I thank Thomas Regelski for his thoughtful nuanced response and for providing welcome counterpoint to the original article. This rejoinder is a complete version of my condensed reply that appears in print. Regelski’s response supports the premise of integrating participatory culture in music programs while raising important issues and concerns for music educators to consider in this process. I appreciate the opportunity to clarify and expand upon some of the ideas articulated in my article and Regelski’s response throughout this rejoinder. In particular, I focus on how musicianship may be forwarded through participatory culture and propose related curricular change in terms of convergence and hybridity.

Music, Musicianship, and Media

Regelski argues that “the dominating focus of Toward Convergence is on the participatory values of social and digital music media more than on music per se.” This reading is understandable given the prominent role that media plays in the type of participatory culture discussed throughout the original article. Many of the examples in Toward Convergence draw upon specific media skills articulated by Jenkins. For instance, throughout the article I outline instances of musical appropriation, the skill or ability to meaningfully sample and remix media content. Furthermore, the original article highlights multiple examples located on YouTube and throughout the Internet in the form of digital media. However, though the original article emphasizes the role of media in participatory culture, one ought to consider the types of musical engagement discussed in terms of musical skills, understandings, ways of knowing, or meaning making. In other words, musical practices that incorporate or are inspired by digital media are still imbued with musicianship and potential for musical learning.

To determine the types of musicianship, musical understanding, or meaning making involved in such practices we might broaden our focus from the digital media and related
technology to the musical processes, practices, and ways of knowing encompassed in such ‘musicking.’ For example, consider how a young person or group of young people might take a popular song or ensemble repertoire; determine additional music that matches well with the harmonic structure, tempo, and stylistic aspects; re-interpret both pieces; leverage technology to modify and mix both selections; procure corresponding imagery; assemble all components as a video; and upload it to YouTube.6 While one could focus on the final product as a YouTube video or the software and hardware used to create the music, we ought to consider: 1) the aural skills and musicianship involved in identifying two musical selections that would work well being juxtaposed; 2) the analytical skills and creative thinking involved in determining how best to modify each musical example; 3) the musicianship and music decision making in mixing both selections; and 4) the social, cultural, and aesthetic values involved in the choices one makes while creating the final version and the discourse surrounding its inclusion online.

As Regelski suggests, such musicianship can and ought to be contextualized from a media education perspective; I argue, however, that these types of musical practices are at the core of music education, though less present in music education programs. Updating music programs may require music educators to reconcile intersections between and overlaps of media and musical practices. Similarly, music educators might work to translate or recontextualize such musical engagement in ways that do not involve technology. Regelski’s interpretation raises an important issue; discussing music in the context of digital media may result in an obscuring of the music and musicking by a focus on the media. Furthermore, those less familiar with these types of musical practices may find recognizing the encompassing musical skills or ways of knowing, difficult. This is partly an issue of literacy or literacies.
When envisioning how contemporary musical practices might be integrated in school music programs, music educators ought to consider the music literacies involved in such engagement. In his work on broadening the concept of literacy and thinking in terms of literacies, Gee suggests that “the rap artist who can understand and compose rap songs but not read print or musical notation is literate (can give and take meanings) in the semiotic domain of rap music, but not print or music notation literate in that domain.” A similar case might be made in terms of creating remixes, mashups, multimedia tutorials or any other number of musical practices representative of participatory culture in contemporary society. By acknowledging the existence of multiple music literacies and, as Regelski argues, that “dominant social groups within a culture determine the values and practices identified with the culture,” we might see how a particular type of music literacy is dominant within music education programs while other music literacies and ways of engaging with music are marginalized.

By becoming more musically literate in contemporary musical practices, music educators and their students may identify the musicianship and potential for musical learning involved in such engagement. Taking on the role of ethnographers and embracing an ethic of learning can assist music educators develop their musical understanding, literacies, and skill sets. As Regelski alludes to, music teacher education programs have a role to play in this process. Just as preservice music educators are expected to develop skills on secondary acoustic instrument or sight reading standard notation, future music educators might also be expected to develop fluency in recording and sequencing applications and decoding MIDI notation and waveforms.

As Regelski suggests, issues of quality, creativity, and musical learning must be taken seriously in the context of the musical practices highlighted above and in the original article. Regelski’s highlighting of these issues presents a strong case for providing students with
opportunities to engage in the broadest possible range of musical experience from social musicking to exploring aesthetic issues ranging from meaning and expression to musical quality. As mentioned in the original article, music educators ought to contextualize students’ musical engagement ranging from addressing essential questions or enduring understandings\textsuperscript{10} to scaffolding students’ reflective and critical thinking in relation to their own and others’ music and musicking. If we embrace the breadth of Regelski’s use of the term “musicking” to include “any forms of personally meaningful engagement with music,”\textsuperscript{11} then surely having students wrestle with and discuss social, cultural, and aesthetic issues in the context of contemporary musical practice will be critical in helping them engage in and take ownership of related discourse. If music educators and students can articulate what constitutes a ‘first chair’ performer or quality composition, why not a top-of-the-line producer or exemplary multitrack video satire?\textbf{Convergence through Hybrid Music Programs}

Regelski provides a helpful explanation of how participatory musical practices might be realized through diverse chamber groups in school music programs.\textsuperscript{12} In his description of such ensembles Regelski suggests that “the site of the social” for digital media musicking is “is less face to face, with “more physical/semiotic separation among actors,” more attention paid to details of the musical ‘object’ or ‘work’, and other traits that at least differ from (and potentially can detract from) the kind of participation and synchrony that qualifies the sociality of participatory musics.” This, however, does not need to be the case.

Along with including the types of chamber groups suggested by Regelski, music educators ought to consider hybrid curricular structures that blur boundaries between ensembles/classes, musical roles, and practices.\textsuperscript{13} While for some, the notion of engaging with technology in schools conjures images of rows of individual students sitting quietly in front of
computer screens, headphones on (or earbuds in) oblivious to their surroundings, this is less an issue of digital media musicking than it is of pedagogy and classroom structures. Keeping in mind the ways that music, musicianship, and media can intersect, music educators might envision how remixing, creating parodies, analyzing mashups, or other forms of musical engagement inspired by or incorporating digital media can move beyond a model of an individual and her computer to one that is as social as performing in a chamber group. While it may entail metaphorical and physical restructuring of the classroom, the scenarios outlined in the original article and Regelski’s response can occur in a range of curricular structures, whether large ensembles, chamber groups, general music classes, or hybrids where students collaborate on projects.\(^{14}\)

As Regelski suggests, we might broaden the types of communities of practice that are fostered in school music programs. However, along with thinking in terms of classes and ensembles as particular communities of practice, music educators ought to consider curricular structures that can support and facilitate multiple communities of practice within the same class or ensemble. Curricular structures in schools are sometimes based on particular musical practices such as ‘music theory,’ ‘performing,’ or ‘composing.’ Allowing for a hybrid combination of musical practices and communities of practice within the same space is more indicative of the musical engagement mediated through or inspired by digital media in contemporary culture. Such an approach is in the spirit of convergence culture, particularly in terms of how formerly compartmentalized courses and ensembles might “conjoin, cooperate, and collaborate.”\(^{15}\)

The documentary film *Re:Generation Music Project* is an example of such an approach.\(^{16}\) The film traces the process and results of collaborations between musicians from five traditional musical genres ranging from classical to country paired with five DJs and producers. Given the
differences between the musics, musicians, and musical practices, the pairings provided all involved a convergence of musical and social expectations, aesthetics, and processes leading to productive tensions. Toward the end of the film, DJ Premier, a producer who combined classical music with aesthetics of hip hop culture and rap music, remarked that “music can’t die as long as someone keeps on making it fresh.” The same might be said for school music programs.

Embracing digital media and music along with participatory and convergence cultures does not mean the end of live or acoustic music. In fact, it may heighten students’ awareness of the unique experience that live acoustic music provides. Nor does the inclusion of contemporary musical practices and participatory culture equate to ending ensembles or presentational performance in schools. However, twenty-first century music programs ought to acknowledge how music is increasingly mediated and remediated through digital means in ways that expand beyond a linear trajectory of music traveling from composers’ minds, to music educators’ batons, to the vibrating air of students’ instruments or vocal chords, to their peers’ and parents’ ears.

The philosophical and logistical concerns and questions raised by Regelski are real and ought to be taken seriously. They invite, even encourage, music educators to consider curricular changes and the potential restructuring of music programs. Some might wonder how to fit participatory cultures and the scenarios outlined in Toward Convergence or Regelski’s response in their existing curricular structures. To those who see potential in working toward convergence I suggest in addition to addressing Regelski’s questions and those outlined in Figure 2, considering “What types of curricular structures are most conducive to participatory cultures, convergence, and contemporary musical practices?” In other words, I propose that music educators reflect on the principles outlined in both the original article and Regelski’s response to envision, perhaps in collaboration with colleagues and their students, their own action ideals and
work toward their realization whether transforming existing ensembles and classes or creating entirely new hybrids. In the spirit of participatory culture, I hope that related conversation continues in person, print, and across a range of digital media.
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