There's an expression, "Out with the old, and in with the new", and for a long time I thought this was a 'good' way to view the process of change. After reading this article, I can no longer say I agree with this. Tobias presented an interesting idea of letting the old and new coexist with one another and converge.

According to Jenkins we have a "public desire to participate within, rather than simply consume, media." (Tobias, 30). We are a participatory culture, and I think a lot of this has to do with the uprise in social media. People today can so easily keep up to date with their favourite artists by following them on Twitter, or liking them on Facebook. They feel a more personal connection with them this way, one that they couldn't have had without social media. Artists' creations then inspire them to create a mash-up or cover of their song. They think to themselves,"If that artist can do it, why can't I?" It's not enough for us to sit back and listen anymore. I myself even feel the urge to try and 'make it my own', or put my 'own spin on things'. It gives us a sense of accomplishment.

I don't think this is a 'negative' aspect of how technology and media have influenced music today. In a way, it creates an immediate way for us to pay homage to artists who inspire us. And, I would have to agree that this is not being showcased in the education system, but should be. Many educators may view this as only applicable to popular music. That covering, remixing or parodying is not meant for Classical music repertoire, or Classically trained musicians. Although it may link more directly with popular music, I don't think it is limited to just that. I think it shows much more of a musician if they are able to remix an original score or perform it in a different light than simply regurgitating what is written on the score. Of course, that too has its place, but it is becoming the only focus in education.

Then the discussion of, what way is the "correct" way to cover, remix or perform it arises. I think the beauty of allowing for more creative liberty is that there is no set way to do it. No one way is any better than another. I suppose that failure isn't applicable then. We can instead appreciate each other's different ways of realizing and envisioning. I strongly believe that this idea is vital in education, in particular the music classroom. Getting children to start thinking critically about choices and investigating different approaches in music is a skill they will carry for the rest of their lives. Again, I think it is harder to analyse and discuss the creative process than to play something as originally written. It's a challenge, but far more rewarding, too.

I loved the idea of having educators help their students to reflect on their musical and creative engagement. I had also never thought about "engaging as ethnographers" (Tobias, 33), but this makes a lot of sense to me. Educators need to survey what their

students are interested in, because dynamics vary from class to class. I can personally think of a couple music teachers who may be resistant to this idea as they wouldn't see how it would incorporate essential musicianship skills, or it's something you do outside of the classroom. I think Tobias makes a good point when he states that this should, and needs to, be implemented in the classroom, so all children are given the opportunity to experience the participatory culture we live in. Musicianship skills can always be incorporated into these new "technological" opportunities. Yet, I still think an important benefit is that it allows for an open discussion that will help a child understand musical concepts in a deeper, more meaningful sense. One that speaks to them on a more personal note.