

### Abstract

Music education's status in the core curriculum of schools in the United States could be considered tenuous at best. While the term *advocacy* may be more politically correct, in reality, organizations such as the National Association for Music Educators, colleges and universities, and the school music teachers themselves have historically been responsible for *selling* their programs to the public. Such efforts were successful in the past thanks to the benevolence of the music industry, social organizations, and large media companies. The purpose of this paper was to detail the history of corporate and donor influence in American music education from the First National Band Contest in 1923 through the Great Depression. Long form quotes from the Music Supervisors' Journal (MSJ) and Music Educators Journal (MEJ) are used to give authentic description to the pulse of involvement by non-music educators during this era, both pro and con, in terms of program aims and curriculum. It was found that several types of organizations helped music educators sell their programs through highly visible events, such as performance contests and memory contests on the radio and in movie theatres. Parallels are drawn to today's climate of increased fiscal scrutiny in music education.

*Keywords:* advocacy, music business, music industry, contests, radio hour, music week, appreciation

California State Superintendent Will C. Wood addressed a constituent of music teachers at a 1923 convention:

If you have failed to sell your music program to superintendents on this occasion, I fancy that you will never be able to sell it at all. The superintendents are all present, and have heard every demonstration given, and the demonstrations were presented in such a manner that they could not fail to be impressed with the excellence of the music, and of the sincerity and pleasure of music instruction in public schools. Judging from the comments that I have heard, I am inclined to believe that you have succeeded in selling your program, for unquestionably the future of school music in this State [California] depends upon the co-operation of the superintendents with the music teachers.<sup>1</sup>

Music education's status in the core curriculum of schools in the United States could be considered tenuous at best. While the term *advocacy* may be more politically correct, in reality, organizations such as the National Association for Music Educators (NAfME since 2011, formerly MSNC<sup>2</sup> and MENC<sup>3</sup>), colleges and universities, and the school music teachers themselves have historically been responsible for *selling* their programs to the American public. Such efforts were successful in the past thanks to the benevolence of music industry sponsors such as music publishers and instrument manufacturers, social organizations such as the Kiwanis club and Women's clubs, and large media companies such as NBC. Ideally, these partnerships have been and continue to remain symbiotic. At best, one might hope corporate sponsorship is seen in some ways as charity aimed to help students. Unfortunately, this relationship is difficult to assess and many in education may ultimately come to be averse to partnerships with big business. The purpose of this paper was to detail the history of corporate and donor influence in American music education from the First National Band Contest in 1923 through the Great

---

<sup>1</sup> "Current Topics," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 9, no. 3 (1923): 38-39.

<sup>2</sup> Music Supervisors National Conference, 1907-1934

<sup>3</sup> Music Educators National Conference, 1934-1998; MENC: The Association for Music Education 1998-2011

Depression.<sup>4</sup> Long form quotes from the Music Supervisors' Journal (MSJ) and Music Educators Journal (MEJ) are used to give authentic description to the pulse of involvement by non-music educators during this era, both pro and con, in terms of program aims and curriculum. It was found that companies helped music educators *sell* their programs through highly visible events, such as performance contests and memory contests on the radio and in movie theatres. Parallels are drawn to today's climate of increased fiscal scrutiny in education and examinations as to the place of music education in schools.

### **A Brief Comment on Conferences and History**

A reader of this paper has likely been to a state-level music educator's conference. These conferences are important for disseminating program aims, showcasing top groups, listening to speakers and perusing product booths so as to keep up-to-date with the latest and greatest instruments and sheet music. At these conferences, there are a lot of *people*. It is easy to notice the most visible; the speakers, educators, and student performers. However, such a conference does not exist without vendors, advertisers, hotels, flights, cars, security staff, concierge clerks, food distributors, parking lot attendants, and likely a few local politicians. The luxuries of today's world means that dozens of cities are equipped to host large scale events. This was not quite so nearly one hundred years ago, "Where shall we meet next year?"... The first big question [of 1923] is, *Can you take care of 2,000 people properly for a complete week in your city?*<sup>5</sup> After a successful national conference in Cleveland, the MSNC looked to grow its' eminence and capitalize on the success of the first "national contest of public school bands"<sup>6</sup> in

---

<sup>4</sup> The Great Depression, 1929-1941

<sup>5</sup> "High Lights of the Cleveland Conference," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 9, no. 5 (1923): 18-22.

<sup>6</sup> Russell V. Morgan, "National School and Band Contest," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 10, no. 3. (1924): 40-41.

order to get support for secondary music programs around the country. Cincinnati was chosen for the 1924 conference, due in large part to the assistance offered by the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce and the Cincinnati Automobile Club in providing free accommodations for members of the conference.<sup>7</sup> In return for helping the conference members, businesses around town gained exposure and the local automobile club, comprised of those with the power to sell cars, parts, and gas, gained access to potentially hundreds of buyers at their free camp.

It is important as history is reexamined to situate oneself in the time for which potential critiques could be made. In 1923, the country was fresh off the War to End All Wars, resources were not abundant, and threats overseas were salient. The Ford Model T was still in production<sup>8</sup>, the 60-story Woolworth Building in Manhattan was the tallest building in the world<sup>9</sup>, the steel industry standardized an 8-hour work week in what turned out to be a landmark labor practice<sup>10</sup>, and the first radio broadcast hit the airwaves as a “Paid Advertisement.”<sup>11</sup> Much of what is taken for granted today, such as the physical moving of bodies with busses and the booking of hotels in megastructures which also house the conferences and contests, required an extra level of careful planning and soliciting of sponsorship to achieve during this era.

### **Buying for Early Band Contests**

The first “national contest of public school bands” took place in Chicago in 1923, funded by the Chamber of Commerce of the Associated Music Industries.<sup>12</sup> Its’ care was placed in the hands of the MSNC the following year, which promised “very substantial prizes will be given by

---

<sup>7</sup> “By Automobile to Cincinnati,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 10, no. 3 (1924): 51-52.

<sup>8</sup> Production years, 1908-1927

<sup>9</sup> Tallest building from 1913-1930. The world’s current tallest building, Burj Khalifa in the United Arab Emirates is 243% taller (2,717 ft.).

<sup>10</sup> [https://fraser.stlouisfed.org/title/162/item/5373?start\\_page=69](https://fraser.stlouisfed.org/title/162/item/5373?start_page=69)

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Morgan, "National School and Band Contest," 40-41.

the Associated Music Industries, who were very much pleased with last year's results, and wish to make the contest more extensive and of greater educational value."<sup>13</sup> The two judged portions of the contest included required material available through publishers found in the *Music Supervisors' Journal* (MSJ)<sup>14</sup>. In subsequent years, the MSJ/MEJ published and promoted the national contest, with rules for instrumentation, musical selections, and performance expectations. In 1928, the small band (32 parts), full band (48 parts) and symphonic band (64 parts) were standardized with each voice required for competition.<sup>15</sup> By working cooperatively with MSNC, publishers from the Associated Music Industries would have a greater idea of how many of each selection to print and for which parts. Exact instrumentation and pre-approved selections of music were required by MSNC to compete, ideally reducing both waste and cost to the consumer in an era of scant resources.

The desire to standardize and canonize certain pieces of literature for school music appears to have been driven by MSNC, not to any explicit benefit to the publishers. The actual task of standardization and selection of music appears to have been made by the publishers themselves, with Jones reflecting upon the movement in 1936 that "The publishers have always been leaders in the field of establishing objectives, probably because they better sense musical and educational needs, and they are vital influences in deciding questions of policy in music."<sup>16</sup> It could be easy to impute that publishers were most concerned with the bottom line or that instrument manufacturers only included the latest instruments<sup>17</sup> to sell more expensive

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 40-41.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 40-41.

<sup>15</sup> "Important Changes in Band Publications," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 15, no. 2 (1928): 69-71.

<sup>16</sup> Archie N. Jones, "Curricular Trends in Music Education," *Music Educators Journal* 23, no. 3 (1936): 14-16.

<sup>17</sup> "Important Changes in Band Publications," 69-71.

equipment. However, it appears the MSNC solicited the involvement of the publishing companies and instrument manufacturing industry during a period of intense desire to use standards to improve performance at the national level. Additionally, it appears publishers and manufacturers were generous enough in their support that the MEJ published a plea to only request materials on loan and for free when absolutely necessary, to assist the “dealer who wishes to be helpful to the full extent of his ability, to know just where to draw the line in order to have a few possible cash customers left from whom to draw the business that all of this generosity is supposed to create.”<sup>18</sup>

### **Selling the Early Success of Contests**

The contests evolved into many state and local community contests, supported by the MSNC, as a means to increase support across the country for secondary music in schools. It was celebrated that the visibility of performing and the spotlight afforded to the winner was successful in “commanding the public attention.”<sup>19</sup> The MEJ boasted that “an interscholastic music meet received no less attention than a major athletic event.”<sup>20</sup> It was felt that the spirit of competition would increase the musicianship of students and eventually the whole country,<sup>21</sup> making the United States a country capable of producing its’ own musicians and musical culture. Competitions began popping up in county fairs, to open up shopping centers, and even horse races, using students to sell the importance of having music around in the lives of citizens. The result was a curriculum dominated by performing the same songs repeatedly to refine and

---

<sup>18</sup> “In the Spirit of Coöperation,” *Music Educators Journal* 24, no. 2 (1937): 19-20.

<sup>19</sup> “Ninth National School Band Contest. Cleveland Schools Host to Thousands,” *Music Educators Journal* 22, no. 6 (1936): 30-33.

<sup>20</sup> “The National Contests,” *Music Educators Journal* 23, no. 1 (1936): 62.

<sup>21</sup> Peter W. Dykema, “The Contest Idea in Music,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 10, no. 2 (1923): 14-62.

memorize a performance, altering what had been up to that time a relatively comprehensive curriculum.<sup>22</sup>

While it was said the winning students enjoyed their experience and communities were appreciative of the performances<sup>23</sup>, the contest model may have resulted in students being used for the financial gains of others, as Maddy unfortunately details in a 1931 critique of contests:

Obviously the reason for having music contests at fairs is to increase attendance. Those in charge of county fairs have little or no interest in the educational value of such contests... The writer served as an adjudicator at a recent county fair music contest at which a first prize of \$75 was awarded to the best school orchestra... they [the fair organizers] estimated that each individual participant brought four paid admissions... If we ignore this growth it will soon be beyond our control. It is time now for every music educator to ascertain the plans of neighboring county fairs and offer guidance in developing such music contests along educational lines. ... County fair managers are likely to distort the objectives of music contests... using the competing bands as the means of securing free music for the fair... I recall judging such a contest in which horse races were alternated with competing bands, with the competing bands taking the place of hired professional bands, at a considerable savings to the fair association.<sup>24</sup>

The prior expose reads not too different than contests or festivals the author of this paper has attended. Entertainment companies, Disney perhaps most notably, hosts “festivals” nearly year-round that require admission to their theme park in exchange for what amounts to providing free entertainment for their guests. This practice appears to have begun in the economically-deprived Great Depression era, where businesses happily hosted “contests” rather than pay professional musicians to draw a crowd. The quality of the performances, driven to be high by the contest-model itself, were screened through auditions to ensure the caliber of performance would not be offending. In response to this clear exploitation of students, alternative voices rallied against

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 14-62.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 14-62.

<sup>24</sup> J.E. Maddy, “Music Contests at County Fairs,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 18, no. 1 (1931): 42.

contest-driven curriculum by offering their own version of commercially-influenced music education: music appreciation courses.

### **Selling “Taste” with Contests**

While band and orchestra contests hoped to show that music education could produce highly skilled entertainment groups, the scope of music appreciation in this era was designed to cultivate taste in consumers. It logically followed that if consumers were educated to be refined in their tastes, the classical music canon would be able to resist the “cheap, the tawdry, and the inane”<sup>25</sup> music that was more popular at the time. Some saw the popularity of the radio and motion picture industries as tools or educational technologies by which music educators could get across their mission of musical discrimination. A National Music Week was developed and sponsored by the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc, with theatre managers benefitting through gate receipts similar to the county fair performance contests:

... fifty musical selections which are generally known as popular classics and which are familiar to the ear throughout the country, will be chosen for use in the national music memory contest. ... the motion picture theatre managers... will play the selections during their showings for at least a month in advance of the contest... Other civic organizations, the radio stations, and churches are expected to cooperate. ... it seems to us that since the vast majority of our people go to the motion picture theatres, the motion picture theatre is the most logical place in which to conduct a popular campaign.<sup>26</sup>

The initial National Music Week in 1926 ultimately gained sponsorship from 32 organizations, including manufacturers, labor organizations, publishing companies, and private donors. The success of radio program contests resulted in the National Broadcasting Company (NBC)

---

<sup>25</sup> J. Harold Powers, “Surface Methods Versus Unchanging Values,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 19, no. 3 (1933): 10-69.

<sup>26</sup> “Plan for a Great Music Memory Contest,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 12, no. 3 (1926): 74-75.

sponsoring a Music Appreciation Hour<sup>27</sup>, selling instructors' manuals to teachers but giving away student resource books for free, as well as providing scholarships and prizes for winners.<sup>28</sup> In return, the NBC gained access to a large, weekly radio audience, allowing them to sell airtime to advertisers and to reify brand loyalty in the minds of consumers towards a company that gives them entertainment for free.

### Debates over Utility as Advocacy

The arguments over the utility of music performance and performance contests were exacerbated by economic conditions at the end of the 1920s. The beginning of the Great Depression, signified by the stock market collapse on October 29, 1929, ushered in an era of conservation of resources as opposed to a previous period of using economic resources and lines of credit to spur growth. It serves to note that the next edition of the MSJ began with the heading "THIS IS YOUR LAST FREE JOURNAL."<sup>29</sup>

The effect of the market collapse was felt in the music education world as both financial and educational practices were examined:

At the present time, taxpayers are crying loudly for a reduction in taxes... In many instances educational needs are being interpreted in terms of bare essentials and utilitarian values, with the result music ... being curtailed or eliminated entirely. Every school system having local broadcasting facilities should make extensive use of the radio as a means of combating the possible unwise curtailment of the music program... The Radio Committee is anxious to hear from supervisors who are already making use of the radio, either as a supplemental teaching device or as an instrument of educational propaganda.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Max T. Krone, "NBC Music Appreciation Hour," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 18, no. 2 (1932): 71.

<sup>28</sup> "National Music Discrimination Contest," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 18, no. 2 (1932): 31.

<sup>29</sup> "THIS IS YOUR LAST FREE JOURNAL," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 16, no. 5 (1930): 3.

<sup>30</sup> Edgar B. Gordon, "Untitled," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 19, no. 3 (1933): 24.

It was suggest that performing music had no purpose for the modern student, but that learning to be a critical listener would be the key to justifying music education:

She [the music teacher] will realize that the large percentage of children in the schools will be consumers and not producers of music, and will therefore try to bring to the many a keen appreciation of music through singing and listening to good music. Knowing that only a small minority of children will make any use in later life of the many forms of theory, including intensive work in sight reading, she will be unwilling to force upon the many the materials that only few will ever use. ... I believe that educators and patrons of the schools will acknowledge that few subjects in the schools have made as much progress in getting close to life and in finding normal functionings in and out of school as has music. This factor alone should play a large part in justifying music's place in the schools.<sup>31</sup>

Radio made listening to music cheaper than a phonograph and the breadth of music that one could hear was immediately increased. Miessner echoes these sentiments in 1935 and points to appreciation models as solutions to solving public support issues with American music education as well as American musical culture itself:

It is necessary, however, to point out one source of danger in the present situation, particularly in our secondary schools where the emphasis, all too common, has been upon the cultivation and exploitation of the talented few. ... schools that attract but a small portion of the students because of the necessarily high standards, and that tend to neglect the lower-level interests of a large majority. Indeed, in many cities these organizations consist of student members who have acquired their skills, not in the schools, but through favorable home environments and individual opportunities to learn music. ... It is doubtful, also, whether it is the function of secondary schools to emphasize specialization in any subject to so high a degree. ... In a democracy, every child should have an equal chance to discover and to develop his natural abilities at his own level, regardless of his economic status. Unless, therefore, the base of musical opportunity is widened, there is danger that the structure may become top-heavy and fall of its own weight. ... There are leisure-time values in recreational music, in amateur music making on many levels that have not yet been fully realized. ... And when in greater numbers and with increasing powers we are able to create as well as make our own music, we shall at least shake off our dependence upon foreigners who have dominated our tastes in the past and given us a national musical inferiority complex. American composers, conductors, and artists will come into their own.

---

<sup>31</sup> Powers, "Surface Methods Versus Unchanging Values," 10-69.

... At last we shall have our own national music – a music of our own people, by our own people – a national Music – *Homemade!*<sup>32</sup>

The issue of relevancy in music education even had the movie industry weighing in, “Perhaps one way to deepen the interest in young people in classical music is to use it in connection with something in which they already find pleasure.”<sup>33</sup> It was posited that “Music Weeks provide practical illustrations of the fact that music plays an essential part in our life activities... to show music in its relation to the other arts, such as literature, pictorial arts, the drama, the dance, the cinema, and radio.”<sup>34</sup> The relevancy of using “folk” instruments began entering national debates as Miessner chimed in with the fiscal observation that:

During the worst year of the depression, nine hundred thousand guitars were sold in this country. Music printers tell me that today they print more music by far for piano accordion than for the piano. Why then, in the name of common sense, do we not recognize the need of these children for help to do better what they want to do and will do anyway?<sup>35</sup>

The debate of contests versus festivals, western classical versus folk instruments, appreciation versus theory, and the best way to *sell* programs for public support rages to this day. The immediate period following the end of the Great Depression saw the United States’ entry into World War II. Literature in the MEJ became focused on country and service, which strongly supported the performance-contest model of music education. Entertainment meant marching bands that displayed American pride, with less emphasis on listening to European music but plenty of patriotic appreciation in American folk music and singing.

### **Lessons from an Unsustainable Market**

---

<sup>32</sup> W. Otto Miessner, “A Plea for Homemade Music,” *Music Educators Journal* 21, no. 6 (1935): 15-66.

<sup>33</sup> “School Music Problems Round Table,” *Music Educators Journal* 25, no. 2 (1938): 56-61.

<sup>34</sup> “Music Week – May 3-9,” *Music Educators Journal* 22, no. 5 (1936): 14.

<sup>35</sup> W. Otto Miessner, “Forces Affecting Musical Progress,” *Music Educators Journal* 25, no. 3 (1938): 18-69.

The support of corporations, businesses, and donors enabled music education in schools to survive the Great Depression, a time of economic scrutiny when programs had to *sell* their worth to continue to exist. Ultimately, the field of music education chose one of two routes to sell their programs; (1) elite performance contests or (2) appreciation models that took advantage of the two popular media technologies of the time (radio and movies). Selling the program became the ultimate force driving curriculum, for better (prevalence of secondary programs) and worse (student exploitation, marginalized curriculum). It would appear companies had little, if any, direct influence. They supplied what was demanded, be it instruments, radios, or sheet music. Additionally, they supplied materials for free or at reduced costs, believing in the mission of the members of MSNC and MENC, and that sponsorship would result in paying customers. Music education during that time was essentially financed privately, with the burden of proof then placed on the classroom teachers to prove the utility of having received funding for their programs. The failure of these models, perhaps, were that (1) entertainment as a driving force for curricular decisions does not make for appropriate educational goals and (2) that the term appreciation in this era was synonymous with enculturation. Two competing products (performance-model, appreciation-model) were made, each were bought, but it was not enough for sustainable music education funding.

As tastes and public opinion changed, companies, businesses, and organizations were there to supply the demands requested of music education. These partnerships were often the result of MSNC members soliciting help from businesses and donors, not the result of businesses looking to exploit and capitalize on students. The review of articles from this time appeared to show some MSNC members as proponents of unintentional student exploitation, looking to profit from program exposure first and foremost. In another period of economic instability,

funding cuts, and teacher protests, the field of music education once again seems to be asking of itself, is music education on a sustainable path? Is it economically viable? Is it reliant on donations? Does that drive curriculum? And perhaps most importantly, how much substance is sold for highly-visible style? There are no easy answers to these complicated questions.

Music appreciation as described in the 1930s sounds like what is termed comprehensive music education today. Listening, theory, history, dictation, and narrative analysis were all different ways to appreciate music. Today, these subjects are treated compartmentalized aspects of music. Separate classes exist for each and it is questionable how much effort is put into unifying any type of spiral curriculum between departments at a school, or year to year with a single teacher. The appreciation classes of yesteryear tended to adopt the current technology of the times as a means to sell the utility of music to the American public. Where they perhaps failed, and where there stands a noticeable difference today, is in the types of music promoted through appreciation courses. In the Great Depression, the aim was to cultivate *taste*, to educate citizens in how to listen to music with discrimination.<sup>36</sup> This meant how to be fiscally responsible with new technology, movie theatres and the radio. The message was one that only the “best” music should be consumed with citizens’ limited resources. In a 1938 letter to the MEJ, one schoolteacher protested the use of classical music in cheap movies:

I wish to enter a complaint about the music that Walt Disney is using for some of his cheaper films. To be very explicit, may I give the following example. We have spent a great deal of time in this school to teach our children the appreciation of Rossini’s “William Tell Overture.” The other evening I attended a motion picture where a Walt Disney cartoon called “The Moose Hunters” came on, and Rossini’s “Overture” was being played for its motivation. I have talked with several musicians about this and they tell me that we are helpless to prevent it because anyone has a right to use this music. However, these experts advise me to write

---

<sup>36</sup> “National Music Discrimination Contest,” 31.

you, and perhaps Walt Disney could use other types of music for his cheaper films.<sup>37</sup>

It has been shown people hate stronger than they love.<sup>38</sup> It could be argued that discrimination in the aesthetic sense can equate to discrimination in the social sense when subjective value is injected. The subjective nature by which classical music was promoted, and the extent to which its' value continued to dwindle despite decades of efforts, speaks to the problem of ascribing elite value to any single art. The public's demand for music did not align with what music education supplied, even when teaming up with large companies. Thankfully, comprehensive music education has evolved to be more multicultural and has removed much value from musical discrimination activities.

### **Evaluating the Present Market**

The contest model of music education remains rampant in the United States' music education programs, with standard instrumentation and literature supplied by manufacturers and publishers. The internet has made the availability and access to materials less reliant on conferences and journal advertisements to move product, though they are still a large part of the business. Scholarships are still supplied to winners of contests, sending those most likely to embrace the contest model to colleges where they may become future music teachers. Entrance into music schools in the United States are largely dependent upon competition in performance. Students are not expected to understand music theory. They do not have to be able to compose music. Qualification to teach music is often predicated on one single musical task, showy performance. Other types of musical understandings do not qualify a student for admission nor

---

<sup>37</sup> "School Music Problems Round Table," 56-61.

<sup>38</sup> Adam Waytz, Liane L. Young, & Jeremy Ginges, "Motive attribution asymmetry for love vs. hate drives intractable conflict," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 111, no. 44 (2015): 15687-15692.

will showy performance on non-standardized instruments. The author's undergraduate music *education* scholarship, like many others, stipulated *performing* with the university ensemble at all performances, public and commissioned. These conditions are not caused by the way in which corporations are involved with music education, be-it standardization, control over publishing, availability of instruments, or incentives such as scholarships or roller coaster rides. These conditions are the result of music education as a business, a system of buyers and sellers, as music *people*, creating a market in which there is a demand for these supplies.

### **Considerations for a New Sustainable Market**

*People* work for corporations, but are corporations, *people*? This contentious issue has resulted in five Supreme Court cases since 2002 and has perhaps influenced public opinion to mistrust big business. Does this mean the people who work for corporations are inherently bad, vultures that take advantage of consumers to increase profit margins? It may be difficult for educators to humanize those in the business world as it is common to assume businesses only care about the bottom line. However, the music industry (publishers, manufacturers, etc.) historically has been essential to supplying, and in many cases subsidizing, music education programs in the United States. It appears other *music people*, industry and business people who were not music educators, were highly influential if not altogether altruistic in supporting the development of music education in schools during the 1920s and 30s.

Large corporations involved in music education today, such as Apple and Fender, are more likely to be associated with other aspects of industry first and involved with music education second. This makes many, including the author of this paper, cautious when considering the degree to which businesses should be allowed to permeate the infrastructure of music education. One main issue is that competition, sponsored by the music industry, has no

place in the music classroom and that more than competition in performance needs to drive the selection of future music teachers. That does not make the music industry the problem, however, and is not a reason for distrust. When Fender donates hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of guitars to school programs, it can be said that they are doing so for hidden reasons. Some have considered the notion of *tainted altruism* to explain a veiled effort at charity.<sup>39</sup> The argument would be that replacement instruments, parts, and strings will be Fender brand. Kids will go home and ask a parent to buy them a Fender by name. Surely, Fender will recoup some of the expenses incurred for donating instruments. However, that practice only becomes problematic when music educators adopt one of two worldviews: students have to be elite electric guitarists to be valued in the classroom, or, appreciation means exploring all the ways to value electric guitar music solely and above all else. Is Fender influencing curriculum by making instruments accessible? Only so far as music educators limit the scope of music education to be electric guitar performance and appreciation courses. Can music education be used to teach students to be smart consumers of music products? Not if educators are afraid they are always being sold snake oil. In reality, many in the industry of music business live in that world as advocates of music education, as friends of music<sup>40</sup>, not to serve business interests above all else but because they genuinely enjoy music and empowering individuals to make their own.

While not all growth during the 1920s and 1930s were positive in terms of curricular choices, the prevalence of music education in secondary schools unquestionably grew extensively through self-promotion. Also during this time, the author would suggest that there

---

<sup>39</sup> George E. Newman, & Daylian M. Cain, "Tainted Altruism: When Doing Some Good Is Evaluated as Worse Than Doing No Good at All," *Psychological Science* 25, no. 3 (2014): 648-655.

<sup>40</sup> "Friends of Music Education Society," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 15, no. 4 (1929): 69-71.

existed a more symbiotic relationship between music education and the music industry, as evidenced by the reflection from Jones in 1936 about publishers establishing objectives because of their respected status.<sup>41</sup> Music education tried to reflect the nature of music in present society, more so than today at least. Educators adopted recent trends in technology, embracing and promoting music education with the radio and at movie theatres. Why has music education more recently tended to shun away from advancements in computers, digital music, streaming, and other developments? Outfitting orchestras and bands cost as much, likely far more, than digital music labs that can cater to the same amount of students. For example, the author of this paper outfitted an existing school computer lab with stations for a music technology program that cost under \$2000, sourced through private and business donations, and sat 30 students per class period. By contacting the sales department of a potential industry-standard software company, it was learned that there was a music education specialist on staff that could help with questions. Ultimately, the gear and software were given at a significant educational and volume discount. A few license codes were offered free of charge to reward certain students with free editions of the software for home use, while any student in the class was eligible for the reduced rate. The author received no benefit for this interaction, unless motivated and highly-engaged students qualifies. This type of symbiotic relationship is key to increasing the relevance of music education without sacrificing ethics or standards. A few students did purchase gear outside of school in addition to the fee for the initial purchase by the school, but is equipping and encouraging students to engage with music outside of school not the goal? This requires the use of tools and software only afforded to students through the adoption of recent technology. These tools and software inherently need to be *sold* to educators. To *sell* music education to our

---

<sup>41</sup> Jones, "Curricular Trends in Music Education," 14-16.

administrators and the public, as was characterized in the opening quote by California State Superintendent Wood, we need current and relevant programs. This means adopting technology and tools familiar and useful to our students. This can be done and should be done without being runners or advertisers for businesses, but as advocates for creative musical potentials.

Review Copy