Inhabiting or Inhibiting?
Physical Expression and Ancillary Movements in Instrumental Music Performance.

D. Scott MacLennan Ph.D.

Abstract: Dr. D. Scott MacLennan studied instrumental music students' conceptions of physical movements not directly involved in sound production. He suggests ways that educators might develop more embodied approaches to teaching after finding that these ancillary movements hold important meanings for students and reflect their degree of engagement with music-making.

Introduction

When choreographer Mark Morris works with his dance company and believes that his dancers are not expressing themselves well through their movements, he tells them "it looks like footprints painted on the floor. Learning the steps is only like learning the notes, but I want more … With my company, sometimes I say, 'That's nice, but it's not inhabited'" (Morris in Keller, 2004). I believe this *inhabiting*, which Morris describes, involves experiencing dance or music at a level that transcends the mere technical aspects of performance and depicts a *deeper* engagement/connection of *living through* and communicating the experience of *doing* the art form, whether it be dance or music. For me, this raises questions for music educators such as: How often do students *inhabit* the music they are playing? What role does physical movement play in this *inhabiting*? Music educators strive to increase student engagement and meaning making with music but how often do conversations occur in classes surrounding expressive movements and the meaning these movements have for students?

In researching the ways students understand and engage in learning, researchers are able to provide a better experiential foundation to support students' learning (Prosser and Trigwell, 1999). In my recent study (MacLennan, 2015), I sought to improve student musicianship and increase the effectiveness of pedagogical practices by 1) enhancing educator and student awareness of adolescent instrumentalists' conceptualizations of their ancillary movements, and 2) stimulating dialogue amongst educators and students about physical movement and musical expression. According to Cadoz (1988), there are two types of physical movements/gestures used by musicians: 1) instrumental movements, those that play a direct role in the production of sound (e.g., breathing in and blowing out air, hand and arm movement of individual keys or a bow), and 2) ancillary movements, those not directly involved in the production of sound (e.g., leaning forward, swaying side to side). This second type, ancillary movement, was the focus of my study, *Mapping how students conceptualize ancillary movement in instrumental music performance* (MacLennan, 2015). I examined the ways in which instrumental (band and orchestra) music students understand ancillary movements by studying their *conceptions* of these movements in instrumental music performance.

Rationale for Study

As a music educator, I have sought out ways to increase student engagement in music-making that go beyond playing music technically well but void of expression and *deeper* meaning. As a performing musician, I have noticed that when I pay attention to how the music I am playing makes me want to move, I can engage in music-making at a more rewarding, *deeper* level. Not only does physical movement help me express what I am feeling or interpret what I conceive the music is communicating to me, it also allows me to focus on the process of music-making and transcend the distracting technical demands and performance anxiety that often impede music performance. Moreover, my movements connect me with fellow musicians, in time-specific, here and now occurrences, who are also moving to the music in their own ways.

I have observed that students' ancillary movements do more than just visually enhance their performances— they reflect the students' degree of engagement with the music. I use the terms *engage* and *engagement* to indicate the establishment of a meaningful contact or connection with a person or phenomenon. Additionally, it is important to understand that it is the participants' conceptions of ancillary movements that I studied and not the phenomenon of ancillary movements. As students actively engage their physical bodies in making music, I suggest that they are acquiring new musical meanings.

Initially, when I became interested in studying students' conceptions of ancillary movements in instrumental music performance, I regularly had conversations with teaching colleagues who said they told their students not to move while playing. I remember one colleague stating that he talked to his students about the positive aspects of movement, but when "that clarinet player made those funny circular motions all the time when he was playing, I quickly put a stop to that." Knowing the influence that a teacher's comments have on his or her students, I was struck by the impact that such directives might have on impressionable adolescents who are concerned with how they appear to others (especially how they appear to those they admire and whose opinions they highly value). The students in my study indicated that when they were told not to move by their teachers, it had a negative effect on their music-making and *in-*

hibited their musical thought, expression, and meaning. Therefore, when music teachers reflect on their teaching practice, are they encouraging students to *inhabit* the music or are they *inhibiting* students' experiences of expressing and meaning making by not including discussion of ancillary movements in their performance habits?

Numerous approaches to music instruction, such as those of Orff, Kodály, and Dalcroze, have encouraged movement instruction as a primary step in the comprehensive process of learning music (Choksy, Abramson, Gillespie, & Woods, 2001). Yet, as Yun (2011) asserts, "The instrumental music program … has not ordinarily stressed this form of basic kinesthetic learning. Instrumental instructors often assume that students have developed elementary rhythmic ability before the age of instrumental ensemble participation" (Yun, 414-5). Through considering the different ways students' conceptualize ancillary movements in the instrumental music classroom, educators may develop greater understanding of what ancillary movement *means* for the students they teach.

Methodology

The research method chosen for this study was phenomenography due to its second-order perspective of studying conceptions. In the second-order[i] perspective, phenomenography is primarily concerned with the content of thinking, of what is perceived and thought about, and with identifying and describing individuals' conceptions of a phenomenon as faithfully as possible through analyzing their statements about the world (or about their experience of it). Further, the phenomenographer's analysis is based on the understanding and experience of a group as a whole, not on an individual.

A phenomenographic inquiry involves collecting data through interviews in a way that permits interviewees to "choose the dimensions of the subject they want to answer" (Marton, 1986, p. 42). As a result, it allows information to surface that is not achievable through questionnaires. Through a semi-structured interview, participants are encouraged to expose their ways of understanding a phenomenon and their relationship to the phenomenon.

Besides asking a series of questions in an interview, I evoked the responses of each student at three different stages of the interview by showing them video footage of instrumentalists performing on stage as well as video footage of themselves or other classmates performing. Though interviewing is the primary and often only method used in phenomenography, I added journaling to allow the participants opportunities during the month following the interview to return to a performance space and clarify their conceptions. This opportunity for students to write in their journals immediately after performing, I contend, yielded greater insight into the students' conceptions of their ancillary movements, which might initially have been ineffable for many of them.

During phenomenographic data analysis, the different ways of understanding that emerge are not constituted independently, but are viewed in relation to one another. *Relationality* is the primary concern, since the intent of the research is not to come to an understanding of the phenomenon being examined, but, instead, the relation between the subject and that phenomenon. Phenomenographers do not aim to separate the phenomenon from related experiences described by the subjects (Marton & Booth, 1997). The interviewees' different ways of understanding are usually ordered in terms of inclusivity of awareness (*structure of awareness*), where more inclusive ways also represent more complex ways of understanding the phenomenon. Categories are defined by their qualitative differences from one another and reported in order of complexity and inclusivity, thus providing clarification of the relationships between different ways of experiencing a single phenomenon. The primary goal of the phenomenographer is to explicate the *structure of awareness*, usually defined through *categories of description*, which illustrate variation within a whole group's experience of a phenomenon.

I amassed the collective experiences of the participants through interviews and student journals and then analyzed the data, creating interrelated categories of increasing levels of complexity of understanding of ancillary movements that describe the ways adolescents experience those movements. Finally, these inter-related levels were graphically represented in a format that phenomenographers refer to as an *outcome space* (see Figure 1 below).

This two-month study involved 24 students from three Vancouver high schools, located in different communities (West-side-affluent, Eastside-middle-income, and Inner City) in an attempt to include participants of different socioeconomic status (SES); gender (10 male and 14 female); and grade levels (8 to 12). The students were enrolled in a variety of instrumental music classes including concert band, jazz band, orchestra, and drum line. As well, the ethnic backgrounds of the students in the group included representatives from Asian, Southeast Asian, Latin American, and European countries.

Findings

After the students finished their month of journaling, I analyzed the interview transcripts and journal entries, organizing the data through qualitative coding that emerged through a reiterative process of re-reading and combining similar codes. The students' responses were gathered into a *pool of meanings* where data that identified individual participants were discarded. I analyzed the *pool of meanings* and created categories of variation, which were further organized into inter-related levels, representing the relationships among the categories. The categories of description reflect five levels of complexity of students' conceptions of ancillary movements:

Extrinsic Technical
        Beats and Rhythms (level 1)
        Music Elements (level 2)
Extrinsic Meaning
        Music Meaning (level 3)
        Communicating (level 4)
Intrinsic Meaning
        Expressive Meaning (level 5)

I chose to use the term *extrinsic* to describe components of music-making that are literally outside of the student. In the Extrinsic Technical level, ancillary movement is understood as a technical means related to learning, experiencing, and/or facilitating music performance. Students at the first level, which I named *Extrinsic Technical: Beats and Rhythms*, used ancillary movements to understand beats and rhythms found in the music and, through their use, helped themselves to obtain greater technical fluency on their instruments. Students who described this type of movement did not report any other use or need for ancillary movements other than to distinguish beats and rhythms in the music. Students at the second extrinsic technical level discussed music elements beyond beats and rhythms, such as dynamics, phrasing, style, and articulation. I named this level *Extrinsic Technical: Music Elements*, since students at this level used ancillary movements to understand music elements such as dynamics, phrasing, articulation, and other stylistic elements and through their use enabled themselves to obtain greater technical fluency on their instrument. This second level reflected a higher level of complexity because students' responses went beyond the discussion of beats and rhythms by including other music elements.

At the Extrinsic Meaning level, an even more complex view of music-making was evident, where the student focused on the inherent meaning of the music through the realization of meaningful musical sound for communication. The student still gave attention to the extrinsic meaning of the music as object, outside of her- or himself, while the ancillary movements, along with the instrumental and technical elements of music-making, were embodied as a means for the student to realize the music's meaning. At this level, the student considers the technical elements of music-making only as the mechanics of playing and as second-ary to the meaning ascribed to the music. The Extrinsic Meaning category describes the understanding that music has a meaning that is unique and specific to it. Musicians illuminate this meaning and perform or communicate it to their audience.

I expanded Extrinsic Meaning into two levels as well. The first, which becomes level three in the overall structure of the categories of description, involves the conceived inherent meaning of the music performed. Level three, *Extrinsic Meaning: Music Meaning*, is where students use ancillary movements to express the inherent meaning of the music (as object). Students whose comments I categorized as being at level three regard the music's meaning as preexisting and believe the performer's duty is to find and convey it. The main difference between level three and level four is the performer's need to communicate this meaning to others. I have called level four *Extrinsic Meaning: Communicating*, where ancillary movements are used to communicate the inherent meaning of the music (as object) to the audience or other performers in community.

Students whose comments I categorized at the final level, Intrinsic Meaning, regard music as what Reid (1999) describes as "a vehicle for expressing personal artistic truths" (p. 73). The extrinsic elements of instrumental technique and inherent music meaning are still contained in this view of music, but the added intrinsic, personal interpretation and meaning of the performer is expressed through the vehicle of the music as well. Therefore, the intrinsic meaning of music is understood through the lens of a musician's own personal meaning making, her or his view of the world from her or his experiences with music, and his or her reinterpretation of the extrinsic meaning of the music. The technical/mechanical aspects of playing an instrument are subsumed in the interpretive process, and the musician's own artistic truth

The different conceptions of ancillary movements in music performance held by adolescents

Extrinsic Technical:

Beats and rhythms (level 1): Ancillary movements are used to understand and/or express beats and rhythms found in the music and through their use allow a performer to obtain greater technical facility on his or her instrument.

Music elements (level 2): Ancillary movements are used to understand and/or express music elements such as dynamics, phrasing, articulation, and other stylistic elements and through their use allow a performer to obtain greater technical facility on his or her instrument.

Extrinsic Meaning:

Musical Meaning (level 3): Ancillary movements are used to understand and/or express the inherent meaning of the music (as object).

Communicating (level 4): Ancillary movements are used to communicate the inherent meaning of the music (as object) to the audience or other performers in community.

Intrinsic Meaning

Expressive meaning (level 5): Ancillary movements occur as a means of self-expression where the music-making becomes a vehicle for expression and communication with others or just oneself.

is envisioned through her or his own understanding of the world. At the core of Intrinsic Meaning is the creation and expression of the performer's artistic truth. Level five, *Intrinsic Meaning: Expressive Meaning*, represents ancillary movement occurring as a means of self-expression where the music-making becomes a vehicle for expression/communication with others or just oneself.

Although all of the students said they valued ancillary movements, several of them said that they found it challenging to use them. Their top four concerns/themes included these: 1) multitasking, having to think about moving; 2) if the teacher talked publically about a student's movements, the students would move less; 3) if they felt confident, students would move more, leading to a greater experience with the music being performed; and 4) due to self-conscious concerns about moving, students might limit their movements to feel safe from possible ridicule. These data have ramifications for talking about ancillary movements with students and raise questions about pedagogical practices involving physical movement used currently in music classrooms. These four themes, along with the outcome space described above, offer greater understanding of the meaning of ancillary movements in the lives of adolescents.

Conclusion and Discussion

I found that 100% of the participants in the study valued ancillary movements in music performance and thought those movements had a positive effect on their experiences in music-making. For example, Eric[ii] stated: "I believe that ancillary movement is a strong factor in musical expression, and a part of musical expression depends on ancillary movement to enhance it." Students varied in their conceptions of their motivations for ancillary movements (unconscious-natural to choreographed), as well as how using ancillary movements caused them extra challenges, but all of the participants stated that the benefits of moving outweighed the challenges. Moreover, some students mentioned that they had not previously discussed moving expressively but believed that conversations about movement should be encouraged in music classes. Even when students expressed concerns about feeling self-conscious when moving, they still thought it to be important and felt that they would move more if their fellow performers around them were moving. As well, some participants professed that ancillary movements have a positive effect, allowing them to feel less nervous and more focused on music-making. This may not be the case for all students, but it seems possible that if students were given opportunities to discover what meaning ancillary/expressive movements had for them, they might develop a greater connection with the music they are making and thereby lessen performance anxiety and other unwanted stresses. Furthermore, educators who do not discuss expressive movements with their students may be limiting students' experiences, allowing non-movement to become the default in their classes. By not having discussions with their students about expressive movements, I suggest educators may be diminishing their students' musical engagement and the overall value music-making has for them.

Participants in this study stated that ancillary movements had a positive effect on their music-making experiences by allowing them to engage with the music and their music-making community more completely than they would otherwise have done. Also, participants expressed that musicians who play without moving communicated the performer's lack of confidence, lack of engagement with the music, and had a negative effect on how they valued the experience of music-making. As Steven asserted: "I think [your] body language has a lot to do with how [you] feel because, if you are standing still, are you really enjoying the music?"

The students I interviewed told me that when they feel they know the music well, they are more likely to move. In their view, when the technical aspects of music-making consume the performer's conscious thought, there is little to no consciousness left to consider ancillary/expressive movements. Even students who felt they moved unconsciously/naturally noted that they moved less if overwhelmed by challenges beyond their skill level. The difficulty of the music combined with having to concentrate on moving overwhelms the performer and the likelihood of a negative experience increases. This might explain why students noted that if their teachers talked about expressively moving with the music, before the students were comfortable with the technical aspects of the music, students might become overloaded with multitasking and, as a result, might move less.

I suggest that expressive movements should be discussed only when the basic technical skills have been developed and students are able to consciously consider expressive movements in their music-making through *somaesthetic* practice. Somaesthetics is a form of reflective bodily awareness that contemplates the body's role in enhancing knowledge, improving active performance, and increasing the pleasures of living. Shusterman (2000) states: "Somaesthetics is devoted to the critical ameliorative study of one's experience and use of one's body as a locus of sensory-aesthetic appreciation and creative self-fashioning" (p. 138). In addition to physical movement through bodily practices, it is the reflective body consciousness or "mindfulness and somaesthetics" that Shusterman promotes "while building upon its extraordinary valuable insights about the profound inter-reliance, the inextricable relatedness, of the human body" (Bowman, 2010, p. 4). Shusterman advocates for pragmatic somaesthetic methods like Feldenkrais, yoga, and tai chi. For example, the Feldenkrais method uses gentle movement sequences to focus direct attention toward enhancing physical movement and mental functioning by improving posture, flexibility, and coordination. Students who primarily viewed ancillary movements from Extrinsic Meaning (levels 3 and 4) or Intrinsic Meaning (level 5) perspectives regularly described this major task of balancing challenge and skill levels and the adverse affects of the increase in multitasking. Yet, all participants suggested that everyone should move with expression when playing and that moving together in a group, when one is comfortable with his or her skill level in comparison with the challenge of the music, is important in music-making. For example, Tara talked about why expressive movements were important:

[F]or them [the audience] to know that there is ex-

pression in you, the fact that the music is so in you that you can't help but to move a little bit, and there's something great that happens in the music when you know it, you have to reflect that with a little bit of an arm movement or head movement or something or ... especially when you're in a group, moving.

Participants repeatedly stated that music performance without movement shows lack of engagement, poor self-confidence in one's abilities, and decreased expression of the music's meaning or one's own personal meaning. The study participants viewed movement as important in music-making as long as moving did not over-tax the performers' capacity to consider it. Therefore, educators need to closely monitor the amount of multitasking their students are doing so that they may help facilitate discussion of expressive movements in their classes when it is most appropriate.

Students expressed concern that ancillary movements should not be taught along with other techniques to overload the conscious thought of the performer. For this reason, I suggest it might be best for discussion and experience of ancillary movements to take place away from the instrument, separate from the worries of playing the right note at the right dynamic, with the correct articulation, tone colour, and phrasing. In his *Eurhythmics*, Jaques-Dalcroze (1935) intentionally used kinesthetic exercises without an instrument so that students could concentrate on incorporating their bodies in their music- making without the distraction of the external instrument. Jaques-Dalcroze rehearsed movements with his students first in the physical body, followed by asking the students to imagine the same kinesthetic motion only in their mind (inner motion), without physical motion. Through such techniques, a physical awareness of the body's relationship with sound can be developed. Memory banks of aural, visual, and kinesthetic images are developed for future recall by the students when engaging in music-making. Therefore, Jaques-Dalcroze's pedagogy helps students connect mental images with experienced kinesthetic images to create a whole body understanding of music through movement. Other highly effective somaesthetic methods, such as Pierce's (2007) *Deepening musical performance through movement* and Weikart, Boardman, and Bryant's (2004) *75 ensemble warm-ups: Activities for bands, choirs, and orchestras*, develop greater body awareness of physical/expressive movements away from the instrument. Both of these methods are very useful for facilitating experience of expressive movements through somaesthetic practice.

By mapping the ways students' conceptualize ancillary movements in the instrumental music class, this study presents educators with information that may increase their understanding of the importance ancillary movements have for the students they teach. The five categories illustrated in the final outcome space shown above indicate the diverse ways that students experience these movements in music-making. Most educators know that there is not one way to teach all students, and that by researching the ways students themselves understand and engage in learning, they may be able to provide instruction suitable to support each student's learning. Through differentiated instruction, a set of strategies could be developed to help teachers meet individual students where they are at when they enter the music class and move them forward as far as possible in their educational journeys. Furthermore, based on the categories of description that I have proposed, researchers and educators can now ask: Do these levels of complexity of understanding in the final outcome space represent different stages in students' development as music makers?

My research supplies educators with increasing levels of complexity of understanding of students' conceptions of ancillary movements through the final outcome space and may help educators to facilitate *deliberate practice* for involving expressive movement activities for their students. Using what Ericsson et al. (1993) describe as *deliberate practice*, expertise is acquired by mastering increasingly complex and challenging sequences of motor activities that go just beyond the students' current reliable level of performance. Therefore, relying on my assumption that ancillary movements can be taught like instrumental movements, I suggest that educators use deliberate practice when developing pedagogy for teaching expressive movement in their instrumental music classes.

I envision an increase in student engagement in music-making through adapting pedagogy to include the diversity in students' conceptions of movement in performance. Based on my analysis of the students' interviews and journaling blogs, I propose that an increase in student engagement with the music being performed is likely to occur when the following four conditions are present:

1. The teacher gives students freedom to make their own natural ancillary movements. Participants stated that they valued natural movements more than choreographed movements because choreographed movements felt artificial, awkward, and forced. Also, if teachers told students not to move, some students felt like it would diminish the quality of their music-making experience.

2. The student feels confident with his or her music skills (balance between challenge and skills). Repeatedly, participants said they would move more if they knew their music well and were not worried about making mistakes. They also discussed how movement in a player's performance shows his or her confidence.

3. The student does not feel self conscious about what others might think of his or her movements. Participants indicated they did not want to be singled out in front of their classmates and said they would move less if their teacher publicly acknowledged their movements. But, if their peers were moving beside them and they felt comfortable playing with the ensemble, they would move more and value the music-making experience to a greater extent.

4. The student discovers that her or his teacher sup-

ports using ancillary movements in performance. In the interviews, participants spoke about the importance of having conversations about expressive movements in class, about teachers displaying expressive movements for their students, and how, if their teacher(s) did not discuss expressive movements in class, they would feel less likely to move. Participants also mentioned that if they were encouraged (not demanded) to move by their teacher, when they were not too self-conscious or overwhelmed, they would move more.

Thus, when educators stand in front of their instrumental music classes, do they help their students inhabit the music or do they inhibit their students music-making experiences? By not discussing ancillary or expressive movements and the meanings these movements have for students, I suggest educators may be *inhibiting* their students' music-making and, possibly, their own. I encourage educators to increase the effectiveness of their pedagogical practices to improve student musicianship and student engagement by facilitating their students' opportunities to *inhabit* the music they play.

References

Bowman, W. (2010). Living philosophy, knowing bodies, embodied knowledge. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education 9*(1), 1–8. Retrieved February 19, 2012, from http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bowman9_1.pdf

Cadoz, C. (1988). Instrumental Gesture and Musical Composition. *Proceedings of the 1988 International Computer Music Conference*. San Francisco, International Computer Music Association (pp. 1-12).

Choksy, L., Abramson, R., Gillespie, A., Woods, D., & York, F. (2001). *Teaching music in the twenty-first century*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. Th., & Tesch-Römer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review, 100*(3), 363-406.

Jaques-Dalcroze, E. (1935). Petite histoire de la rythmique. *Le Rythme, 39*, 3-18.

Keller, J. (2004, July 11). Music; Let's play the music [and dance]. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 21, 2012 from http://www.nytimes.com/2004/07/11/arts/music-let-s-play-the-music-and-dance.html?pagewanted=print&src=pm

MacLennan, D. S. (2015). *Mapping how students conceptualize ancillary movements in instrumental music performance* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved March 1, 2015, from http://circle.ubc.ca/handle/2429/52157

Marton, F. (1986). Phenomenography: A research approach to investigating different understandings of reality. *Journal of Thought, 21*(3), 28-49.

Marton, F. & Booth, S. A. (1997). *Learning and awareness*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.

Pierce, A. (2007). *Deepening musical performance through movement: The theory and practice of embodied interpretation*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding Learning and Teaching: The Experience in Higher Education*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Reid, A. (1999). *Conceptions of teaching and learning instrumental and vocal music: A study of the ways musicians and their students experience the phenomenon of teaching and learning music at a tertiary level*. Retrieved June 28, 2012, from http://worldcat.org/oclc/156765587

Shusterman, R. (2000). *Performing live: Aesthetic alternatives for the ends of art*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Shusterman, R. (2008). *Body consciousness: A philosophy of mindfulness and somaesthetics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Weikart, P. S., Boardman, B., & Bryant, E. (2004). *75 Ensemble Warm-Ups: Learning on the Move, Grades 4-12*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Yun, G. K. (2011). *The effects of a movement-based after-school music program on music underachievers' musical achievement, social development and self-esteem* (Doctorial dissertation). Retrieved July 20, 2012, from Proquest Dissertations & Theses. (Publication number 3487241)

Dr. Scott MacLennan is the Music Director of the Kwantlen Wind Symphony at Kwantlen Polytechnic University and an Adjunct Professor at the University of British Columbia. He received his Ph.D. from the University of British Columbia where his research involves studying students' conceptions of ancillary movements (physical movements not necessary in the production of sound) in instrumental music performance. He holds a Bachelor of Music and a Bachelor of Education from the University of British Columbia along with a Master of Music in Conducting (Wind Band) from Sam Houston State University, Texas. His award winning ensembles have performed throughout Europe, Asia, and North America, playing in such notable venues as Carnegie Hall, New York, USA, and Santa Maria della Pieta (Vivaldi's Church) in Venice, Italy. With his 25 years of music education experience, Dr. MacLennan is in demand as a guest clinician/conductor/adjudicator and can be reached at scott.maclennan@kpu.ca.

Précis

Stimuler ou inhiber ? L'expression physique et la gestuelle dans la performance musicale instrumentale

Dans cet article, MacLennan a réuni les réflexions des étudiants de musique instrumentale à l'égard du mouvement physique qui n'est pas directement impliqué dans la production sonore. Il propose des moyens par le biais desquels les enseignants peuvent développer des approches d'enseignement différentes. Ses résultats de recherche suggèrent que les mouvements expressifs de l'enseignant revêtent des significations particulières pour les étudiants, révélatrices de leur degré d'engagement dans la pratique musicale. MacLennan considère que l'enseignant qui n'aborde pas la question de la gestuelle ou des mouvements expressifs et de leur signification pour les étudiants peut ainsi inhiber leur performance et même la sienne.

[i] The notions of *first-order* and *second-order* perspectives come from *first-order* logic and higher-order logic where there are predicates having predicates or functions as arguments, or where one or both of the predicate quantifiers or function quantifiers are permitted (Mendelson, 1964, p. 56). Whereas first-order logic quantifies only the variables that span over individuals, second- order logic also quantifies over relations. Second-order logic refers to logics with two (or three) types where one type is comprised of the objects of interest and the second is either sets of those objects or functions on those objects (or both, in the three type case). For example, second order arithmetic has two types: the numbers and the sets of numbers. C. S. Peirce originated the term second-order logic when predicate logic, with its most similar notation to the modern form, was introduced to the mathematical community (Putnam 1982).

[ii] To safeguard students' privacy, pseudonyms were used for all the participants in the study.