

Music is a

Broadcast

- Sound is an open-ended transmission medium, difficult to confine or occlude within the range of audibility (Forrest, 1994).
- Broadcast signals attract attention, good and bad.
- This medium makes music inherently social**, a phenomenon deliberately shared rather than a stimulus to be experienced privately.
- Subsonic vibrations (seismic signals) can similarly be interpreted musically, and they are also as broadcast. (e.g., the Muse Seek Project, Battle 2015)

Is it Music?
This definition includes some activities which might be widely considered as musical, whether or not they are perceived in such a fashion as to support sustained concurrent action. A few examples are:
- Marching
- Chanting
- Metronome humming
Despite how some of these terms are interpreted, some sounds that we hear as musical are really tricks of the mind. To hear bird song as musical is easy, given its organisation, but it is not a signal intended to induce concurrent action in us humans.

Familiarity

- Well known interaction between familiarity and enjoyment: too novel and too repetitive are boring.
- Knowing a piece: more practice doing with the music, confidence in participation
- Boring music can be interesting with learning to options of doing.
- Repetition supports play, provides a solid ground for testing options of doing.
- Practiced doing allows for more confident, more expressive action, thus deeper engagement and affective response
- Personality differences?
 - enjoyment to new music and tolerance of ambiguity (openness)
 - frustration with new music and perfectionism (can't act well)

Sufficiently Competent to Play

- The same music can be enjoyed by untrained listeners and highly trained musicians.
- Music often experience in crowds of mixed competencies, each participating as they are able and willing.
- Individuals evaluate action opportunities to music with respect to their own capacity:
 - tone deaf singers can enjoy singing
 - uncoordinated babies can enjoy moving with music
- Actions associated with music change with practice (Zatorre, et al., 2007)
- hard music becomes interesting as we learn how to act with it.

Sustained

- Musical signals are expected to continue until specific cues are employed to indicate an ending.
- Unlike other broadcast signals, there is no apparent pressure to transmit information faster.
- Activities involving sustained attention are costly. Many are justified by their benefits (eating, sleeping, etc.)

Acknowledgements

A number of people have listened and responded to my ideas on what music is over the last several years, helping it shift to its current form. In particular, I would like to thank G. Wiggins for his objections, M. Pearce and E. Clarke for their interest, and B.C. for ongoing inspiration. My thanks also to the funding bodies supporting my graduate work, the Department of Music and Performance Arts Professions in Steinhardt (NYU) and the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

What is heard as music? What is afforded by musical hearing?

- Auditory streams recognized as musical are evaluated using criteria distinct from other sound sequences, including speech (ex: Mantell & Pfondresher, 2013).
- Sounds **not intended** to be heard as musical can be heard as such, ex: construction noise.
- Some people report voluntarily engaging musical hearing of any soundscape.

Proposal: According to our ears, music is a broadcast signal enabling sustained concurrent action.

Signal

- Music is a signal: information communicated from a sender to a receiver through some medium of transmission (Smith, 1965).
- At minimum, a musical signal indicates the proximity of another human being, one willingly broadcasting their presence.
- Music also conveys information about the sender's:
 - emotional state, cultural identity, intention to engage and influence a receiver.
- Music uses the physical properties of sound, parametrized in service of communication.

Enabling

- Components of music perception are involuntary (ex: metrical entrainment, key identification.)
- A musical signal constrains but does not determine how a listener will respond or engage with it.
- Music allows for concurrent action, but it does not compel a listener to move or make sound.
- Responses and concurrent actions may be scaled down (simplified, less effortful), poorly executed, or even subversive.
- Some behaviours may only be possible when musical hearing is active.

Music vs Language

Despite similarities in the source and some signal qualities:

- Language does not support sustained concurrent action.
- Music is much more resilient to intermittent attention.
- Music does not efficiently transmit ideas.

How might these differences in perceptual opportunities be evaluated?

Performed Arousal

- Listeners find it easy to evaluate relative arousal levels between and within pieces of music.
 - Perhaps music is then conveying intensity of action, the performer's **apparent effort**.
- If music express a target arousal level, it can encourage hearers to act with the same degree of calm or gusto.
 - Hearers can control how and whether to move towards this target.
- Judging effort and intensity in social context:
 - Embarrassment at dancing with too much or too little enthusiasm.
 - The problem of music at the wrong intensity for the context.
 - Is turning it down (up) enough?

Concurrent

- Musical signals can support unison action, strict synchrony between many people.
- Musical signals can also support distinct action sequences perceived as coordinated, fit and ill-fit.
- Concurrent actions to music may also produce musical signals.
- Many aspects of actions coordinated with musical signals can be assessed for quality of fit:
 - timing, tuning, timbre, affect, etc.
- If broadcast, these assessments may depend on perception through musical listening.

Bibliography

Battle, M. (2015) The Muse Seek Project, www.themuseseekproject.com
 Fitch, W. T. (2012). The biology and evolution of rhythm: Unraveling a paradox. *Language and music as cognitive systems*, 73-95.
 Forrest, T. G. (1994). From sender to receiver: propagation and environmental effects on acoustic signals. *American Zoologist*, 34(6), 644-654.
 Huron, D. (2006). *Music: a life well spent*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Mantell, S. & Pfondresher, P. Q. (2013). Vocal imitation of song and speech. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 56(2), 177-202.
 Tian, X. and Poeppel, D. (2013). The effect of imagination on stimulation: The functional specificity of efference copies in speech processing. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, (Early Access):1-17.
 Smith, W. J. (1965). Message, meaning, and context in ethology. *American Naturalist*, 90:45-49.
 Tylen, K., Allen, M., Hunter, B. K., & Roeperoff, A. (2012). Interaction vs. observation: distinctive modes of social cognition in human brain and behavior? A combined fMRI and eye-tracking study. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 6.
 Zatorre, R., Chen, J., and Penhune, V. (2007). When the brain plays music: auditory-motor interactions in music perception and production. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 8(7):547-558.

Action

- The essential claim of this theory is that our perception of music is principally to support concurrent action.
- We hear music so as to know how to act with it and, correspondingly, with the persons generating the signal.**
- Accurate perception of the signal heard, inference of meaning, and memorisation are of secondary importance.
- Is this testable? Action and imagined action is measurably different from observation and imagined observation (Tian & Poeppel, 2013).

Add your thoughts?

This theory is a work in progress. You are welcome to share examples and arguments for or against it.

Please jot down your comment on a post-it and place it on the poster wherever it best relates to the printed content. And if you would like your contribution to be acknowledged in future interactions of this theory, please include your name.