

The Moral Ends of Band

Randall Everett Allsup

QUERY SHEET

This page lists questions we have about your paper. The numbers displayed at the left can be found in the text of the paper for reference. In addition, please review your paper as a whole for correctness.

- Q1.** Au: Please add year & Reference for Dewey citation.
- Q2.** Au: Is MENC the full publisher for Allsup 2004, or should it be spelled out?
- Q3.** Au: Please complete publisher location for Bruner 1960: UK or MA?
- Q4.** Au: Please add university location for Dobbs 2005.
- Q5.** Au: Is SUNY the full publisher for Hansen 2006, or should it be spelled out?
- Q6.** Au: Please add university location for Hoffman 2008.
- Q7.** Au: Please add university location for Holsberg 2009.
- Q8.** Au: Please add university location for Mantie 2009.
- Q9.** Au: Is MENC the full publisher name for Shively 2002, or should it be spelled out?

TABLE OF CONTENTS LISTING

The table of contents for the journal will list your paper exactly as it appears below:

The Moral Ends of Band

Randall Everett Allsup

Randall Everett Allsup

The Moral Ends of Band

This article provides a theoretical framework through which to reimagine and revitalize contemporary music education practices, using the large ensemble paradigm called band as the primary unit of analysis. Literature suggests that band places too much emphasis on teacher control and external measures of validation. Critics propose replacing this historic art form with ones that exist outside of school. It is argued in this article that band's crisis of legitimacy can be resolved by refocusing on student welfare and student well-being. Because band is the only indigenous American art form that exists in and has come into fruition through the public school, band directors are bound by a public trust to put the education of students first. Using Dewey's understanding of the role of public schooling in a democracy, a vision of moral education through music education is advanced. Band is ideally poised to illustrate what moral education can be.

6
11
16
21

ONE OF THE SUCCESSES of public music education in the United States has been the way in which *band*—the concert bands, marching bands, jazz ensembles, drum lines, and every- 26
thing else that make up this conceptual genre called *band*—has shaped the musical and social experiences of generations of young people. The accomplishments are considerable: The band experience has brought to life important music from 31
the past, cultural milestones from artists such as Percy Grainger and Duke Ellington, while at the same time evolving in new directions. Band brings together a cross-section of the student body, a collective of young individuals each of 36
whom are charged in the cocreation of a larger musical goal. So, too, band rooms are social spaces apart from mere instruction, marked-off places where friendships are deepened, ideas are argued over lunch, and identities are formed and 41
protected (Adderley, Kennedy, & Berz, 2003; Hoffman, 2008; Morrison, 2001). I share with many band directors the aspiration that band has the capacity to shape and direct the best aspects of who we are and who we wish to be. 46

There are virtues to band, and I wish to locate these virtues within a larger project. I argue in this article that the North American secondary instrumental public school band program is an ideal space for moral exercise and growth. Be- 51

Randall Everett Allsup is an assistant professor of Music and Music Education at the Teachers College Columbia University.

Correspondence should be sent to Dr. Randall Everett Allsup, Music and Music Education, Teachers College Columbia University, 525 West 120th Street, Box 130, New York, NY 10027. E-mail: allsup@tc.edu

cause the band experience is situated at the intersections of art, community, self-interest, and public schooling, band has the capacity to serve as an exemplar of what moral education could be.

56 In linking music education to moral principles, I note with appreciation some of the conventional conceptions of moral education, when for example teachers teach children to work together respectfully, to tell the truth, and not to steal.
61 But I am attracted to a somewhat less narrow view of school morality, one that connects moral education to the most formative undertakings of life, to those qualities that enhance personal growth and independent thinking while enriching
66 our relationships with others. Drawing upon the writings of John Dewey, specifically his *Moral Principles in Education*, my starting definition of moral education aims at “making the methods of learning, of acquiring intellectual power, and
71 of assimilating subject-matter, such that they will render behavior more enlightened, more consistent, more vigorous than it otherwise would be” (Hickman, 1978, Vol. 4, p. 268). For Dewey, moral education aims at growth—the acquisition
76 of intellectual power and the development of human character that “fund the self” (Hansen, 2006, p. 173).

I present for consideration a theoretical rationale for band, a framework with the direct
81 purpose of guiding research and practice so that the aforementioned moral qualities, existing as they do in inert or actualized capacity, become the explicit ends of band education. Furthermore, because band is an art form housed within the
86 public school, and thus part of a larger public trust, its educational obligations differ in form and function from those that operate elsewhere. My argument turns on this distinction. Because band is a subset of public schooling, it must
91 concern itself with the development of *moral qualities*, the cultivation of those human potentialities, powers, and individualities that enrich and enlarge a young person’s life as she moves through the world with others. In this sense, the
96 terms *band* and *band education* will be viewed as coterminus, a conceptual framing that holds immense promise for an indigenous American art form that is moving into its second century.

External Forces at Play

With increased international focus on the outcomes of schooling combined with rapid tech- 101
nological change and globalization, academic disciplines across North America are scrambling to reexamine their social relevance and methods of practice (Rothstein, Jacobsen, & Wilder, 2008). Band, like all subjects within the arts and 106
humanities, is in the midst of a crisis of intense introspection (Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Battisti, 2002; Fonder, 2000; Shively, 2004). In drafting this framework, I found some evidence that contemporary instrumental educators are wrestling 111
with various pedagogical methods for responding to social change, approaches that include constructivist practices (Brown, 2010; Holsberg, 2009; Shively, 2002), critical and feminist perspectives (Dobbs, 2005; Gould, 2005; Mantie, 116
2009), and democratic rationales (Allsup, 2004). But given the scope and history of band, these efforts appear undersized. Without a wide-ranging debate on educational ends, instrumental music teacher educators may be ill poised to do much 121
more than react to change, rather than to guide and shape future practices with specific goals in mind.

It would be unfair to imply that public school band directors are unconcerned with change. I 126
read in the discourses that circulate around band the enduring tensions between those rationales that must be made to justify its existence and the vision that is called upon to bring this tradition to life. Band directors share with all arts educators 131
a mounting sense of existential threat: “Maybe this is our last generation; maybe we have finally lost our public support.” There is little surprise, then, that to survive ongoing budget cuts, performance and advocacy have become 136
difficult to distinguish, with most of the work done in schools visible primarily through high-caliber concerts and comparative competition. Concerts are curriculum and rationale (Russell, 2006), a point of obviousness to many (Reynolds, 141
2000). But a reliance on external evaluation, politically justified or not, leaves band directors without the conceptual tools to create curricula that are uniquely theirs and their students’ alone.

146 When band literature becomes frozen through
a priori ends, the multiple and diverse musical
 experiences that are needed to bring the music
 to life are narrowed in favor of predefined means
 and predefined ends. The band experience must
 151 be larger than its literature, and much larger than
 the evaluation of its literature. In a concert-as-
 curriculum culture, justification for band is seen,
 heard, and judged from outside the lived experi-
 ence of the student, marking an externality that
 156 belies the formative aims of what I argue is moral
 education. We hear very little about the inner
 lives of most aspiring young musicians, besides
 longstanding calls for a culturally predetermined
 type of psychomotor faculty called musicianship,
 161 what David Elliott (1995) and others have called
praxial know-how.

Something goes missing when we focus our
 attention on the external valuations of band
 more than the personal values that animate its
 166 participants. We know, for example, that there
 are exacting criteria for the judgment of ev-
 erything from State-sponsored solo literature to
 the posture and precision of a marching drum
 line. I have even heard that there is such a
 171 thing as a Florida *mezzo-forte*—a predetermined
 sonic volume that some band directors achieve
 in competition, or don't. "The danger is," warned
 Dewey, "that those who become interested in this
 work of standardizing conditions—the external
 176 side of the school work—will forget the limits
 of standardized uniformity, and attempt to carry
 it over into the strictly human, spiritual element
 that cannot be standardized" (Hickman, 1978,
 Vol. 15, p. 181).

181 When considering the band experience from
 the learner's point of view, critics have found
 teacher-directed aims that take for granted the
 emotional and aesthetic appeal of playing music
 with others (Shively, 2004). In John Schieb's
 186 (2006) case study of a "typical" middle school
 band in the American mid-west, he observed
 that the predominant curricular outcomes cen-
 tered around "opportunities to be in competition
 with other students ... skill development for
 191 achievement's sake and to receive a satisfactory
 grade ... and learning and following classroom
 rules and procedures" (p. 35). Lindy, the young

trombone student who provided the data for this
 case study, "never mentions musical emotions,
 feelings, or aesthetic qualities in her responses to 196
 my questions about what she enjoys most about
 band. ... In fact, she never mentions the term
music during the entire interview" (p. 35).

If the interests of band students are not ap-
 parent, and if the band director focuses learning 201
 around the predeterminations of quality litera-
 ture, musicianship, competition, technique, and
 half-time shows and concerts, a sociological leap
 logically ensues. Why should students be in-
 volved in school music when everything youths 206
 ostensibly desire is available outside of school
 and enjoyed on their own terms? For advocates
 of non-institutional learning, such as John Kratus
 (2007) and David Williams (2007), public school
 music education "has become disconnected from 211
 the prevailing culture" (Kratus, 2007, p. 44) and
 risks irrelevance. The critique goes something
 like this: If students are flourishing musically
 outside of institutionalized music education, ei-
 ther (a) publicly financed school-based music ed- 216
 ucation is no longer needed, or (b) public music
 education needs to start looking more like the
real world, e.g., commercial or popular culture.
 After all, "students can do more musically at
 home without us than they can at school with 221
 us," claimed Williams (2007, p. 21).

In contemporary music education research,
 the allure of the real world is framed in stark
 binaries between out-of-school music and in-
 school music. The former, according to Kratus 226
 (2007), "is individualistic, primarily nonclassical,
 satisfies the user's personal and emotional goals,
 and makes wide use of guitar and keyboard;"
 the latter is "large-group oriented, primarily clas-
 sical, satisfies curricular goals, and focus[es] 231
 on instruments that restrict musical involvement
 after graduation" (p. 47). I agree with Kratus that
 band directors must reckon with this contrast, and
 that we must look more carefully at what intrinsi-
 cally motivates children. Does the historic frame- 236
 work of teacher-directed, concert-as-curriculum,
 advocacy-based band education estrange young
 players from communities outside school? If we
 listened more carefully, what else would Lindy
 tell us about what band means to her? 241

It is easy to draw these contrasts, and in the name of student satisfaction, it is tempting to do away with band programs, and follow our students' interests like so many moths to the candle of popular culture. But as I outline in the next section, there are moral grounds for resisting the internal/external dualisms of out-of-school music versus in-school music, or nonclassical music versus classical music, for focusing more holistically on student independence and growth. These claims hinge on an understanding of public education as it relates to personal welfare, societal good, and the special place that music plays in shaping young lives. This argument is also important because it supplies a theoretical framework for band that is not measured solely by external comparisons or misleading dichotomies, but by its own internal legitimacy as a site of human flourishing.

261 **Band and the Public Trust**

I begin with the claim that band as it is known—the concert bands, marching bands, jazz ensembles, drum lines, and everything else that make up this conceptual genre called *band*—is one of America's great indigenous art forms, but one that exists in and has come into fruition primarily through public education. Unlike jazz, rock and roll, Shaker quilts, and modern dance, the band experience that I am describing—the very experience that came to define and shape my own middle and high school education—was created through the American public school system and exists almost exclusively within public schools and for the public school student.

In describing the way that moral principles can guide and animate formal music education, it may be helpful to draw a distinction between a moral vision of public education and the contemporary demands that are placed on schools today, where it is all too common to view the school as an adjunct of commercial industry, as the training grounds for future work. The school, in Dewey's vision, is a social space the value of which is determined not by the degree to which it replicates the world outside, but by the degree to

which it advances the welfare of society. A kind of plasticity is inherent in the latter distinction, as well as a suggestion of moral purpose.

Moving beyond the dichotomies of in-school versus out-of-school interests, the public school is both an extended place of diverse contact and connection and also an embryonic space of self-formation, a place of trial, observation, and judgment. The student is at the center of this activity, with webs of interest reaching out and back, looking forward and looking past. "Here, too, the ethical responsibility of the school on the social side must be interpreted in the broadest and freest spirit," wrote Dewey.

It is equivalent to that training of the child which will give him such possession of himself that he may take charge of himself; may not only adapt himself to the changes that are going on, but have the power to shape and direct them. (Hickman, 1972, Vol. 5, p. 60)

The moral ends of public schooling are to equip young people to be independent thinkers and actors, to free them from adults' care so that they might not only shape and direct an unfolding world, but also reimagine it. *Freedom, empowerment, agency, self-reliance, one-anotherness*—these are the moral ends of education: "The power to frame purposes, to judge wisely, to evaluate desires by consequences which will result from acting upon them; power to select and order means to carry chosen ends into operation" (Hickman, 1985, Vol. 13, p. 41).

Just as critics of band have looked externally at rock groups and social media for curricular inspiration, the advocates of band have often looked to the Western European classical orchestra or the thriving drum and bugle corps culture in North America as idealized models for instruction and performance practice. But I would argue that none of these sites have as their primary mission the educational growth of their members. Orchestras, for example, are organizations whose ends aim for a perfectly rendered interpretation of a musical work and whose means are determined by whatever it takes to get there. That the Chicago Symphony Orchestra provides spaces for musical experimentation,

creativity, and improvisation; helps players grow musically and socially in diverse and profound ways; provides a training ground for citizenship and cooperation; encourages rookie players to learn from mistakes and try something new; that Ricardo Muti is a kind and patient instructor in his tradition; that the *maestro* seeks out the good of his players more than the good of the concert—these are not reasons we attend Chicago Symphony concerts. Mahler and Bruckner are the reasons we support the Chicago Symphony, not the budding growth of its fourth-chair trumpet player.

I would say the same about the Cavaliers of Rosemont, Illinois, a renowned drum and bugle corps. Young people who elect to spend an entire summer mastering 12 minutes of music and the company of instructors who train them on the football field are not obligated by the same moral principles found in public schools. Even as I care for the well-being of the young people who audition into drum and bugle corps and elect to abide by their rules and traditions, there is no public institutionally defined moral imperative at the core of the drum and bugle corps art form. If the Cavaliers were to adopt as their mission the moral education of the young learners in their care—as they could—the ends and means of the drum and bugle corps experience would change fundamentally, and perhaps unrecognizably. By contrast, a high school band’s place in the public trust obligates it to be moral. The degree to which its practices change a lot or change very little depend upon a given school’s individual educational setting and the ethos that surrounds it, not on the preexisting practices of a given art form.

As such, some adjustment must be made in the degree to which the conventional norms that govern private models of practice like rock groups, professional orchestras, and drum corps inform the inner workings of a publically supported school-based musical tradition. A reconstruction is called for, one that moves in favor of the local needs, experiences, and multiple expertise of a given school community. In this sense, traditions and artistic norms—those learned deeply and those encountered broadly—fund or empower the growing musical self for the sake of the grow-

ing musical self. Although a tension will most certainly exist between diversity of opportunity and the right to experiment on the one hand, and the power of learning a traditional art form intimately on the other, taken together these ends are not moral contradictions. On the contrary, this tension is, itself, an essential moral principle, one that guides instruction and practice, and one that shapes human lives.

The Obligation to Be More and Do More

The virtues of band exist in its widest capacity. As such, today’s band programs have an obligation to do more. The physical and musical capacity to do more, furthermore, is already in place. To that end, I return to the points presented in the opening paragraph—that band is a rare space within the public school of multiple and diverse educational means and musical and social purposes. When band is considered conceptually to be more than a denominational genre, band is richer and more varied than the isolate with which its adherents are mostly preoccupied, namely the concert band and the quality of its supporting literature (Budiansky & Foley, 2005). The wind ensemble is only a subgenre, no more or less, within the larger constellation of instrumental musical activity and social interaction called *band*. Band education becomes moral education when a diversity of musical experiences is embraced and when the student is placed at the heart of its activities.

I make no distinction between band and band education. Band, housed within the public school and existing for the education of young people, is morally obligated to live up to the highest ideals we hold forth for public education in a democratic society. Its legitimacy is located within this promise. This means that band educators must concern themselves with the diverse cultural lives of their students more than the admiration, administration, and preservation of a singular tradition. In contrast to the narrow education of Lindy the middle school trombone player, I encourage band educators to view band con-

ceptually, as an interdisciplinary field of artistic study that “appeals to the child’s active powers, to his capacities in construction, production, and creation, mark[ing] an opportunity to shift the
 431 centre of ethical gravity from an absorption which is selfish to a service which is social” (Hickman, 1978, Vol. 4, p. 277).

A shift in gravity from mere learning to the testing and trial of learning is worth imagining.
 436 “The child is born with a natural desire to give out, to do, to serve” (Hickman, 1972, Vol. 5, p. 64). Passive absorption is growth in its most superficial way. No one argues that Lindy learned nothing in band. But Dewey called on teachers
 441 and students to connect and extend the results of their study together, multiplying experiences in such a way that growth surpasses the limits of teacher prediction or external evaluation. Unless diverse opportunities are afforded to her, we
 446 can only hold Lindy to the most superficial of educational ideals.

To whose ends were Lindy’s talents put? To what end was Lindy’s education charted? Throughout Dewey’s writings on schools, democracy, and moral education, he talked about the classroom as an extended space, a place of broad expertise where diversity is a premium, and where our actions inform others, as theirs inform ours. In this vision, each band rehearsal space is
 456 comprised of a unique collection of individuals with intersecting and colliding interest, guided by an ethos of learning from others, rather than using others. Echoing Kant’s categorical imperative, David Hansen (2006) wrote, “In all that we do,
 461 we should treat others as ends in themselves, never merely as a means to our own ends” (p. 166). This ancient perspective, analogous to the Golden Rule, is the capstone of moral education, finding fruition in the famous last
 466 sentence of *Democracy and Education*: “Interest in learning from all the contacts of life is the essential moral interest” (Hickman, 1978, Vol. 9, p. 370). Hansen continued that this imperative

471 mirrors Dewey’s notion of *learning* from all contacts with others, a posture that seems to presume treating them as ends. After all, Dewey does not speak of interest in *using* all our

contacts to serve our purposes, and it is striking that he refers to learning from others as a ‘moral’ interest. (p. 166, italics in original) 476

So what would this mean for students? What would it really mean to imagine learners as ends in themselves, as persons with projects? What would it mean for us as band educators to move aside just a little bit, to shift the center of gravity,
 481 or to resist seeing students as means to our own ends?

Suddenly, band looks very different. The exoskeleton of concert-as-curriculum collapses like a dragonfly’s empty shell. The conductor’s
 486 podium becomes a focal point, not the focal point. Direction is no longer synonymous with education. The flute is not limited to classical music. The voice is not limited to choir. Everyone takes turns playing the drums. Students have
 491 major instruments and minors, favored styles, and favored groups. The wind ensemble would not melt into history, but exist proudly among other genres and musical offerings. Comparative competition gives way to inner challenges.
 496 Each section in band decides chair placements. Guitars, accordions, and iPads come into view. Students perform the music of Percy Grainger, Duke Ellington, and the kid next door. And just as jazz long ago became a historic part of the
 501 band experience, so, too, becomes popular music, and folk music, and hip-hop, and hybrid-jazz-popular-folk-hip-hop music. Of course, these are just a few ways of reimagining and reconceptualizing band. They are not, however, moral pre-
 506 scriptions or a new set of dogmatic injunctions, which would, in turn, defeat the generative nature of this framework. Rather, each band is charged in constructing and reconstructing a different course of study for each generation of students. 511

A moral framework must look carefully at methods of teaching. Although hesitant to label specific teaching practices moral, non-moral, or even immoral, I would like to call attention to the way that competition, in particular, has
 516 framed many band practices that might otherwise lead to unexpected places. The question is not “Should there be external measures of evaluation or should bands compete or not,” but rather

521 “For whom does external competition serve, and
 what quality of growth is promoted through
 competition, and how does competition shape
 human conduct and character?” Defenders of
 competition would argue that competing is not
 526 really the point of what they do. Competition
 is simply the band director’s best choice for
 achieving excellence—achievement is the end,
 not an award or trophy.

Taking such a defense at its word, I am
 531 sympathetic to the idea of going beyond what
 one thinks one is capable of doing. Even the
 word *virtuoso* suggests some kind of moral virtue
 is inherent in winning a concerto competition,
 taking a first-place rating, or at least being
 536 good enough to come close. Yet with regard
 to band, I worry about words like *excellence*
 and *achievement*, *winning* and *success*, mostly
 because I so rarely hear positive talk about
failure, *trial*, or *experimentation*. Virtuosity as
 541 an end for instrumental music education defines
 only a very limited approach to knowing music,
 one that shapes, in very particular ways, what
 musical options are later available to the adult
 musician. We need more room for failure in
 546 band, not less. We need less direction and more
 experimentation.

A half-century ago, Jerome Bruner (1960)
 challenged schools to produce math students that
 thought and acted like mathematicians, and his-
 551 tory students that thought and acted like histori-
 ans. We need to ask ourselves if we are producing
 music students who think and act like virtu-
 osos or music students who think and act like
 composers, producers, artists, and amateurs (cf.
 556 Reimer, 2003, pp. 274–299). Although neither
 is inherently moral (or nonmoral or immoral),
 I point out that a band curriculum whose end
 is amateurism aims to provide learners with a
 love of music and a love of making music
 561 (Fr: *l’amour* = love; the amateur), whereas the
 virtues of virtuosity aim at perfection, at best
 a platonic form of appreciation. We might at
 least consider the possibility that there are equal
 advantages to being a multimusical amateur, as
 566 there are to being a Level 6 clarinet player. To
 that end, the decision to become an amateur mu-
 sician, a virtuoso—or both—should be presented

to the student through the offerings of a rich and
 diverse band curriculum.

The very heart of moral education is help- 571
 ing children to discover, cultivate, and enlarge
 their best selves. This is what Dewey meant, I
 think, when in his writings on democracy and
 moral education he referred to schools as *embry-*
onic communities as much as they are *extended* 576
communities. Through the opportunities that are
 available, some relevant to a particular student’s
 interests and some unfamiliar, band has an almost
 overlarge capacity to help young persons find and
 shape their lives, just as others around them are 581
 finding and shaping their lives. In this protected
 embryonic community, there is no subject called
band that exists apart from its students and
 teachers and the interests that its students and
 teachers find and bring with them. In other words, 586
 band is both shareholder and subject of study.
 Misrecognition is the mistake we makes when
 band educators think of recruiting for band, rather
 than conceiving of band as “a mode of personal
 experiencing”—not a monolith or externality— 591
 but a “system of working forces” (Hickman,
 1978, Vol. 4, p. 287) that is made up jointly
 by all participants as they engage in the work
 they do. When we recruit for band, we have
 a ready-made picture of just what band is and 596
 who will fit into it or not. In contrast, band as a
 formative, self-generating community, is a space
 that is slightly unknown, always different, and
 subsequently shaped anew by each generation of
 contributors (Shieh, 2008). 601

The critic might respond that this sounds an
 awful lot like pandering to the whims of adoles-
 cence, and that the aforementioned mode of asso-
 ciation may well guarantee the end of a century
 of traditions, like the concert band and classical 606
 music. However, there is no educational growth
 to be found in pandering, and thus pandering to
 the young serves no moral purpose. Moreover,
 regarding the survival of classical traditions like
 the wind ensemble or jazz music, the opposite is 611
 true. Band educators have an obligation to afford
 students the opportunity to engage in traditional,
 classical, and unfamiliar music—as long as the
 end is student growth, and not simply the survival
 of the chosen tradition or cultural product. 616

It is condescending, furthermore, to suggest that young people will have no interest in the unfamiliar. Wrote Hansen (2006),

621 Dewey counsels teachers not to fixate on who students are apart from subject matter. There is no call to regard students as having pre-determined, final selves with final interests to whom subject matter must be utterly alien or remote ... as if students come to class as consumers with their tastes and preferences neatly lined up, rather than bundles of energy, 626 confusion, insight, doubt, accomplishment, innocence, worldliness and more.

Hansen continued, “The fusion of self and interest in learning emerges in and through activity, 631 not through first lining up in one column students ‘interests’ and then lining up in another column elements of the subject matter and trying to figure out a match” (p. 177). This view does 636 not condescend to young people, and does not label students by perceived identity. It refuses the cliché that all young people are interested in little more than guitars and keyboards, and that our band students are by nature individu- 641 alistic, uninterested in classical traditions, and egocentric in their needs (Kratus, 2007; Williams, 2007).

The tension between old and new, familiar and unfamiliar, is, itself, an essential moral principle, 646 one that aims at independence and self-formation. Band provides students the opportunity to study traditions that exist outside what they can access at home or in the hallway. When band does more, we afford students the opportunity to be 651 more—more than the labels society gives them, and certainly more than that which a teacher can safely predict. But these external offerings must fuse with student interest [the embryonic commu- 656 nity] and then make new meaning in the learner’s life, at home or in the hallway [the extension of space]. Wrote Hansen (2006), “The self ‘loses’ and ‘finds’ itself in its involvement with objects.” Objects in this context are not understood as inert physical things, but “anything that draws 661 out simultaneously both focus and solicitude.” He continued, “with every new encounter the self loses an aspect of its prior identity because it is now infused with, and has infused, the new

object ... the fact means the self has found a new aspect through its interaction” (pp. 174–175). 666 This fusion is not absorption, but a process of struggle and trial—of judgment and creativity. As this fusion concerns band education, it presents a vision of the emergent self, funded by diverse musical opportunities and extant traditions, and 671 taking place within a community that is specially crafted to realize these ends. Imagine Lindy in just such a setting. Picture an education that has prepared her to perform the Mozart *Requiem* in a community orchestra, march in the college 676 marching band, and start a local indie band over summer break. The quality of her band education is judged not by whether she continues to play in community concert bands after high school or not, or the number of trophies she leaves behind, 681 but by the degree to which she can create and recreate—fuse and refuse—a life of complex and self-fulfilling musical engagement. The moral ends of band are to secure the conditions of just such a possibility. 686

Conclusion

Although there is not one subject by which the principles of moral education are best exercised, band is uniquely matched with a physical space as near large as its moral capacity. I have little 691 doubt that band students, with all of their interests and curiosity, will expand to fill this space. And this must be a shared space, of course. If the public school band does not share its aims with its members, if participants do not have a 696 personal and common stake in its outcome, then there is no reason beyond sentiment to continue this tradition. Yet, only the strictest traditionalist could claim that the framework provided in this article is not pro-band. A moral framework is 701 one way to insure continuity from past to future. Nor is this article an apology for traditional band practices. A moral framework would reshape this tradition in large and small ways. But this is already happening. Band, with its small and large 706 groups, jazz programs and marching units, is already an art form in evolution, all the more thrilling that its inimitable experiences take place in the public school.

References

- 711 Adderley, C., Kennedy, M., & Berz, W. (2003). A home away from home: The world of the high school music classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 55, 190–205.
- Q2 716 Allsup, R. E. (2004). Of concert bands and garage bands: Creating democracy through popular music. In C. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education* (pp. 204–223). Reston, VI: MENC.
- 721 Allsup, R. E., & Benedict, C. (2008). The problems of band: An inquiry into the future of instrumental music education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 16, 156–173.
- 726 Battisti, F. (2002). *The winds of change: The evolution of contemporary American wind band/ensemble and its conductor*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music.
- Brown, D. (2010). Band as reflective collaboration—Advancing an alternative rehearsal paradigm. *Finnish Journal of Music Education*, 13, 8–16.
- Q3 731 Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Budiansky, S., & Foley, T. W. (2005). The quality of repertoire in school music programs: Literature reviews, analysis, and discussion. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 12, 17–39.
- Q4 736 Dobbs, T. L. (2005). *Discourse in the band room: How talk shapes teaching, learning, and community in a middle school instrumental music classroom* (Doctoral dissertation). Northwestern University.
- 741 Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fonder, M. (2000). Educational quality vs. artistic quality in band literature: Must it be either/or? *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 28–29.
- 746 Gould, E. (2005). Nomadic turns: Epistemology, experience and women university band directors. *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 13, 147–164.
- 751 Hansen, D. (2006). *John Dewey and our educational prospect*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Q5 Hickman, L. (Ed.). (1972). *The early works of John Dewey, 1882–1898* (Vols. 1–5). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- 756 Hickman, L. (Ed.). (1978). *The middle works of John Dewey, 1899–1924* (Vols. 1–15). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hickman, L. (Ed.). (1985). *The later works of John Dewey, 1925–1953* (Vols. 1–17). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. 761
- Hoffman, A. R. (2008). “Like who you are”: *Socially constructed identity in the middle school band* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, College Park. 766
- Holsberg, P. W. (2009). *Constructivism and band: New approaches for instrumental music* (Doctoral dissertation). Teachers College, Columbia University. 767
- Kratu, J. (2007). Music education at the tipping point. *Music Educators Journal*, 94, 42–48. 771
- Mantie, R. (2009). *Stylizing lives: Selected discourses in music education* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto. 788
- Morrison, S. J. (2001). The school ensemble: A culture of our own. *Music Educators Journal*, 88, 24–28. 776
- Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education: Advancing the vision* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Reynolds, H. (2000). Repertoire is the curriculum. *Music Educators Journal*, 87, 31–33. 781
- Rothstein, R., Jacobsen, R., & Wilder, T. (2008). The outcome goals of American public education. *Grading education: Getting accountability right* (pp. 13–34). Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. 786
- Russell, J. (2006). Building curriculum based concerts. *Music Educators Journal*, 92, 34–39.
- Schieb, J. W. (2006). Lindy’s story: One student’s experience in middle school band. *Music Educators Journal*, 92, 32–36. 791
- Shieh, E. (2008). Developing leadership in the ensemble classroom. *Music Educators Journal*, 94, 46–51.
- Shively, J. L. (2002). Musical thinking and learning in the beginning instrumental music ensemble. In E. Boardman (Ed.), *Dimensions of musical learning and teaching* (pp. 169–186). Reston, VA: MENC. 796
- Shively, J. L. (2004). In the face of tradition: Questioning the roles of conductors and ensemble members in school bands, choirs, and orchestras. In L. Bartel (Ed.), *Questioning the music education paradigm* (pp. 179–190). Toronto, Canada: Canadian Music Educators Association. 801
- Williams, D. (2007). What are music educators doing and how well are we doing it? *Music Educators Journal*, 94, 18–23. 806