative of the journey in developing these three articulations of his philosophy.

I find it interesting that, of the authors who critiqued Reimer, only Vernon Howard (who is not a MDG member) does so quite directly. Although this analysis is limited in scope, the obvious tact demonstrated in critiquing the work of someone who had been a vocal critic of praxial philosophy suggests that perhaps public disagreements are handled collegially by the MDG discourse community, at least with outsiders. After this brief examination of the strategies employed by four ACT authors to disagree with Reimer, I will now move on to an analysis of the writing style of a few articles within the journal.

In Search of an ‘ACT Writing Style’

The final section of this paper will examine issues of writing and style. Because ACT is an international journal, I was curious about the level of tolerance for second language markers. I wondered how the journal editors would balance MDG’s commitment to inciting an international conversation with standards for writing,

especially given that the MDG authors whose work I have read are all very gifted writers. Finally, I will speak briefly to the writing style of the various kinds of articles in the journal in hopes of being able to delineate the boundaries of accepted rhetorical style for the community. Hylands (2004) writes:

At the community level, academics write as group members. They adopt *discoursal practices* that represent an authorized understanding of the world (and how it can be perceived and reported) which acts to reinforce the theoretical convictions of the discipline and the right to validate knowledge (17, emphasis mine).

It is these “discoursal practices” that interest me. In tracing the boundaries of accepted style, I will end with an example of an article that, out of all the articles published in the journal to date, is the closest to the originality pole on the continuum of originality/allegiance, deviating markedly from the norms of academic writing in tone, use of unique rhetorical devices, and format. By examining the rhetoric and writing of this article and laying it beside the philosophy and research articles discussed previously, I hope to come to a better understanding of the ACT’s expectations of members of the discourse community in terms of originality and loyalty. First, a word on the challenges of having an international discourse community.

Because of the Mayday Groups’ strong commitment to diversity and inciting an international conversation, there are a large number of articles by scholars from non-English speaking countries, and consequently, I would argue that ACT editors have a fairly high tolerance for second language markers. This seems to have been Jurgen Vogt’s experience as an author. In his footnotes, he acknowledges editor Wayne Bowman for helping to make his article more “idiomatically appropriate” in English (Vogt Footnote 17). The article was obviously accepted in spite of second language markers and then refined with Bowman’s help.

It would seem that readers, too, have a certain tolerance for second language markers judging from some of the articles that have been contributed by members of the international community and accepted for publication. An example of an excellent article containing some small second language markers is that of Finnish scholar Lauri Väkevä (2002). This article, printed in the inaugural issue of the journal, occasionally contains statements such as “From the educational standpoint, the disenchantment to the postmodern strategies makes perfect sense” (2). In spite

of minor second language markers, the author's meaning comes through loud and clear.

Väkevä's article, like most of the articles in the Reimer symposium issue and the journal as a whole, is a philosophy article. This type of ACT article is fairly cohesive in style in the way the authors establish credibility, discredit others, and make their arguments, and most are relatively conservative, leaning towards loyalty to the MDG community. These articles have more in common with writing from the discipline of philosophy than with the other kinds of articles in ACT. Their authors attempt to convince readers using *ethos* and *logos* appeals in establishing their credibility.¹² For example, Väkevä argues that Western music education is still modernist in nature and he cites Christopher Small and Thomas Regelski, two very well-known praxial scholars, to support his assertion as well as several articles he has written (*ethos* appeal). By doing so, he effectively establishes the credibility of his argument as well as his own credibility as a scholar. Väkevä then goes on to argue for "a pragmatic rationale" for praxialism (4) using reason and logic to carefully build his case (*logos* appeal). Hildegard Froehlich's (2009) article on community outreach is another example of this category of article. Froehlich's essay is a well-reasoned article where she argues for a more nuanced understanding of community as a web of relations between "selves" within geo-political realms, special interest groups, and groups brought together by a common purpose (communities of practice). As a rhetorical move, she adeptly situates her topic within the realm of concern of the MDG discourse community:

Members of the Mayday Group and others (e.g., Elliott, 1995, 2007; Bowman, 2000, 2007; Jorgensen, 1995; Small, 1997, 1998; Stublely, 1998; DeNora, 2000) have concerned themselves for quite some time with the construct of community from various theoretical perspectives, often suggesting understandings of community that are based on the principle of shared praxis in the moment of collective music making or listening. It is a definition of community useful for describing the social dimension of what the field of music education seeks to achieve because it is specific... Other uses of the term community are not nearly as specific (88).

She then goes on to show the lack of clarity in how the construct of community is used in other contexts. In doing so, Froehlich acknowledges the work of several fellow MDG scholars and even pays the community a compliment, thereby establishing

Froehlich's credibility, creating interest in what she has to say, and communicating her respect and loyalty to, as well as her knowledge of, the MDG discourse community.

Another type of article, such as Monica Lindgren and Claes Ericsson's (2010) article "Rock Band Context as Discursive Governance in Music Education in Swedish Schools," consists of fairly typical examples of reporting research. The style of these articles for the most part could be found in any social sciences research journal. For example, Lindgren and Ericsson write:

In this article, based on the results of a larger research project funded by the Swedish Research Council (Ericsson and Lindgren 2010), we will discuss and problematize the rock band context in music education in Swedish compulsory schools in relation to governance and knowledge formation. The empirical material on which the study is based consists of video documentation of (ninth) grade music education at eight schools for one semester (37).¹³

Clearly, it is not a specific writing style, but the topic of music outside of the western classical music canon that makes the article appealing to the audience of ACT. Like other research articles in the journal such as Blahd (2004), Downey (2009), and Stunell (2010), Lindgren and Ericsson tend to be fairly neutral, close to neither pole on the continuum of originality or loyalty to the ACT community, although the topic of articles in this group always aligns with MDG Action Ideals in some way.

Looking at the body of articles published in the journal, I naively expected to find an 'ACT style' of writing. I reasoned that because many of the articles were originally adapted from MDG colloquia presentations and that these colloquia were often organized around one of MDG's Action Ideals that there would be some characteristic stylistic markers. My perception was that, while other journals are published by specific academic communities, the link between MDG and the content and authors published in ACT was stronger than for other journals in the field of music education. I was surprised to discover that outside of the philosophy articles, there are many variations in style due in large part, I think, to the interdisciplinary and international nature of the organization and a commitment to maintaining a space for (an) alternative narrative(s) regarding music education¹⁴. Upon reflection, I must concede that academic discourse

communities including that of ACT are characterized by diversity, although each obviously has its own spectrum of what is accepted and acceptable. Hylands (2004) confirms this, stating, “Communities are frequently pluralities of practices and beliefs which accommodate disagreement and allow subgroups and individuals to innovate within the margins of its practices and in ways that do not weaken its ability to engage in common actions” (11).

For example, while a fundamental and uniting belief of the MDG membership is that music and music education are praxial in nature, there are differing conceptions of what praxial means within the community. While David Elliott’s 1995 initial articulation could be characterized as primarily cognitive in nature (Koopman 2009), O’Toole (2000) has argued for a more socially-grounded notion of praxialism which allows for multiple identities such as “gender, class, race, sexuality, patriarchy, and so on” (39). In contrast to Elliott’s statement that, “*Fundamentally, music is something that people do,*” O’Toole writes, “Musicking, then, is something people do together” (30), a distinction she takes from Christopher Small. O’Toole is part of a distinct subgroup of MayDay scholars whom I would consider feminist critical theorists. Some of these scholars also contribute perspectives from queer theory. Together, they serve as “brokers” between feminist and queer scholarship and MDG. Wenger (1998) suggests that brokering is one of the key mechanisms of change as a community of practice negotiates meaning. Brokers are individuals who straddle membership in multiple communities and bring ideas from one community into another. In addition to perspectives from feminist and queer theory, there are many examples of brokering within the corpus of articles published in ACT from fields as varied as education, ethnomusicology, philosophy, and sociology. As mentioned above, it turns out that many of the writers published in the journal are not members of MDG and, due to MDG’s commitment to multidisciplinary, are not even necessarily music educators. All of these factors—international contributors, a diversity of views within the community, writers and brokers from outside MDG—make it difficult to discern a cohesive ‘ACT rhetorical style.’

As opposed to being a publication with a uniform ACT style, a more nuanced understanding of the journal is that the editor, chosen by and belonging

to the inner circle of the MDG community of practice, selects articles to be reviewed by the editorial board and outside reviewers and engineers discussions that he thinks (it has always been a man to date) would be interesting to its members and that are important for a praxial and critical view of music education.¹⁵ Authors come from different disciplines and therefore, even within different kinds of articles in the journal, the writing is sometimes typical philosophical writing with many of the characteristics Hylands (2004) describes, at other times more casual and chatty, and at times, formal and full of ‘researchese’ or even narrative writing conventions. Perhaps all of this speaks to my first research question, i.e. which is more important: loyalty to the group or originality, and at least on the level of style, I would have to conclude originality.

A good example of an article that demonstrates the MDG community’s commitment to originality¹⁶ is a book review written by American scholar Elizabeth Gould. Gould’s (2005) article is entitled *Desperately Seeking Marsha: Music and Lesbian Imagination*. To give a sense of the outer limits of stylistic originality in ACT, I will examine the unique rhetorical strategies Gould uses to argue her point. Like the four articles discussed earlier, Gould’s article is an ACT-style book review in one of the journal’s symposia issues edited by Wayne Bowman. In summary, the article looks at whiteness through a lesbian perspective (Gould 2010) and makes the case that because, as the authors of the book under review suggest, music and music education have been historically characterized by white and male views of music and musicians, not only do people of other colours and cultures get left out by the dominant conception of the musician, as suggested by the book, but also those of different sexual orientations. Gould invokes “the lesbian imagination” in this discourse about music and explores the potential it holds as an alternative perspective.

This is a very creative and interesting article in that not only does it address a unique and potentially controversial topic, but Gould uses wit, humour, shock, and embedded sound clips to build her case. The opening sentence is a great example of the use of some of these strategies in causing readers to enter into her argument: “ ‘All musicians, we must remember, are faggots’ (Brett 1994, 18, emphasis in original)—at least we’re all socially constructed that way” (2). The

reader cannot help but be captivated.

Gould's article is fascinating on a number of levels, the first being her voice, which is, in fact, a result of a very clever and interesting rhetorical strategy. Gould stakes out a lesbian perspective in a disarming way by using a chatty and informal tone. She takes on the persona of a lesbian "grrrlfriend." Gould is literally being "Marsha" from her title, whom she describes in her footnotes as, "An actual musician, conductor, and teacher who is black, lesbian, and differently-abled, as well as feminist, funny (no, that's not an oxymoron!), and fearless" (14). Gould effectively uses the persona Marsha as a strategy to disarm and soften up her audience. As an example of Gould's rhetorical strategy, I have chosen the following quote which also illustrates the author's humour and wit:

Ouch. What an unpleasant place to find ourselves—unless, of course, you don't mind being homosexual, female, mad, monastic, or a heterosexually married wife (read "oppressed" in modern patriarchal society). Musicians. Who would have thunk it? I mean—aren't we the heroes, the geniuses, noble and revered, who at the very least make lots of money and get—well, the girl (as opposed to grrrl)?—that is, any white girl, because, after all, we are all white, right?—at least those of us in the tuxedos and long black dresses standing on the brightly lit stage, our audience shrouded in both darkness and silence. You know—us. You and me (3).

This is clearly not Gould's voice. A later article (Gould 2007) also published in ACT has a very different tone in spite of still demonstrating a high level of originality using sound clips, art, and poetry. A sample of the writing from Gould's 2007 article clearly shows the difference in tone and voice:

As a Deleuzian feminist project (Braidotti, 2002) this process is materialist (embodied), concerned with power relations and current technologies, positivity, assemblages, connections as opposed to self-contained communities; conflating high/low culture, focusing on creativity and nomadic texts, nonlinear in terms of becoming as well as sexual difference. It does not invoke questions of justice—of morality—however, but one of ethics (Deleuze 1990).

It is almost hard to believe this is the same author. Gould later writes about the rhetorical strategy of being "Marsha." She states,

"Marsha" is a dear friend of mine; both the person Marsha and my 2005 *ACT* article, "Desperately Seeking Marsha." She—and I think of the text as animate—continues to enrich my life, create controversy, and make me smile. The "Marsha" article was meant to be funny, humorous, including sound files that are ridiculous asides intended to amuse and

startle, highlighting the absurdity of sorting and ranking (Gould 2010, 82).

As Gould (2010) suggests, a second rhetorical move in the “Marsha” article is the use of sound clips, some of the author reading text as Marsha in a way that implies the unthinking manner many people construct views of sexual orientation, and some of music, both of which make for an innovative use of the eJournal format of the publication. One of the pieces of music is a hilarious live version of a song poking fun at homophobia called *Leaping Lesbians* sung by Meg Christian. The fact that Gould chose a live version is perhaps simply a matter of availability, but the live recording ends up being a powerful rhetorical move: Meg Christian has the crowd in the palm of the hand singing along and cheering, seemingly communicating their agreement with the sentiment of the song and making homophobia seem downright silly.¹⁷

Gould does little to communicate her belonging to the MDG community in any of her three articles, instead, firmly planting her flag as a lesbian scholar and feminist. In addition to citing many queer theorists, Gould also cites bell hooks, Judith Butler, poet and activist Audre Lorde, professor of music education and women’s studies Julia Koza, and Gloria T. Hull’s 1982 collection on black women’s studies, to give a few examples. Gould is out there on the edges of this discourse community serving as a broker between feminist and lesbian theory and MDG. Out of 26 issues, she has an article in three of them. While ACT seems to embrace originality at least in style, not many authors take advantage of the invitation to the degree that Gould has.

Concluding Thoughts

I found the process of conducting this selective analysis to be both fascinating and revealing. Hylands (2004) suggests that because research is a social enterprise, examining how scholars write in a given discipline provides clues to how that community constitutes reality. This inquiry has indeed deepened my understanding of and respect for MDG as a critical and alternative space for music education scholarship.

While Hylands argues that it is *how* academics write rather than *what* they

write that distinguishes various discourse communities, I found that this distinction was not particularly relevant for my project. Perhaps because ACT seems to encourage originality and because of the international and multidisciplinary orientation of MDG as an organization, the primary marker of membership to this particular discourse community is not how scholars write, but the fit of topics with MDG's Action Ideals. Every article addresses the Action Ideals of the organization in some way. Gould's (2005) article fits under Action Ideal 5, establishing and maintaining contact with other disciplines, in this case, feminist and queer perspectives, as well as number 6, a commitment to a "radical broadening" of the theoretical interest of research and theoretical base. The essays in the Reimer symposium issue fit under Action Ideal 7 related to a "sound philosophical process" as the foundation for action in music education, as well as Ideal number 5. The editors of ACT have been true to the mandate of the journal of publishing articles that "illuminate, extend or challenge the Action Ideals of the MayDay Group" (MayDay Group 2011).

Of course, this 'fit' principle is true on some level for every academic journal. One would not send a science article to a math journal, or even a quantitative teacher education study to a post-structuralist teacher education journal. I have tried to show some of the variety and range of rhetorical styles apparent throughout the journal to give a sense of the level of originality that is accepted by the ACT community as well as the flavor of the conversation. I am left feeling that ACT and MDG provide a unique conversation space, although MDG is not without its critics. While there is no question that ACT's epistemological leanings are other than positivist, articles of different genres resemble comparable articles from other disciplines in the social sciences, and there is room for rhetorical originality providing that the author's philosophical foundations align with MayDay Group Action Ideals.

I originally perceived of this journal as being 'all about praxialism,' when in fact, it is more accurate to say that it is primarily a critical theory journal. I find it comforting to know that there is room to be creative and to write in a variety of different styles so long as the topic under discussion addresses the Action Ideals of the MayDay Group. I am also pleased to see ACT enact a commitment to

multidisciplinarity, although it has been suggested that MDG could go further in this regard (e.g. Lamb 2009).

This paper has examined the journal of the MayDay Group after first presenting MDG as a unique community of practice. Selected articles were examined in terms of how authors disagree and mark their belonging to the discourse community, and the work of one particular author was discussed as an example of the outer limits of ACT's acceptance of originality. Instead of a single writing style and uniform community, ACT seems to represent a 'plurality of practices and beliefs' (Hylands 2004) due to its multidisciplinary and international orientation. After a good look in from the outside, I am filled with profound respect for the scholars who have created this discourse space and are part of this community. ACT is a unique space to exchange and debate ideas, a feature that has great potential to engender action in the field of music education.¹⁸

References

- Agger, Ben. 2006. *Critical social theories: An introduction, 2nd ed.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Berkenkotter, Carol & Thomas N. Huckin. 1995. *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blahd, Stephan. 2004. Music teachers—in training and at work: A longitudinal study of music teachers in Sweden. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 3(3).
- Bowman, Wayne. 2003. Symposium: Bennett Reimer's Philosophy of Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 2(1).
- Downey, Jean. 2009. Informal learning in music in the Irish secondary school context. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 8(2), 47–59.
- Elliott, David. 1991. Music as Knowledge. *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 25, 21–40.
- Froehlich, Hildegard. 2009. Music Education and Community: Reflections on 'Webs of Interaction' in School Music. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 8(1), 85–107.
- Gould, Elizabeth. 2003. *Troubling currents: On becoming MayDay.* Article presented at the 13th MayDay Group Colloquium, Vancouver, BC.
- Stark, Jody. 2014. Looking in from the edges: A journal analysis of *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(2): 84–111.
act.maydaygroup.org

- _____. 2005. Desperately seeking Marsha: Music and lesbian imagination. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 4(3).
- _____. 2007. Legible bodies in music education: Becoming-matter. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6(4), 201–23.
- _____. 2010. But all of us are straight: “Marsha” undone. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 9(3), 82–98.
- Howard, Vernon. 2003. Whither the vision. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 2(1).
- Hylands, Ken. 2004. *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Koopman, Constantijn. 2009. The nature of music and musical works. In D. Elliott (Ed.), *Praxial music education: Reflections and dialogues*. [eBook], 79–97. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195385076.001.0001
- Lamb, Roberta. 2009. Ethnomusicology, feminism, music education: Telling untold tales. In V. Kurkela & L. Väkevää (Eds.), *De-canonizing music history*, 141–162. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lindgren, Monica & Claes Ericsson. 2010. Rock band context as discursive governance in music education in Swedish schools. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 9(3), 35–54.
- Mayday Group. 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.maydaygroup.org>
- Määttänen, Pentti. (2003). Reimer on musical meaning. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 2(1).
- Mick, Connie Snyder. 2011. Rhetorical moves: Ways of performing rhetorical analysis. *Community Writing and Rhetoric*, Fall, 1-3.
- Myers, Greg. 1990. *Writing biology: Texts in the social construction of scientific knowledge*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- O’ Toole, Patricia. 2000. Music Matters: Why I don’t feel included in these matters. *Bulletin for the Council for Research in Music Education*, 144, 28–39.
- Pinar, William. 1975. *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Troy, NY: Educator’s International Press.
- Regelski, Thomas A. 2002a. About the issue. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 1(1).
- Stark, Jody. 2014. Looking in from the edges: A journal analysis of *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(2): 84–111.
act.maydaygroup.org

- _____. 2002b. On “methodolatry” and music teaching as critical and reflective praxis. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 10(2), 102–23.
- _____. 2010. Telling of “untold tales”: Correcting the ‘story’ told of the MayDay Group. www.maydaygroup.org
- Reimer, Bennett. 2003. A response to the reviews. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 2(1).
- Schön, Donald. 1983. *The reflective practioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Stubley, Eleanor. 2003. A tale thrice told: Bennett Reimer’s vision across the decades. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 2(1).
- Stunell, Gillian. 2010. Not musical? Identity perceptions of generalist primary school teachers in relation to classroom music teaching in England. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 9(2), 79–107.
- Väkevää, Lauri. 2002. Naturalizing philosophy of music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 1(1).
- Vogt, Jurgen. 2003. Philosophy–music education–curriculum: Some casual remarks on some basic concepts. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 2(1).
- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wheeler, T. Ray. 2006. Toward a framework for a new philosophy of music education: Logstrup as synergy between the Platonic and Aristotelian perspectives in the music education philosophies of Bennett Reimer and David Elliott. Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Texas. Retrieved May 1, 2012 from Proquest Dissertations & Abstracts Database (3254233).

Notes

¹ In fact, members have recently been invited to be signatories to a new version of the ideals revised by a committee struck at the 2011 colloquium.

² See, for example, Roberta Lamb’s (2009) critique as well as Thomas Regelski’s (2010) rebuttal.

³ As does the journal’s acronym, ACT.

⁴ While Ideals 5 and 6 clearly speak to a commitment to interdisciplinarianism, the text under Action Ideal 6 states, “We support an approach to music education inquiry that draws its problems from and applies its conclusions to the authentic musical actions of people and thus from music that incorporates a rich diversity of musical meaning and experience.”

⁵ Sage Publications, publisher of all of the NAFME journals, is a notable exception. Authors here retain the copyright and are permitted to post the article on personal and institutional websites once it is published, or to use it for teaching purposes or to distribute to colleagues without permission providing that it is used for non-commercial purposes. See “Authors Re-using Their Own Work” at <http://www.sagepub.com/journals/Journal201902/title-tabview=permissions>

⁶ In issue 1(2), for example, articles range from 5 to 17 pages in length.

⁷ Hylands is referencing the work of Myers (1990) as well as Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995).

⁸ It is important to note there are disagreements. There are, in fact, several instances of MDG members disagreeing with each other within the pages of ACT such as Wayne Bowman’s article in issue 1(1), all of the articles in issue 6(2), and issue 7(1). In addition, several MDG members have criticized the organization’s stance and practices at colloquia and in other publications. See, for example, Gould (2003), Lamb (2009), and O’ Toole (2000). All of these latter criticisms seem to be concerned, at least in part, with issues of inclusion.

⁹ The titles of the following two articles written after Elliott’s (1995) book was published give some sense of the tone of the argument: Reimer, B. (1996). David Elliott’s philosophy of music education: Music for performers only. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 128, 59-89; Elliott, D. J. (1997). Continuing Matters: Myths, Realities, Rejoinders. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 132, 1-37.

¹⁰ This is the central tenet of Reimer’s philosophy.

¹¹ To be fair, Reimer perhaps deserves some credit here in that reading Reimer seems to be the impetus for Stubley’s insight.

¹² I have taken this distinction from Mick (2011). For a discussion of these two terms, see the earlier section entitled “Rhetorical Moves and Style.”

¹³ By this time, ACT had moved to numbering pages of articles successively in each issue.

¹⁴ I am mindful of Gould’s (2003) invitation to nomadic thought and a philosophy of difference in constructing the identity of MDG.

¹⁵ As mentioned earlier, often the articles printed in the journal are adapted from MDG colloquia paper presentations, and the colloquia are often organized around one of the group's Action Ideals.

¹⁶ I am indebted to Vincent Bates who pointed out that in fact, originality in some ways paradoxically serves as a marker of membership in MDG. Of course he is right given the critical theory foundations of the organization.

¹⁷ The only information about this music that I could find was under a YouTube video posted by "Lesbianmusic" who stated, "This record released 35 years ago was Olivia's [a record label] response to Anita Bryant's rant against homosexuals." Bryant apparently was and is a strong opponent of gay rights in the US. The following link opens a recording of the song: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9Itz80d7ec>

¹⁸ I am grateful to ACT editor Vincent Bates and the reviewers who made many very helpful suggestions to improve this paper, and also to Elizabeth Gould and Roberta Lamb.

About the Author

Jody Stark is a doctoral student in music education at the University of Alberta where she is studying music teacher professional learning. She also teaches music and music education at Concordia University College of Alberta where she was the Executive Director for Concordia's summer choral music and teacher education program *Singspiration/Inspiration for Teachers*. A well-known clinician and teacher educator in Alberta, Jody taught general and choral music in the schools for many years in both English and French before becoming a university instructor. Her emerging research interests include music education philosophy, childhood musical practices, and teacher education and professional learning.