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Editorial Note

I am pleased to present the Proceedings of the 2013 Desert Skies Symposium on Research in Music Education. This symposium, with its long history, continues to be a forum for engaging in lively discourse regarding the diverse practices in contemporary music education. These discussions are intended to promote new pathways for innovation in research and practice.

David Teachout, during the symposium’s opening speech, provided historical facts regarding the Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE). Jere Humphreys and John Geringer, during their keynote speeches, provided those in attendance opportunities to consider the changes occurring in the music education field, research practices, and research competence.

The four full-length papers in the 2013 Proceedings represent various research foci. Dijana Ijah presents an examination of teaching behaviors in orchestra directors, while Alena Holmes and Sharri VanAlstine offer an overview of participants’ experiences and views on world music during an immersion-style summer camp experience. Regina Carlow guides readers through the personal growth and insight of preservice teachers completing field experiences with students who are not native English speakers. Finally, Joyce McCall presents historical data and a content analysis regarding music programs at historically Black colleges and universities.

On behalf of the Desert Skies National Advisory Board, we hope you gain new perspectives upon reading these informative articles, and that they serve as catalysts for new discussions and research topics. I hope you plan to attend the 2015 Desert Skies Symposium.

Shelly Cooper, 2013 Director
Desert Skies Symposium on Research in Music Education
Welcome

Welcome to the thirteenth biennial Desert Skies Symposium on Research in Music Education. The purpose of this symposium is to showcase current research in music education and the Desert Skies National Advisory Board hopes the presentation of such material will inform research, pedagogy, and practice now and in the future. It is my hope that the 2013 Desert Skies Symposium will be a thought-provoking forum for you to exchange information and engage in dynamic dialogues with colleagues who share similar professional interests.

Shelly Cooper, Symposium Director
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THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2013

5:30 - 6:00 pm  Check-in or Late Registration

6:00 pm  Opening Remarks

6:00 - 7:00 pm  David J. Teachout, Opening Speaker
                University of North Carolina at Greensboro
                *A History of the Symposium on Music Teacher Education 2004-2012*

7:00 - 7:15 pm  Break

7:15 - 8:45 pm  SYMPOSIUM RESEARCH SESSION #1

7:15 – 7:30  2-Minute Overviews from Presenters
7:30 – 8:45  Rotation of 3 Breakout Sessions

*Presenters:*

Ashley D. Allen, University of Kansas
*Teaching Anxiety Experienced by Music Education Methods Students*

Tami J. Draves, University of Arizona
*Second-Stage Music Teachers’ Professional Identities*

Laura Dunbar, University of Arizona
*Mainstreaming in Music Education Journals (1960-1989): An Analysis*

Joyce McCall, Arizona State University
*Music Programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs):
A Content Analysis of Undergraduate Music Education Curriculum*

Ryan Scherber, Florida State University
*The Effect of Primary Instrument on Sensitivity to Intonation*

Ryan Shaw, Michigan State University
*The How and Why of Lesson Planning: A Comparative Case Study of
Experienced Band Teachers*

8:45 - 9:45 pm  Evening Reception
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2013

9:00 Welcome
Dr. Rex A. Woods, University of Arizona
School of Music Director

9:00 - 9:45 am Jere T. Humphreys, Keynote Speaker
Arizona State University

Change in Music Education: The Paradigmatic and the Praxial

9:45 - 10:15 Discussion/Reaction/Questions

10:15 - 10:30 am Break

10:30 am - 12:00 pm SYMPOSIUM RESEARCH SESSION #2

10:30 – 10:45 2-Minute Overviews from Presenters
10:45 – 12:00 Rotation of 3 Breakout Sessions

Presenters:

Lisa Martin, University of Colorado

‘I Just Want to Teach Music!’: A Case Study of First-Year
Music Teacher Occupational Identity

Peter Miksza, Indiana University Jacobs School of Music
Brent Gault, Indiana University Jacobs School of Music

Classroom Musical Experiences of US Elementary School Children: An Analysis
of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study of 1998-99

Emmett O'Leary, Arizona State University

A Geographic, Demographic, and Economic Analysis of Bands Competing in the
Bands of America Grand National Championships Finals Between 2002 and 2011

Shaun Popp, Florida State University

The Effect of Different Visual Perspectives on Instrumentalists’
Perception of Conductor Expressivity

Karen Salvador, University of Michigan-Flint

Music Instruction for Elementary Students with Moderate to Severe
Cognitive Impairments: A Case Study

Emily Schwartz, Arizona State University

The Composition Processes of Beginning Band Students in the
Absence of Teacher-Imposed Parameters

12:00 - 2:00 pm Lunch
2:00 – 3:30 pm  SYMPOSIUM RESEARCH SESSION #3

2:00 – 2:15  2-Minute Overviews from Presenters
2:15 – 3:30  Rotation of 3 Breakout Sessions

*Presenters:*

**Phillip Hash**, Calvin College, Michigan

*Music Education at the New York Institution for the Blind: 1832-1863*

**Dijana Ihas**, Pacific University, Oregon

*Teaching Behaviors of Middle and High School Orchestra Directors in the Rehearsal Setting*

**Steven N. Kelly**, Florida State University

**Julia Heath**, Florida State University

*A Comparison of Nationally Ranked High Schools and Their Music Curricula*

**Mitch Robinson**, Michigan State University

*Changing The Conversation: Considering Quality In Music Education Qualitative Research*

**Justine K. Sasanfar**, Independent Scholar, Wichita, Kansas

*Influence of Aural and Visual Expressivity of the Accompanist on Audience Perception of Expressivity in Collaborative Performances of a Soloist and Pianist*

**Crystal Guy Sieger**, Case Western Reserve University

*Identity Perceptions of Undergraduate Double Majors in Music Performance and Music Education*

3:30 - 3:45 pm  Break
Symposium Program

3:45 – 5:15 pm  SYMPOSIUM RESEARCH SESSION #4

3:45 – 4:00  2-Minute Overviews from Presenters
4:00 – 5:15  Rotation of 3 Breakout Sessions

Presenters:

Virginia Wayman Davis, University of Texas – Pan American

Listening Preferences of Music Teachers

Laura Dunbar, University of Arizona

The Practice Habits of an Undergraduate Music Education Major with Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)

Dawn Farmer, Boise State University


Joanne Rutkowski, The Pennsylvania State University

The Comparative Effectiveness of Male and Female Singing Models on Kindergarten Children’s Use of Singing Voice Achievement

Sandra Sanchez, University of Miami

Individual Adequacy of Immersed Music Program Participants

Gina Jisun Yi, Michigan State University

Effect of Fingering on Piano Performance Accuracy Among Undergraduate Music Majors

The Evening Is Free
Symposium Program

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2013

8:30 - 9:15 am  John M. Geringer, Keynote Speaker  
Florida State University  
Ruminations on Research Competence: Oh, and Now You’re Supposed to be the Expert?

9:15 - 9:45 am  Discussion/Reaction/Questions

9:45 am - 11:15 pm  SYMPOSIUM RESEARCH SESSION #5

9:45 – 10:00  2-Minute Overviews from Presenters
10:00 – 11:15  Rotation of 3 Breakout Sessions

Presenters:

Natalie Boeyink, Indiana University Jacobs School of Music
An Examination of Sex and Participation Among Junior High, High School, and College Students at Jazz Festivals

Regina Carlow, University of New Mexico
If They Can’t Understand Me, How Can I Teach? Examining Music Education Students’ Perceptions of Working with English Language Learners

Steven N. Kelly, Florida State University  
Keith P. Matthews, Florida State University
An Investigation of Hiring Practices by Secondary School Principals of Music Teachers

Susana Marlene Lalama, University of Miami
A Comparison of Student and Teacher Perceptions of Classroom Management in Secondary Band Rehearsals

Tim Nowak, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester
Procedures for Evaluating Public School Music Curricula

Sean R. Powell, Columbus State University
Examining Preservice Music Teacher Concerns in Peer- and Field-Teaching Settings

Heather Nelson Shouldice, Michigan State University
Trading Hindemith for ‘Hugs, High-Fives, and Handshakes’: One Pre-service Music Teacher’s Decision to Teach Elementary General Music
11:15 am - 12:45 pm  SYMPOSIUM RESEARCH SESSION #6

11:15 – 11:30  2-Minute Overviews from Presenters
11:30 – 12:45  Rotation of 3 Breakout Sessions

Presenters:

Mark A. Belfast, Jr., Florida State University

*The Effect of Perceived Ensemble Reputation on Large Ensemble Performance Ratings*

Dawn Farmer, Boise State University

*Authorship Gender and Methodology in Music Education Research, 2008–2011*

Erik Johnson, Colorado State University

Stephanie Prichard, University of Colorado

*Why it Comes so Naturally for Me: The Influence of Concerted Cultivation and Communities of Practice on the Musical Identity Development of Two Young Musicians*

Adam J. Kruse, Michigan State University

*“I Always Had My Instrument”: The Story of Gabriella Ramires*

Peter Miksza, Indiana University Jacobs School of Music

*Arts Education Advocacy: The Relative Effects of School-Level Influences on Resources for Arts Education*

Amy Spears, Arizona State University

*Evolving Practices in Elementary and Middle School Band Classrooms*

Sharri VanAlstine, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Alena Holmes, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

*World Music Immersion During Summer Choir Camp: Implications for the Development of International Mindedness, Attitudes, and Preferences in Middle/High School Choir Students*

12:45 - 12:50 pm  Concluding Remarks

12:50  The Conference ends
John M. Geringer  
Florida State University

John M. Geringer is the Lewis V. Pankaskie Professor of Music and Director of the Center for Music Research (CMR) at Florida State University. He teaches courses in Perception and Cognition of Music, Experimental Research in Music, Music Measurement, and related areas. Professor Geringer taught at the University of Texas at Austin for 26 years (from 1976 to 2002) following degrees from the University of California at Berkeley, California State University, and Florida State. He joined the FSU faculty in 2002.

Dr. Geringer’s research publications concern relationships between music performance and the perception of music within music contexts. He continues an active research agenda and his contributions appear in leading international and national journals in Music Education, Music Therapy, and Music Psychology. He currently serves as Co-Editor of the *String Research Journal*, and is a member of the editorial boards of the *International Journal for Music Education: Research, Psychology of Music*, and *Psychomusicology*. He has also been active in the National Association for Music Education (formerly MENC), having served on the Executive Board of the Music Education Research Council, two terms on the *Journal of Research in Music Education* Editorial Board, and one term on the *UPDATE* board. He regularly presents results of his research at international and national professional societies and has given presentations in Australia, Canada, Latin America, Europe, Asia, Africa, and the United States. Professor Geringer received the Distinguished Alumni Award from The Florida State University College of Music and the Senior Researcher Award from the Music Educators National Conference (now NAfME) in 2000.

Contact Information:

**John M. Geringer**, Director  
Center for Music Research  
College of Music  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL 32306-1180  
Telephone: 850. 644. 5787  
Email: geringer@fsu.edu
Jere T. Humphreys
Arizona State University

Jere T. Humphreys, professor of music at Arizona State University, teaches courses in foundations of music education, research methods, and sociology of music. He has advised 36 dissertations and two master’s theses worldwide, including several national and university award winners. He holds degrees in music education and clarinet performance from the University of Mississippi, Florida State University, and University of Michigan.

Professor Humphreys conducts historical and quantitative research on a wide array of topics and has published more than 170 works. He has presented research, lectured, and consulted in 30 countries on six continents, including 15 keynote and other major speeches. He was editor of the Journal of Historical Research in Music Education and has sat on the editorial committees of 15 education, music education, and music therapy journals. He is the Contributing Editor for Music Education and the only non-musicologist on the Senior Editorial Board for the second edition of the New Grove Dictionary of American Music (Oxford University Press).

Humphreys received a Citation of Excellence in Research (1985) and Senior Researcher Award (2006) from MENC: The National Association for Music Education, and a Distinguished Service Award “for exceptional contributions to scholarship” from the MENC History Special Research Interest Group (2010). He is a Fulbright Senior Scholar, Fulbright Senior Specialist, and U.S. Department of State Academic Specialist. He is also a volunteer construction house leader for Habitat for Humanity and serves on the boards of directors of several professional and community organizations, among them Habitat for Humanity Macedonia and the American Civil Liberties Union of Arizona.

Contact Information:

Jere T. Humphreys
Professor of Music
School of Music
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85287-0405 USA
www.public.asu.edu/~aajth
Telephone: 480.965.4997
Email: Jere.Humphreys@asu.edu
David J. Teachout  
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

David J. Teachout is Associate Professor and Chair of the Music Education Department at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG). His degrees are from West Virginia University (BME), the University of Oklahoma (MME), and Kent State University (PhD). Prior to joining the faculty at UNCG, he taught undergraduate and graduate courses at the University of Minnesota and at Pennsylvania State University; he also enjoyed ten years of successful public school instrumental music teaching experience in Moore, Oklahoma.


Contact Information:

David J. Teachout  
Chair, Music Education Department  
University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
School of Music, Theatre and Dance  
P.O. Box 26170  
Greensboro, NC 27402  
www.uncg.edu/mus  
Telephone: 336. 334. 4759  
Email: djteacho@uncg.edu
Abstracts
(Listed Alphabetically by Author)

Teaching Anxiety Experienced by Music Education Methods Students
Ashley D. Allen, University of Kansas

The purpose of this study was to investigate what, if any, changes would occur pertaining to the autonomic nervous system (ANS) response among preservice teachers, specifically as it related to classroom management. Participants (N = 30) were enrolled in a general music methods course at a Midwestern university, where they taught three lessons containing classroom management issues. An oximeter was used to record pulse rates; the researcher uploaded the data onto a software program and analyzed the results for changes in pulse rate. Repeated-measures ANOVA was used to determine whether significant differences in pulse rate occurred (a) from the start of each teaching episode, (b) when the discipline issues occurred, and (c) between teaching and resting heart rates. Results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences, indicating that pulse rates did not significantly change between resting, teaching, or during discipline issues.

Contact Information:
Ashley D. Allen
504 Lancaster Ct.
Lawrence, KS 66049
Telephone: 405. 412. 6419
Email: adallen05@gmail.com

The Effect of Perceived Ensemble Reputation on Large Ensemble Performance Ratings
Mark A Belfast, Jr., Florida State University

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of perceived ensemble reputation on large ensemble performance ratings. The sample of participants consisted of music and non-music majors (N = 94) at a large university in the southeastern United States. Participants listened to three different recordings of Gustav Holst’s “Song of the Blacksmith,” and provided ratings for five performance characteristics. Approximately half of the participants completed surveys containing labels with the performance history and accomplishments of each ensemble. The remainder of the participants received surveys that did not identify the performing ensembles. The results revealed a significant interaction between the main effects of label use and ensemble performance. The Keystone Wind Ensemble was rated higher by the no-label group than the label group, while the Tokyo Kosei Wind Orchestra and Eastman Wind Ensemble received higher ratings from the label group than the no-label group.

Contact Information:
Mark A Belfast, Jr.
FSU College of Music
122 N. Copeland St.
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Telephone: 850. 644. 3507
Email: mbelfast@fsu.edu
An Examination of Sex and Participation among Junior High, High School, and College Students at Jazz Festivals

Natalie Boeyink, Indiana University Jacobs School of Music

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships among sex, instrument choice, and improvisation at jazz festivals. Participants included 761 students performing in junior high, high school, and college jazz bands. They were observed at four Midwestern jazz festivals, and student sex, instrument, solo opportunities, and band director sex were noted. The major findings of this study were as follows: female participation ranged from 18% (college bands) to 39% (junior high bands); and male soloists significantly and disproportionately (with respect to participation rates) outnumbered female soloists. Results demonstrated the continued gender-stereotyping of musical instruments with drums and bass played almost exclusively by males, and saxophone played by the largest percentage of females. The bands were overwhelmingly conducted by males at the high school (81%) and college levels (100%), however females comprised 60% of junior high band directors.

Contact Information:
Natalie Boeyink
720 S. College Mall Rd. E2
Bloomington, IN 47401
Telephone: 502.271.9578
Email: nboeyink@indiana.edu

If They Can't Understand Me, How Can I Teach? Examining Music Education Students’ Perceptions of Working with English Language Learners (ELL)

Regina Carlow, University of New Mexico

This paper is centered around the author’s assertion that there is a high level of teacher dependence on contextual language as the main vehicle for transfer of musical knowledge and that ELL students are often placed at a disadvantage because of this reliance. The data and subsequent narrative are based on qualitative interpretive analyses of student work, journals and class discussions of a course entitled Teaching Music to Special Populations, an elective open to both music education and special education majors. The primary research question focused on pre-service students’ perception of their readiness to teach ELL students. Findings suggest that there are highly embedded cultural meaning systems in the everyday teaching of music in K-12 and music teacher education programs. Additionally, issues of racism, bias and stereotyping exist as a natural part of the human endeavor of teaching and must be acknowledged and accepted in music teacher education.

Contact Information:
Regina Carlow
Department of Music
1 University of New Mexico
MSCO4 2570
Albuquerque, NM 87131
Telephone: 505.277.4825
Email: rcarlow@unm.edu
Listening Preferences of Music Teachers

Virginia Wayman Davis, University of Texas – Pan American

This study aimed to discover the music listening preferences of music teachers. Specifically, in which formats do teachers listen to music for personal pleasure, how do they obtain the music they choose, and how frequently do they choose to listen to certain genres of music. Using an online survey, music teachers answered questions about their listening and purchasing habits. Results were then analyzed using simple statistics and Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) to discover listening preferences for the group as a whole, as well as what differences may occur with regards to age, teaching situation or other factors. Through this analysis, it was shown that although music teachers chose a variety of music for personal listening, they tended to listen to “Classical” art music with the most frequency. Younger teachers also chose some popular styles more frequently than older teachers and some listening choices tended to align with teachers’ job types, such as choral teachers’ frequent choice of vocal art music. Music teachers also embraced technology in their listening, frequently selecting listening formats such as computer downloads and mp3 players.

Contact Information:
Virginia Wayman Davis
University of Texas - Pan American
1201 W. University Dr.
Edinburg, TX 78541
Telephone: 956. 665. 7439
Email: davisvg@utpa.edu

Second-Stage Music Teachers’ Professional Identities

Tami J. Draves, University of Arizona

The purpose of this case study research was to explore the professional identities of second-stage music teachers. Participants were two second-stage music educators teaching in middle school (grades 6-8) music classrooms. Participants were between years 4-10 of their careers and taught primarily instrumental (band and orchestra) ensembles. Data were collected in individual formal interviews and on a password protected blog. This article reports on the four themes developed through cross-case analysis: (a) Professional Development, (b) Parent Involvement, (c) Student Achievement/Enjoyment, and (d) Professional Peers. Participants experienced professional development in various dichotomies such as informal/formal, choice/mandatory, subject-specific/subject-neutral, personalized/general, and perpetual/bounded. Students and their parents played prominent identity-reinforcing roles for the participants. Student achievement and enjoyment, especially when recognized by others, also reinforced participants’ professional identities. Participants’ professional peers were almost exclusively other music teachers. Implications for research and K-12 and university practice are included.

Contact Information:
Tami J. Draves
The University of Arizona
School of Music
PO Box 210004
Tucson, AZ 85721-0004
Telephone: 520.626.0556
Email: tdraves@email.arizona.edu
Mainstreaming in Music Education Journals (1960-1989): An Analysis

Laura Dunbar, University of Arizona

The purpose of this study was to explore the reaction of the music education community to Section 504 and PL 94-142 regarding mainstreaming practices. A content analysis was conducted for the articles published between January 1, 1960 and December 31, 1989 in Music Educators Journal (MEJ), Journal of Research in Music Education (JRME), and Bulletin for the Council of Research in Music Education (Bulletin). Research questions regarding the number of articles published, the ratio of research to pedagogical articles, disabilities addressed within the articles, and the affiliations and geographic locations of the article authors guided the analysis. Pedagogical articles were separated from research articles for analysis purposes. Based on the results of the analyses, the reaction to the legislation was one of enthusiasm for some while others had little or no reaction. Implications and suggestions for further research are discussed.

Contact Information:
Laura Dunbar
1708 E Saint Isidore Street
Tucson, AZ 85712
Telephone: 928. 301. 4383
Email: ldunbar@email.arizona.edu

The Practice Habits of an Undergraduate Music Education Major with Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)

Laura Dunbar, University of Arizona

Musicians spend a large amount of time isolated in the practice room. Students with Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) often have limited abilities to self-regulate, which has become a term synonymous with setting goals, using strategies, monitoring progress, and inhibition. This case study involved observation of an undergraduate music major with ADHD over the course of a month; the student was in the final year of her degree with a dual major in music education and music performance. The purpose of the study was to explore the practice habits of the participant and investigate how the student learned to practice, what methods of practice were most effective, and if the student used any accommodations to help focus for longer practice sessions. Family and teacher influences and practice rituals were of extreme importance. The results of this study have implications for all instructors who want their students to practice effectively.

Contact Information:
Laura Dunbar
1708 E Saint Isidore Street
Tucson, AZ 85712
Telephone: 928. 301. 4383
Email: ldunbar@email.arizona.edu

Dawn M. Farmer, Boise State University

The American Bandmasters Association (ABA) was founded in 1929 in order to recognize outstanding contributions of band directors. In the eighty-four years it has been operational, 694 members have been invited into the organization’s membership ranks, and only twelve members have been female, accounting for 1.729% of the group’s total membership. The first female was extended a membership invitation in 1985, changing the face of the ABA; in the following twenty-seven years, eleven female band directors and one female composer were voted into the organization. Through conducting interviews with the nine surviving female band director members of the ABA, data was collected in order to explore the personal and professional backgrounds of these women. Examining the stories, thoughts, and advice of these women provide a window into the lives of highly successful bandswomen and lends a voice to a marginalized population.

Contact Information:
Dawn M. Farmer
1910 University Drive
Boise ID 83725
Telephone: 310. 801. 3110
Email: dawnfarmer@boisestate.edu

Authorship Gender and Methodology in Music Education Research, 2008–2011

Dawn M. Farmer, Boise State University

The purpose of this study was to evaluate gender-related authorship and research methodology patterns in music education research. A follow up to a similar 2008 paper (Farmer, 2008), articles in this sample were examined in order to determine if the frequency of women authors in the sample matched the frequency of women receiving doctoral degrees in music education and if women are publishing more frequently than in 1984-2007. Furthermore, methodologies of the articles were tallied to determine what types of research were being published and in what frequencies. Analysis of seven top-tier music education journals published from 2007 to 2011 suggested that women published below the expected frequency, but significantly lower, and that quantitative research comprised 80.5% of published articles. Data indicated that women were less frequent authors than men, but published a greater percentage of qualitative research.

Contact Information:
Dawn M. Farmer
1910 University Drive
Boise ID 83725
Telephone: 310. 801. 3110
Email: dawnfarmer@boisestate.edu
Music Education at the New York Institution for the Blind: 1832-1863

Phillip M. Hash, Calvin College

The purpose of this study was to document the history of music education at the New York Institution for the Blind from the opening of the school in 1832 through the tenure of the facility’s first music director, Anthony Reiff, who retired in 1863. Research questions pertained to the school’s origin and operation, and to its music curriculum, pedagogy, faculty, ensembles, and resources. The NYIB opened in 1832 and provided a home and education for students ages eight to twenty-five. The music program served as recreation and vocational training, and as a means of promoting the school. Reiff joined the faculty in 1835 and established a band and choir that performed throughout the city and surrounding states. He also organized a monitorial system whereby advanced students taught private lessons to beginning musicians. George F. Root, a prominent teacher and composer, joined the faculty in 1847 as director of vocal music, while Reiff assumed leadership of the instrumental division. Sigismund Laser replaced Root in 1855 and remained at the NYIB until 1863, when both he and Reiff left the school. The faculty at the NYIB developed and promoted effective methods for teaching music to the visually impaired and prepared graduates to serve as church musicians, piano tuners, and music teachers. Findings from this study may have implications for teaching blind and other impaired individuals today.

Contact Information:
Phillip M. Hash
Music Department
Calvin College
1795 Knollcrest Circle SE
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49546-4404
Telephone: 815. 351. 6634
Email: pmh3@calvin.edu

World Music Immersion during Summer Choir Camp: Implications for the Development of International Mindedness, Attitudes, and Preferences in Middle/High School Choir Students

Alena Holmes, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Sharri VanAlstine, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

The purpose of this study was to discover what effect the performance and study of world music has on middle school and high school summer music camp participants’ development of international-mindedness and attitudes toward world music. The following research questions were the focus of the study: 1. Does the performance and study of four world music pieces from four different cultures make a significant difference in participants’ international-mindedness? 2. Does the performance and study of four world music pieces from four different cultures effect students attitudes and preference for world music?

The participants in the study (N=35) were students enrolled in the summer choral music camp at a mid-sized university in the United States. Results of the study indicate that when middle and high school students study and perform world music, their international-mindedness grows and they develop more positive attitudes about world music and the cultures from which they come.

Contact Information:
Alena Holmes
Department of Music
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
800 W. Main Street
Whitewater, WI, 53190
Telephone: 608. 609. 5620
Email: holmesa@uw.edu

Sharri VanAlstine
28 South Fremont Avenue
Janesville, WI 53545
Telephone: 763. 300. 3684
Email: vanalsts@uw.edu
Teaching Behaviors Of Middle And High School Orchestra Directors In The Rehearsal Setting

Dijana Ihas, Pacific University

The purpose of this study was to investigate the frequency and the time that middle and high school orchestra directors engaged in seven specific teaching behaviors in a rehearsal setting. Of particular interest was the amount of time orchestra directors engaged in conceptual teaching behaviors operationally defined as verbal behaviors of orchestra directors in which they attempt to make students aware of, have an understanding of, and/or be able to transfer any musical concept. Participants ($N = 12$) were full-time middle and high school orchestra directors teaching in Washington, Oregon, or California. Each participant submitted a video recording of two regular orchestra rehearsals. Video recordings of participants were divided into 20-minute segments and randomly selected for observation of seven specific and operationally defined teaching behaviors: (a) nonmusical behavior, (b) nonverbal instruction (direction), (c) verbal instruction (direction), (d) noninteractive listening, (e) nonverbal feedback, (f) verbal feedback, and (g) conceptual teaching. These seven teaching behaviors were analyzed using the Simple Computer Recording Interface for Behavioral Evaluation (SCRIBE) of Duke and Stammen (2007). The data were reported in the form of the frequency with which each behavior occurred, the average time for each behavior expressed in minutes and seconds, and the percentage of time used on each behavior. Findings on conceptual teaching were reported.

The results indicated that, on average, orchestra directors spent slightly more than 5% of the observed rehearsal time on conceptual teaching. Most of the instructional time was used on nonverbal instruction (28.15%) and verbal instruction (27.76%). Orchestra directors observed in this study used the least amount of time (2.42%) on nonverbal feedback. The most concerning finding of the study was the time orchestra directors used on nonmusical behaviors (14.70%), and the most interesting finding of the study was that middle school orchestra directors used twice as much time (7.40%) as high school orchestra directors (3.21%) on conceptual teaching. The findings of this study provided suggestions for future research and implications for music educators.

Contact Information:
Dijana Ihas
Pacific University
2043 College Way
Forest Grove, OR 97116
Telephone: 503. 352. 2102 (office)
541. 513. 7804 (mobile)
Email: dihas@pacificu.edu
“Why it comes so naturally for me”  
The influence of Concerted Cultivation and Communities of Practice  
on the musical identity development of two young musicians

Erik Johnson, Colorado State University  
Stephanie Prichard, University of Colorado, Boulder

The purpose of this bounded case study was to investigate how engagement in classical and popular music activities influences the development of two young musical learners: Nick and Vincent. Due to a high degree of parental involvement, as well as Nick’s and Vincent’s participation in multiple musical activities, two prominent social learning theories were used to construct our theoretical framework: concerted cultivation (Lareau, 2003, 2011), and communities of practice and identity development (Wenger, 1998). Three themes emerged from our analyses: 1) concerted cultivation leads to a high level of access to a broad musical community; 2) while each child was most active within a specific musical genre, both boys actively negotiated multiple hybrid musical trajectories; 3) because of the norms inherent to each musical community, Vincent was able to embrace the identity of a full participant within the popular music community, while Nick encountered significantly more barriers. Themes and implications are discussed.

Contact Information:  
Erik Johnson  
Colorado State University  
1778 Campus Delivery  
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1778  
Telephone: 720. 364. 1858  
Email: e.johnson@colostate.edu

Stephanie Prichard  
University of Colorado, Boulder  
1620 Egret Way  
Superior, CO 80027  
Telephone: 571. 236. 4183  
Email: stephanie.prichard@colorado.edu

A Comparison of Nationally Ranked High Schools and Their Music Curricula

Steven N. Kelly, Florida State University  
Julia Heath, Florida State University

The purpose of this study was to compare musical, educational, and social characteristics of high schools ranked highest by the publications Newsweek and US. News & World Report. Specifically, the study addressed the following questions: (1) What are the similarities and differences of the educational, musical, and social characteristics of the top ranked schools? (2) What music courses are offered at each high school? (3) What types of performances do the music programs present each year? (4) What (if any) are the qualifications for students to be enrolled in the music programs at each school? (5) How many students are enrolled in each school and in the corresponding music programs? (6) How do characteristics of the music programs reflect those of each school in general? Fifty-four music teachers at twenty-five high schools that were commonly listed by both publications were emailed a questionnaire consisting of five open-ended questions reflecting the research questions posed in the study. Findings indicated that while most participating schools were non-traditional, and educationally and socially diverse, they were traditional and similar regarding music characteristics. Possible implications of the findings are discussed in the conclusion.

Contact Information:  
Steven Kelly  
College of Music  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL 32306-1180  
Telephone: 850. 644. 4069  
Email: skelly@admin.fsu.edu

Julia Heath  
College of Music  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL 32306-1180  
Telephone: 850. 322. 3912  
Email: juliadheath@gmail.com
An Investigation of Hiring Practices by Secondary School Principals of Music Teachers

Steven N. Kelly, Florida State University
Keith P. Matthews, Florida State University

The purpose of this paper was to investigate hiring practices of secondary school principals when selecting music teachers. Specifically, the study sought to determine (1) Are there differences between hiring practices by principals in middle school and high school? (2) What are principals’ search methods and practices used to hire music teachers? (3) Who is involved in the hiring selection of music teachers? (4) To what extent do prospective music teachers perform a teaching demonstration before a hiring decision is made? and (5) To what extent do selected characteristics influence a principal in the decision to hire a prospective music teacher?

Participants were seventy-three middle school and high school principals from Georgia and Florida who completed a survey pertaining to venues they used to search for prospective music teachers, individuals involved in the interview process, and characteristics that influences principals’ hiring of music teachers. Findings demonstrate that future public school music teachers should focus on a variety of local venues and skills when preparing to begin searching for teaching positions. They should also be prepared to communicate their skills to a variety of individuals who will be involved in the interview process, and that a variety of social and musical characteristics influence principals’ decisions to hire prospective music teachers.

Contact Information:
Steven Kelly
College of Music
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-1180
Telephone: 850.644.4069
Email: skelly@admin.fsu.edu

Keith P. Matthews
212 Meridianna Dr.
Tallahassee, FL 32312
Telephone: 770.598.9850
Email: keithpm1@yahoo.com

“I Always Had My Instrument”: The Story of Gabriella Ramires

Adam J. Kruse, Michigan State University

The purpose of this instrumental case study is to better understand the academic, social and musical experiences of a Chicana music education student. Interviews with a third generation Chicana student at a Midwestern university explored her academic, social and musical experiences that preceded her pursuit of an undergraduate music education degree. Due to the current level of academic and social success enjoyed by this student and her access to a wealth of social capital and successful academic models, she is presented as a critical case. Barriers to academic and social pursuits as well as resilience to barriers related closely to aspects of identity navigation and social capital interaction in this student’s experience. The role of music, music education, and specific music educators acted as crucial ingredients for her eventual success. Implications for music educators and researchers include a call for additional support and greater understanding of potentially marginalized student populations.

Contact Information:
Adam Kruse
2211 Valleywood Dr. SE
Apt. E3
Grand Rapids, MI 49546
Telephone: 812.212.1181
Email: kruseada@msu.edu
A Comparison of Student and Teacher Perceptions of Classroom Management in Secondary Band Rehearsals

Susana M. Lalama, University of Miami Frost School of Music

This study used a survey to compare student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in secondary band rehearsals in Florida schools. Twenty-one schools participated, yielding a sample of ensemble teachers (N = 34) and their students (N = 749). The survey instrument collected data for the variables of teacher expectations, teacher behaviors, and student rehearsal conduct, as well as demographic information for teachers, students, and schools. T-tests results reveal that teachers and students perceive teacher expectations and teacher behaviors differently. Individual items were analyzed and results found that teachers and students perceive teacher behaviors more congruent than teacher expectations. Regression analyses suggest that student responses for teacher behaviors were significant predictors of rehearsal conduct, whereas teacher perceptions produced non-significant results. Teachers were asked for reasons why they felt students misbehave; the largest response placed fault with the students, followed by performance-related reasons, family-related situations, and then teacher-related reasons.

Contact Information:
Susana M. Lalama
15 Alhambra Circle #28
Coral Gables, FL 33134
Telephone: 305.968.8252
Email: S.lalama@umiami.edu

“I Just Want to Teach Music!”
A Case Study of First-Year Music Teacher Occupational Identity

Lisa Martin, University of Colorado

This multiple case study explored factors contributing to the occupational identity, teacher efficacy, and professional commitment of two first-year music educators. Potentially influential factors examined included (a) primary and secondary socialization, (b) teaching responsibilities, and (c) context-specific work environment. A maximum variation sampling strategy was used to target two novice music educators teaching in contrasting work environments (i.e., urban versus suburban) with contrasting teaching responsibilities (i.e., high school general music versus middle school band). Data in the form of interviews, field observations, journals, artifacts, and informal electronic communication was collected over the course of eight weeks. A priori, in vivo, and descriptive coding revealed several patterns and themes, including (a) teaching responsibilities impacting occupational identity, (b) work environment affecting teacher commitment, and (c) teaching responsibilities and work environment impacting teacher efficacy. Implications for teacher education and suggestions for future research are discussed.

Contact Information:
Lisa Martin
625 Viridian Drive #361
Lafayette, CO 80026
Telephone: 847.863.5346
Email: lisa.martin@colorado.edu
Music Programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs): A Content Analysis of Undergraduate Music Education Curriculum

Joyce McCall, Arizona State University

Using purposive sampling, four National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) accredited Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) were selected, ensuring equal representation of institutions from all regions in the United States; parochial, non-parochial, private and public. Institutions examined in this study are as follows: Howard University, Xavier University-Louisiana, Central State University and Prairie View A&M University. Focusing on undergraduate music education curricula in HBCUs, the researcher conducted this pilot study by examining findings based on the following questions: 1) What music curricula are offered at NASM accredited HBCUs?; 2) What are the strengths and weaknesses of music programs at HBCUs? and; 3) What implications for future research are suggested by this pilot study?

Contact Information:
Joyce McCall
7250 S. Kyrene Rd.
APT 227
Tempe, AZ 85283
Telephone: 601. 329. 1959
Email: joyce.mccall99@gmail.com

Arts Education Advocacy: The Relative Effects of School-Level Influences on Resources for Arts Education

Peter Miksza, Indiana University Jacobs School of Music

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of common recommendations for arts education advocacy using data from the 2009-10 NCES elementary and secondary school surveys on arts education. Regression models assessed the effect of variables representing community support, administrators’ support, having arts educators in leadership roles, and school climate more generally as predictors of principals’ reports of the adequacy of funding, instructional time, and number of arts specialists for arts education. Additional models were tested to determine whether these effects would remain after controlling for minority status, poverty status, and school community type. Parent/community support, including arts specialists in school leadership roles, and having an arts curriculum specialist/program coordinator had the most pronounced effects on the reported adequacy of resources. Student interest/demand for arts education, including arts grades in secondary students’ GPA, and the number of arts events elementary school principals attended were also significant effects.

Contact Information:
Peter Miksza
Indiana University Jacobs School of Music
1201 E 3rd St
Bloomington, IN 47405
Telephone: 812. 855. 7253
Email: pmiksza@indiana.edu

Peter Miksza, Indiana University Jacobs School of Music
Brent Gault, Indiana University Jacobs School of Music

The primary purpose of this study was to describe the musical experiences elementary school children in the United States receive in the academic classroom setting. The data were drawn from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study of the Kindergarten class 1998-99 (ECLS-K), a nationally representative study that followed kindergarteners through to their 8th grade school year with the last data collection wave in 2006-07. The variables pertaining to musical experiences in the academic classroom that were available in the ECLS-K were: (a) the frequency and duration with which children received music instruction, (b) the frequency that music was used to teach math, and (c) the percentage of children receiving formal music instruction outside of school. Each of these variables was also analyzed as a function of child urbanicity, socioeconomic status (SES), and ethnicity. Statistically significant ($p < .001$) disparities among children based on urbanicity, SES, and ethnicity were found on each of the musical experience variables. Overall, white, suburban students of high levels of SES tended to receive significantly more musical experience than students of color from urban and rural settings and of low SES. Policy implications as well as considerations for future research are discussed.

Contact Information:
Peter Miksza  
Indiana University Jacobs School of Music  
1201 E 3rd St  
Bloomington, IN 47405  
Telephone: 812. 855. 7253  
Email: pmiksza@indiana.edu

Brent Gault  
Indiana University Jacobs School of Music  
1201 E 3rd St  
Bloomington, IN 47405  
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Email: bgault@indiana.edu

Procedures for Evaluating Public School Music Curricula

Timothy E. Nowak, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester

With the upcoming changes in the National Standards and the implementation of the Common Core, districts will have to reexamine their music curriculum to ensure its structure and philosophical underpinnings are still relevant and effective for the delivery of the new content. This study used a multiple case study approach to examine the process through which five public school districts in the Rochester, NY, area review and evaluate their music curricula. Interviews were conducted with music curriculum leaders and coded to examine emergent themes. Themes were then compared using cross-case analysis. Analysis revealed several common trends in curriculum evaluation procedures. These procedures were synthesized with procedures in academic literature to create a process model for evaluating music curricula in public schools. This model can be used as a template for music education leaders in public schools seeking to design, improve, or clarify their procedure for evaluating pre-existing music curricula.

Contact Information:
Timothy E. Nowak  
415 Hammocks Drive  
Fairport, NY 14450  
Telephone: 609. 468. 5701  
Email: tenowak@gmail.com
A Geographic, Demographic, and Economic Analysis of Bands Competing in the Bands of America Grand National Championships Finals Between 2002 and 2011

Emmett O’Leary, Arizona State University

This study examines geographic, demographic, and economic characteristics of bands competing in the Bands of America Grand National Championships Finals from 2002 through 2011. A frequency analysis of bands participating was performed to determine the number of unique schools represented in the event (N = 31). To determine differences from state norms, individual school and school district data were compared to state averages. Compared to state averages, competing schools were found to have an enrollment that was an average of 346% larger, an average percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch 27.59 points lower, and median household income for the school district’s of these bands was 42% higher than state means. The study highlights continuing inequities in marching band competition with bands from rural areas and lower socioeconomic statuses being at a distinct disadvantage in this event.

Contact Information:
Emmett O’Leary
806 W. Brown St. Apt. D
Tempe, AZ 85281
Telephone: 574. 210. 0685
Email: eoleary@asu.edu

The Effect of Different Visual Perspectives on Instrumentalists’ Perception of Conductor Expressivity

Shaun R. Popp, Florida State University

The study (1) investigated subjects’ perception of conductor expressivity through an audio-visual presentation showing four visual perspectives and using two orders, and (2) explored the relationship between subjects’ normal ensemble seating position and subjects’ perception of conductor expressivity.

Thirty-seven (N = 37) undergraduate music education majors viewed four audio-visual clips of a wind ensemble conductor leading a performance of the same musical excerpt and were asked to rate the conductor’s expressivity for each segment. Significant differences were found in expressivity ratings of visual perspectives and for orders. An interaction transpired between orders and visual perspectives. No differences were discovered for seating position and no interaction occurred between seating position and visual perspectives. Future studies might use an even sample of subjects in terms of seating position and conducting training, and employ various orders, conductors, ensembles, and music.

Contact Information:
Shaun R. Popp
College of Music
The Florida State University
122 North Copeland St.
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Telephone: 502. 931. 0682
Email: poppshaun@gmail.com
Examining Preservice Music Teacher Concerns in Peer- and Field-Teaching Settings

Sean R. Powell, Columbus State University

The purpose of this study was to examine the concerns of preservice music teachers using the Fuller and Bown teacher concerns model. Participants were 12 senior-level instrumental music education majors enrolled at a medium-size American public university. A video-assisted, stimulated recall method was used to interview participants after 2 peer-teaching and 2 field-teaching episodes. Data consisted of 1,019 coded statements drawn from over 900 minutes of interviews. Task concerns were the most reported in all interviews, followed by self concerns and student impact concerns. Task concerns decreased across the four teaching episodes, while student impact concerns increased from the first field-teaching episode to the second. Rehearsal strategy use, evaluation of teaching, and individual student impact were the most frequently coded task, self, and student impact concerns, respectively. Overall, participants reported that peer-teaching was more difficult and stressful than field-teaching. Implications of the Fuller and Bown framework as well as additional future research directions are proposed.

Contact Information:
Sean R. Powell
Schwob School of Music
900 Broadway
Columbus, GA 31901
Telephone: 706. 649. 7399
Email: spowell4@gmail.com

Changing The Conversation: Considering Quality In Music Education Qualitative Research

Mitchell Robinson, Michigan State University

The establishment of criteria for quality in qualitative research in music education has existed as a thorny issue within our profession for many years. The range of opinions and beliefs concerning “goodness” criteria for qualitative research is vast, and encompasses multiple belief systems, paradigm orientations and research stances. The purpose of this paper is to briefly review the conversation in our profession with respect to establishing and modifying evaluative criteria in qualitative research over the past several decades, provide alternative approaches to considering issues of evaluation in qualitative inquiry in music education, and extend the conversation as we consider our future as a research community.

Contact Information:
Mitchell Robinson
208 Music Practice Building
College of Music
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
Telephone: 517. 355. 7555
Email: mrob@msu.edu
The Comparative Effectiveness of Male and Female Singing Models on Kindergarten Children’s Use of Singing Voice Achievement

Joanne Rutkowski, The Pennsylvania State University

This study investigated the effect of a male singing model on kindergarten children’s singing voice achievement. Kindergarteners received informal music guidance once a week from two music teachers, one female and one male (September to December), and one female music teacher (February to May). Teachers sang together during activities; one or the other sometimes took the lead. Children (n=18) were administered the Singing Voice Development Measure (SVDM) - one day by the female teacher and another day by the male teacher - in September, December and May. Intra-rater reliabilities (r=.89 to 1.00) and inter-rater reliabilities (r=.880-.991) were high. Paired samples t-tests revealed significant differences between models, favoring the female model, for all tests except neutral syllable performances in December. Significant gains in use of singing voice were found for the female model from December to May and from September to May. No significant gains were found for the male model.

Contact Information:
Joanne Rutkowski
Penn State
School of Music
University Park, PA 16802-1901
Telephone: 814. 863. 0419
Email: rvi@psu.edu

Music Instruction for Elementary Students with Moderate to Severe Cognitive Impairments: A Case Study

Karen Salvador, University of Michigan – Flint

Although elementary general music teachers in schools all over the United States teach students with a variety of special needs every day (Chen, 2007; Hahn, 2010; Hoffman, 2011), many undergraduate music education programs do not adequately address exceptionality (Salvador, 2010). Articles regarding “strategies that work” appear perennially in professional literature (e.g., Adamek, 2001; Hammel, 2004; McCord & Watts, 2006), but these strategies have seldom been the subject of empirical research in peer-reviewed literature, and none of these articles pertain to how elementary music teachers are modifying instruction to meet the needs of students with moderate to severe cognitive impairments (CI) who attend music with their self-contained categorical classes. This qualitative study details the practices of Carrie Davis with regard to music instruction of students with moderate to severe CI, both when these students were included with their fourth grade peers and also when they attended music with their self-contained class.

Contact Information:
Karen Salvador
University of Michigan-Flint
126 French Hall
303 E. Kearsley
Flint, MI 48502
Telephone: 517.862.1982
Email: ksalvado@umflint.edu
Individual Adequacy of Immersed Music Program Participants

Sandra M. Sanchez, University of Miami

The purpose of this study was to examine individual adequacy of immersed music program participants. Participants (N = 485) of summer music camps (SMC) and drum corps (DC), ages 15 to 21, completed an online questionnaire that measured individual adequacy in general and immersed music settings. The questionnaire examined participants’ self-reported individual adequacy in general and immersed music settings through two measures. Results revealed a strong correlation between participants’ individual adequacy scores in general and immersed music settings, suggesting parallel attitudes and behaviors within and away from immersed music experiences. Additionally, non-significant relationships among demographic characteristics, participation characteristics, and individual adequacy suggest personal characteristics do not affect individual adequacy scores. Mean scores of SMC and DC participants were significantly different, finding higher scores for DC participants. Although SMC and DC participants deemed relationships the most enjoyable aspect of participation, responses concerning music, performance, similarities, and personal benefits were unbalanced.

Contact Information:
Sandra M. Sanchez
50 Menores AVE Apt. 727
Coral Gables, FL 33134
Telephone: 727.742.1877
Email: S.sanchez@umiami.edu

Influence of Aural and Visual Expressivity of the Accompanist on Audience Perception of Expressivity in Collaborative Performances of a Soloist and Pianist

Justine K. Sasanfar, Independent Scholar, Wichita, Kansas

The present study examined the influence of aural and visual accompanist expressivity on perception of overall expressivity in collaborative performances of a soloist and pianist. Participants (N = 72) with and without backgrounds in music viewed audio-visual performances of soloists performing with an accompanist who played either aurally expressive or unexpressive and appeared either visually expressive or unexpressive; soloists remained stylistically appropriate (aurally and visually) throughout. Participants rated the overall expressivity of each performance using an 11-point rating scale and completed a survey addressing perception of expressivity in collaborative performance in reference to the study and in general. Performances with aurally and visually expressive accompaniment were perceived with significantly higher levels of expressivity than unexpressive versions, though only participants with music backgrounds discerned a difference between the aural expressivity conditions. Results indicate the performance of the accompanist may influence perception of overall expressivity in these settings; further implications are discussed.

Contact Information:
Justine K Sasanfar
251 N. Dellrose St.
Wichita, KS 67208
Telephone: 952.200.1045
Email: justinesasanfar@me.com
The Effect of Primary Instrument on Sensitivity to Intonation

Ryan V. Scherber, Florida State University

This study investigates potential correlations between an individual’s primary instrument and sensitivity to intonation. Previous studies have shown the intonation of higher pitches is easier to discern than lower pitches and that musical training has a significant effect on pitch perception. Absent from prior studies is how specific musical training and numerous years on a single instrument may effect sensitivity to intonation. Participants in this study judged the intonation of computer-generated tones across four ranges: soprano, alto, tenor, and bass (SATB) in a paired-comparison format in which the second note was deviated by 0, 7, or 14 cents (flat and sharp). Results of the study indicated no significant differences between ranges across all participants as well as between primary instrument ranges, although a trend was evident indicating more discriminant perception within the soprano and alto ranges.

Contact Information:
Ryan V. Scherber
525 W. Park Ave. #5
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Telephone: 614.787.2152
Email: rvs09@admin.fsu.edu

The Composition Processes of Beginning Band Students in the Absence of Teacher-Imposed Parameters

Emily Schwartz, Arizona State University

The purpose of this action research study was to examine the processes beginning band students use to compose when given few parameters. Fifteen fifth and sixth-grade students were observed for seven weeks during their participation in an after-school Composing Club. During these weekly club meetings, students had the opportunity to compose a piece and record it in a student-created recording studio. Students were given no parameters for their compositions. While each student’s process was unique, their compositional processes fell into three broad categories based on how students perceived the lack of parameters: 1) The Explorers, who embraced the freedoms they were given and explored multiple possibilities of sounds before recording, 2) The Dependent Learners, who showed difficulty creating a composition without teacher direction and, 3) The Rule-Makers, who quickly created their own compositional parameters in the absence of teacher-given ones.

Contact Information:
Emily Schwartz
1828 E. Dunbar Dr
Phoenix, AZ 85042
Telephone: 562.355.2377
Email: ermuller@asu.edu
The How and Why of Lesson Planning: A Comparative Case Study of Experienced Band Teachers

Ryan D. Shaw, Michigan State University

The purpose of this study was to investigate the lesson planning practices of three experienced band teachers at the high school level. For the purposes of this study, experienced teachers are those with 20 or more years of teaching experience. Research questions included: (a) how do experienced high school band teachers plan for teaching, and (b) how do they draw meaning from the lesson planning process?

The study employed a comparative case study design, viewed through a phenomenological lens to provide rich, detailed description of both planning processes and the meaning attached (Merriam, 2009; Moustakas, 1994). The researcher studied three experienced band teachers in different communities in a Midwestern state, and data included focus group and individual interviews. Findings showed participants' planning was multi-layered, nested, linked to reflection, and flexible. Participants valued lesson planning and preferred to do it in a non-prescribed and personal format. Data from my study led to the design of a lesson-planning model based on experienced music teacher planning. Recommendations for future research and practice are discussed.

Contact Information:
Ryan Shaw
808 Inkster Ave.
Kalamazoo, MI 49008
Telephone: 616.570.2456
Email: rydshaw@gmail.com

Trading Hindemith for “Hugs, High-Fives, and Handshakes”:
One Pre-service Music Teacher’s Decision to Teach Elementary General Music

Heather N. Shouldice, Michigan State University

Existing research suggests that the secondary ensemble experience is a strong influence in the decision to teach music, and most preservice music teachers plan to teach in a secondary ensemble setting. The purpose of this case study was to explore the experiences and beliefs of one male music education student who chose a student-teaching placement in an elementary general music setting rather than his original intent to become a band director. Analysis revealed four themes: (1) the influence of undergraduate coursework, (2) his tendency to be student-centered, (3) the need for broadening students’ musical skills and understanding, and (4) dissatisfaction with the current band culture. Findings suggest that music teacher education and future music education research might focus on teacher/director role perceptions, beliefs about the purpose of music education, and critical incidents that influence career decisions in pre-service music teachers, as well as the role of music education coursework in teacher identity development.

Contact Information:
Heather N. Shouldice
2018 Teaneck Circle
Wixom, MI 48393
Telephone: 734.693.6067
Email: heathershouldice@gmail.com
Identity Perceptions of Undergraduate Double Majors
In Music Performance and Music Education

Crystal Guy Sieger, Case Western Reserve University

The purpose of this study was to investigate music performance/music education identity by examining double majors in various stages of their programs of study who aspire to become a performer and music educator. As they simultaneously develop both identities, double majors cope with additional challenges as they determine who they are and who they hope to become. Using individual and focus-group interviews and e-mail prompts, I investigated the experiences of five undergraduate students majoring in music education and music performance. Six themes emerged from the analysis. Participants expressed various degrees of a blended musician identity. They described similar socialization processes, and training as performers and teachers, along with challenging schedules, enhanced and exacerbated those processes. Participants identified performer and teacher qualities that influenced self-perceptions, and described conflict between performance and music education majors within studios and the school. Implications for music school faculty and music students are included.

Contact Information:
Crystal Guy Sieger
Case Western Reserve University
Department of Music
208 Haydn Hall
11118 Bellflower Road
Cleveland, OH 44106
Telephone: 520. 400. 5767
Email: cas235@case.edu

Evolving Practices in Elementary and Middle School Band Classrooms

Amy Spears, Arizona State University

This collective case study explores evolving practices that some music teachers are incorporating into traditional band classes. Three primary questions guide the study: 1) What non-traditional practices are band teachers applying in their classrooms? 2) Why does the teacher use these practices? 3) How do these practices impact music-making in the instrumental ensemble setting? My study involves observations of three band classrooms at elementary and middle schools. I observed one seventh and eighth grade band class and two fifth grade beginner band classes two to three times each, wrote field notes, and interviewed each teacher at least twice to understand their teaching philosophies and to gain insight into their teaching methods I observed. Findings indicate that some evolving approaches include peer teaching and learning, emphasis on musicality, and student choice. Implications for practice and research are discussed.

Contact Information:
Amy Spears
2201 E. Pinchot Ave #3
Phoenix, AZ 85016
Telephone: 205. 482. 5910
Email: amy.spears@asu.edu
The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of fingering on piano performance accuracy among undergraduate music majors. Undergraduate non-piano majors (N=40) who were enrolled in four piano classes served as participants in this study. Participants in the experimental group were given a piece with predetermined fingerings on the score. The control group was given the same piece without any fingering. Both groups practiced the piece for 10 minutes per class, twice a week for two weeks. Videotaped performances were analyzed for pitch and rhythm accuracy. The t-test result indicated no significant differences between control and experimental groups. However, fingering in this study tended to affect pitch more than rhythm.

Contact Information:
Gina Jisun Yi
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Detroit, MI 48234
Telephone: 310.991.0423
Email: ginayi@hotmail.com
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University of North Carolina at Greensboro
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Desert Skies Symposium on Research in Music Education
University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona
February 21-23, 2013

The purpose of this paper is to present a history of the Symposium on Music Teacher Education, which has been an initiative of the Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE) since 2004. The Symposium on Music Teacher Education (SMTE Symposium), a biennial event since 2005, has occurred four times (2005, 2007, 2009, and 2011) and has been hosted each time by the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in mid to late September.

The SMTE Symposium is recognized by many in the profession as providing a much-needed opportunity to convene a professional gathering around topics germane specifically to music teacher education. The significance of such an event was made evident right from the start. Organizers estimated the inaugural event would be deemed ‘successful’ with 75 attendees. The first SMTE Symposium in 2005 drew 175 attendees, and each event since has drawn increasingly more people. The most recent SMTE Symposium (2011) included 265 attendees. From another perspective, one might measure success of the SMTE Symposium by the number of graduate students (the next generation of music teacher educators) that have attended. Graduate student attendance has grown from 19 attendees in 2005 to 23 in 2007, 43 in 2009, and 60 in 2011. Many of those graduate students who attended the earlier symposia are now music teacher educators in college or university positions across the country.

Having served as Chair of the Executive Committee for SMTE when the idea of a recurring SMTE Symposium was first conceived, and having continued as the organizing Chair for every SMTE Symposium to date, I am in an advantageous position to offer an informed perspective regarding the circumstances surrounding the initiation and perpetuation of the event. In the present paper, I plan to (a) describe precursors that led to the first SMTE Symposium in 2005, (b) explore the evolution of ideas and actions that have occurred across the four SMTE Symposia to date, and (c) review the event’s effects and possible directions going forward.

Methodology

Data for this historical study were gathered mostly from primary resources that included: (a) the SMTE website (smte.us), (b) the Call for Proposals for each event, (c) the symposium program booklets from each event, (d) the Journal for Music Teacher Education, (e) minutes from every SMTE Executive Committee meeting since April 2004, (f) email correspondence among SMTE Executive Committee members, (g) participant lists, and (h) personal notes.

Background of SMTE

This background will include a brief description of SMTE and its place in the National Association for Music Education (NAfME, formerly Music Educators National Conference—MENC). It will continue with an overview of SMTE’s activities since its inception and conclude with a description of specific events leading to the first SMTE Symposium. SMTE is one of two Societies and fifteen Councils that comprise the ‘Societies and Councils’ component of NAfME (National Association for Music Education, n.d.). SMTE was formed at its inaugural meeting convened by Dr. Charles Leonhard.
during the 1982 MENC Biennial In-Service Workshop in San Antonio, Texas. Leonhard’s vision for the organization included five “essential functions” (p. 4, Leonhard, 1991).

1) conduct and disseminate research in music teacher education;
2) develop innovative programs of music teacher education;
3) advise (and monitor) state departments of education, schools’ and departments of music, and accrediting agencies (NASM and NCATE) on the content of and standards for music teacher education programs and the musical preparation of elementary classroom teachers;
4) develop high-level personal and professional bonding and professional identity among music teacher educators; and
5) exert political and social pressure on the conference, state departments of education, and, collegiate institutions to deal intelligently with music teacher education programs. (p. 4)

Although these ‘essential functions’ were the sole vision of Dr. Leonhard, they align closely with what SMTE has formally adopted and maintains as its purposes.

1) Improve the quality of teaching and research in music teacher education;
2) Provide leadership in the establishment of standards for certification of music teachers; and
3) Serve as an arm of [NAfME] in influencing developments in music teacher education and in the certification of music teachers. (Society for Music Teacher Education, n.d.)

Since the establishment of SMTE, the organization has undertaken several publication projects to further its purposes. One of the earliest initiatives of SMTE was the 1984 publication, *Music Teacher Education: Partnership and Process*. At the request of Paul Lehman, then-president of MENC (now NAfME), Eunice Boardman Meske, then-chair of SMTE, appointed a taskforce charged with “preparing a forward-looking document that could lead music teacher preparation into the next decade” (Music Educators National Conference, 1987, p. 9). The result was a report organized into four broad sections, each providing recommendations regarding a critical area of music teacher education. Those areas include: (a) recruiting, selecting, and retaining future music teachers; (b) preparing future music teachers via teacher certification programs, (c) implementing professional development programs to promote career growth among those in the field, and (d) attending to music teacher educators (college and university music and music education faculty members and experienced master teachers serving an important teacher-preparation role in schools) (Music Educators National Conference, 1987).

Probably the most prominent publication initiative was (and is) a professional journal for music teacher education. In 1991, *Journal for Music Teacher Education* (JMTE) was started as a vehicle to deliver current ideas in music teacher education. Although research comprises a substantive proportion of the articles published, the intention of the journal was originally to be a broader “exploration of [SMTE’s] thoughts and feelings about teacher preparation” (Collins, 1991, p. 1). Since that first issue, JMTE continues today as a “peer-reviewed online-only professional development journal published twice a year, [offering] philosophical, historical, descriptive, or methodological articles related to music teacher education. Some issues offer media reviews and ‘Perspectives’ essays that discuss opinions and viewpoints” (Sage Journals, n.d.).
SMTE has since produced several additional publications, each addressing a particular aspect of music teacher education. In 1992, the *Syllabi for Music Methods Courses, Volume 1* was published as a collection of music education course syllabi for graduate and undergraduate courses in general, choral and instrumental music. The collection was reviewed and selected by a committee from SMTE and serves as a resource for music teacher educators across the country. In 2002, Barbara Lewis edited *Syllabi for Music Methods Courses, Volume 2* as a follow up publication to Volume 1. The 2002 edition was pursued in recognition that several important events had taken place since the first edition that affected the landscape of music teacher education, including the publication of the National Standards and a great many advances in technology, all influencing the instruction of future music teachers. In 1997, *Strategies for Teaching: Guide for Music Methods Classes*, one volume of MENC’s ‘Strategies for Teaching’ series, was published as a project of SMTE. Congruent with the entire ‘Strategies for Teaching’ series, *Guide for Music Methods* book was intended to offer ways in which teachers of methods courses could prepare their students for incorporating the National Standards for Music Education into music instruction at all levels (Hall, Boone, Grashel, & Watkins, 1997). In 1999, *Society for Music Teacher Education: Professional Literature Project* was published as an undertaking of SMTE to assemble a categorized citation list of articles that address music teacher preparation. According to Heller (1999), editor of the project, no single bibliographic tool existed at the time as repository for music teacher education literature. Further, confusion existed as to the distinct nature of literature on music teacher education as compared to that of music education. Consequently, music teacher educators were not always aware of the literature their field. The *Project* begins with an introduction describing its purpose and history, and continues with eight chapters, each providing bibliographic information about music teacher education literature in a specific area, including: (a) music teacher education in general, (b) conducting, (c) fieldwork, (d) elementary classroom teacher education in music, (e) general music teacher education, (f) choral music teacher education, (g) instrumental music teacher education, and (h) graduate study in music teacher education (Heller, 1999). The project was updated in May 2003.

In addition to publications, SMTE has periodically organized gatherings to pursue ideas on music teacher education either at stand-alone events (e.g. *Symposium '97: Innovation in Music Teacher Education*, held in April 1997 at the University of Oklahoma School of Music) or as a designated portion of a larger event (e.g., pre-conference teacher education sessions at NAfME biennial in-service conferences, music teacher education sessions at annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association and at biennial meetings of the International Society for Music Education, etc.).

Although the aforementioned publication and presentation opportunities help music teacher educators engage in much needed dialogue about music teacher preparation, they come with their own sets of challenges. Aside from *JMTE*, each of the publications is a ‘one-off’ venture, meaning each addresses a specific aspect of music teacher education, but is not a mechanism for the on-going development of ideas. Although *JMTE* is a periodical, Heller (1999) astutely pointed out its limitation for moving ideas forward. According to Heller, “[JMTE] fills the gap, but at a very slow pace. The *Journal* publishes two issues per year, with five to ten rather short (two- to five-page) articles” (Heller, 1999, “Introduction,” para 2). Gatherings of music teacher educators have posed similar challenges regarding the need to explore and revisit good ideas often enough to affect changes in the music teacher education profession. Like many of the publications, gatherings for pursuing ideas on music teacher education exclusively have been ‘one-off’ events and gatherings as parts of other, larger organization gatherings never quite allowed for the needed in-depth focus on music teacher education without...
being subject to, as Heller (1999) put it, “forces from outside the discipline: from music, from education, from the liberal arts, and the sciences” (“Introduction,” paragraph 2).

Around the early 2000’s, many in music teacher education had begun to experience a collective awareness that what had been missing was a venue to engage with the multitude of music teacher education issues on a regular basis such that the profession of music teacher educators could respond deftly to ever changing societal influences and needs of the profession. What follows is a description of the pivotal events leading to the first Symposium on Music Teacher Education.

Events Leading to the First SMTE Symposium

Mr. Jeffrey Kimpton, then-director of the University of Minnesota School of Music as well as a contributor to the 1984 Partnership and Process publication and long-time advocate for music teacher development, presented the keynote address at the teacher education preconference session of the 2004 MENC biennial meeting. His plan was to pose three questions in his initial 40-minute address, and then ask attendees to form three groups (one for each question) to discuss possible answers/solutions to each question before reassembling to share ideas. The questions were:

1. What partnerships must we create, build, or reenergize in K–12, higher, and professional education for music teacher education in the future?
2. Where will the supply of new teachers come from? and
3. What is the role of MENC, NASM, or other state or national professional organizations in providing leadership and support for new research and models? (Teachout, 2005, p. 6).

His intention was to ‘give legs’ to the ideas discussed, encouraging continued thinking and action well after the session ended. True to this ideal, a Special Focus issue of JMTE was proposed to the JMTE’s editor, William Fredrickson, and approve immediately. From the SMTE Executive Committee, three two-member teams were charged to monitor the session’s group discussions and take notes. Those notes formed the basis of three articles in the Special Focus Issue of JMTE that was published in spring 2005 (see Journal of Music Teacher Education, Volume 14, Issue 2).

The events of the 2004 Teacher Education preconference session at the MENC biennial meeting sparked the idea among the SMTE Executive Committee of holding a regularly recurring event dedicated solely for music teacher education. In fall 2004, all members of the SMTE Executive Committee met in Chicago for planning meeting at the Best Western hotel in Rosemount, IL on October 29 and 30 to map out a national-level regularly occurring event for music teacher educators. In attendance were Janet Barrett (Liaison to MENC National Executive Board), Sara Bidner (Immediate past chair), Tina Bull (Northwest division representative), Jeffrey Bush (Western division representative), Susan Conkling (Eastern division representative), Don Ester (Chair-elect), William Fredrickson (JMTE editor), Janet Robbins (Southern division representative) Robin Stein (Southwestern division representative), David Teachout (Chair), and Linda Thompson (North central division representative). Some of the ideas decided at that meeting included:
1. Unanimous approval of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) as the site for the 2005 symposium.
2. The event was originally scheduled for October 6-8, but was changed to September 15-17 when it was learned the Sociology of Music Education symposium was scheduled for the October weekend.
3. The event would open Thursday evening with a keynote presentation and close Saturday evening with some sort of social function.
4. Components of the symposium would include plenary panel discussions, individual presentations of research and best practice by invited or selected participants, a forum for graduate research (completed or in progress) and a closing discussion calling for plans of action.
5. The SMTE Executive Committee would meet Thursday afternoon prior to the opening events and again Sunday morning after the symposium.
6. After much discussion, a title was agreed upon unanimously to be, “Rethinking, Researching, and Revitalizing.”

In December 2004, a Call for Proposals was distributed to various outlets including the Music Researcher’s listserv, SMTE state chairs, editors of state MEA publications, MENC member alerts, and the SMTE portion of the MENC website. A deadline for proposals was set for April 15, 2005 and notifications of accepted proposals were sent by June 1, 2005.

First Symposium and Follow-up at the MENC Biennial Meeting

The first SMTE Symposium took place on September 15-17, 2005 on the UNCG campus, and was titled, “Rethinking, Research, Revitalizing.” Dr. Richard Ingersoll, Professor of Education and Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania presented the Thursday evening opening keynote address titled, “The Teacher Shortage: A Case of Wrong Diagnosis and Wrong Prescription.” Three themes permeated the symposium and intentionally reflected the first three sections of the 1984 Partnership and Process publication: (a) finding future music educators (which incidentally aligned well with Dr. Ingersoll’s address), (b) preparing future music educators, and (c) supporting the professional development of music educators. For each theme there was (a) a plenary panel presentation; (b) break out presentations of research, position papers, and best practices; and (c) a plenary summary of those presentation sessions, intended to keep all attendees informed of what was being presented (see Appendix A).

Additional components of the 2005 SMTE Symposium included a Graduate Research Forum for graduate students bringing completed works or works in progress (members of the JMTE editorial board served as mentors, providing constructive feedback and advice), and a Friday evening poster session during which three types of products were presented as posters: research, best practices, and position pieces.

A distinguishing feature of the first SMTE Symposium (and each subsequent meeting since) was the pursuit of strategic planning and action for the future. At the 2005 SMTE Symposium, this work took the form of three events on Saturday afternoon. First, there was a round table discussion during which the then-Presidents of MENC (David Circle), the College Music Society (Tayloe Harding), and the National Association for Schools of Music (Karen Wolff) were asked to provide a response to the 2005 JMTE article that resulted from Jeffery Kimpton’s third question, “What is the role of MENC, NASM, or other state or national professional organizations in providing leadership and support for new research and models?” Second, Robert J. Werner, Past-president of CMS, NASM,
and ISME and Dean Emeritus of the Cincinnati College Conservatory of Music provided a culminating summary of all the sessions taking place at the symposium.

The third, and likely the most effective mechanism for pursuing future action, was the formation of 12 Special Action Groups (SAGs) based on the ideas and interests expressed by the attendees throughout the symposium. Janet Barrett structured a procedure whereby drop boxes and stacks of index cards were placed at various hallway locations where the symposium took place. Attendees were encouraged to write down ideas about research and other actions to be pursued regarding one or more specific areas of music teacher education. Throughout the day on Friday and Saturday morning, Barrett periodically retrieved the cards, transcribed the ideas on a PowerPoint presentation, and posted that presentation to a monitor placed in a common area allowing attendees to see the ideas being suggested. During lunchtime on Saturday, Barrett reviewed all the suggested information looking for common themes and arrived at 12 distinct topic areas:

- Alternative Licensure
- Policy and Association Partnerships
- Preparing Music Teacher Educators
- Professional Development: Experienced Teacher
- Professional Development: Mentoring and Induction
- Restructuring: Admission, Assessment, and Alignment
- Restructuring: Cultural Diversity in Music Teacher Education
- Restructuring: Curriculum Visions
- Restructuring: The Study of the Preservice Teacher
- School/University Partnerships
- Teacher Recruitment
- Teacher Retention

After lunch, the attendees were presented with the 12 topics areas and were asked to form Special Actions Groups of interested individuals, one group for each topic area. Barrett recruited facilitators for each of the 12 Special Action Groups and charged them to work with the their groups’ members to pursue four tasks:

(a) Document names and contact information for all members of each group.
(b) Lead the group in preparing a set of questions and sub-questions.
(c) Lead the group in preparing a list of actions for the next six months (leading into the 2006 MENC biennial meeting) and documenting responsibilities.
(d) Lead the group in preparing a list of needed resources and plans for securing those resources.

The working part of the symposium culminated with facilitators giving brief oral reports to the attendees regarding plans for their groups. Attendees departed this inaugural SMTE event with the excitement of having experienced something that had not taken place at previous professional meetings (i.e., specific plans for advancing music teacher education).

The SMTE membership met next at the 2006 MENC biennial meeting in Salt Lake City in April during a 3-hour Pre-Conference session. David Teachout called the meeting to order, reviewed the agenda for the participants, and dismissed the attendees to meet in their respective Special Action Groups for 75 minutes. Attendees returned to the main meeting room while each facilitator presented action plans for the next 18 months (till the 2007 SMTE Symposium). Also during the conference, the SMTE Executive Committee met and approved plans to support an SMTE Website to be independent of the MENC.
Second Symposium and Follow-up at the MENC Biennial Meeting

The second SMTE Symposium took place on September 13-15, 2007 on the UNCG campus and was titled, “Collaborative Action for Change.” The event retained its general structure with an opening keynote presentation and reception Thursday evening, sessions of alternating plenary and primary presentations, a graduate research forum on Friday afternoon, a research poster session on Friday (a separate Saturday afternoon best practice/position paper poster session was added at the 2007 event), and a culminating meeting to discuss specific plans for future action. Incidentally, the term Special Action Groups (SAGs) was retired and replaced by the term Areas for Strategic Planning and Action (ASPs). The SMTE Executive Committee determined that the new term, ‘Areas,’ offered the flexibility that would allow attendees to move from one area to another depending upon their most current need at any point in time.

Dr. Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Cawthorne Professor of Teacher Education for Urban Schools and Director of the doctoral program in curriculum and instruction at Boston College, presented the Thursday evening opening keynote address titled, “Teacher Education: Where Are We and Where Are We Going?” The plenary sessions included case presentations themed around the needs of music teacher educators in disparate settings. On Friday afternoon, Marcia Neel, Coordinator of Secondary Fine Arts for the Clark County School District in Las Vegas (NV), provided a perspective of urban music education and implications for music teacher educators. On Saturday morning, Denese Odegaard, Performing Arts Curriculum Specialist for Fargo (ND) Public Schools, discussed the challenges of preparing young music teachers to enter the profession in a rural setting. A new component for the 2007 event was the presentation of a closing keynote address. Don Gibson, Dean of the Florida State University College of Music and President Elect of NASM, presented, *Music Teacher Education: Curricula, Excellence and Advocacy.*

The twelve Areas for Strategic Planning and Action (ASPs) were pursued in a short Friday morning session designed to educate newcomers about the ASPA concept and to give everyone an opportunity to choose a working group that best fit his or her needs. The ASPA groups met in earnest for a two-hour working session Saturday afternoon. The groups emerged with a several title changes reflecting a clarification of purpose and work being pursued. The new area titles, with changes bolded and underlined below, included:

- Alternative Licensure
- **Critical Examination of the Curriculum**
- Cultural Diversity and Social Justice
- **Music Teacher Socialization in the Pre-service Years**
- Policy and Association Partnerships
- Preparing Music Teacher Educators/Supporting Current Music Teacher Educators
- **Program Admission, Assessment, and Alignment**
- Professional Development for the Experienced Teacher
- Professional Development for the Beginning Teacher
- School/University Partnerships
- Teacher Recruitment
- Teacher Retention
At the closing plenary session, ASPA facilitators presented plans for the work to be pursued in their areas. Janet Barrett created a visual representation of those plans with a ‘Mindmap’ tool that allowed attendees to see the work being pursued by all the ASPAs in one ‘snapshot’ (see Appendix B).

Similar to the 2006 MENC biennial meeting, the SMTE membership met at the 2008 MENC biennial meeting in Milwaukee in April during a 3-hour Pre-conference session. Don Ester, SMTE Executive Committee Chair, called the meeting to order, provided several brief introductions, and asked each ASPA facilitator to present a brief (two minute) report on recent actions and pending objectives. For the next two hours, attendees met in their ASPA working groups; after which, they returned to the main meeting room while each facilitator presented action plans for the next 18 months (till the 2009 SMTE Symposium). With the second symposium and second MENC pre-conference meeting have been completed, a pattern had been established providing a sense of stability and direction to SMTE. Incidentally, this momentum was building at the same time that MENC announced plans in 2008 to discontinue their biennial meetings.

Third Symposium and Follow-up at the MENC Biennial Meeting

The third SMTE Symposium took place on September 10-12, 2009 on the UNCG campus and was titled, “Enacting Shared Visions.” The event continued with its general structure including an opening keynote presentation and reception Thursday evening, working sessions of alternating plenary and primary presentations throughout Friday and Saturday, a graduate research forum, a research poster session, a best practice/position paper poster session, a closing keynote speaker, and a culminating ASPA working group session.

For the first time, the opening keynote speaker was a music educator. Dr. David E. Myers, Director of the School of Music at the University of Minnesota, presented the Thursday evening opening keynote address titled, “Contemplating Values in Music Teacher Education: Can We Achieve What We Believe?” The plenary sessions were devised around the idea of creating connections among various constituencies. On Friday morning, Wendy Sims, Chair of the Society for Research in Music Education (SRME), and Mary Luerhsen, Executive Director of the National Association of Music Merchants, discussed connections between the work of the research community and ways to connect that work to policy development. On Friday afternoon, Philip Greco, a K-7 general music teacher in the Farmington (NY) public schools, and Mark Campbell, associate professor of music education at the Crane School at Potsdam (NY), presented ways they make connections for music education between the K-12 level and higher education. On Saturday morning, several university professors from various institutions and content areas discussed connections that could be made in higher education among the areas of music education, musicology, and music theory. Mark Clague (musicologist at the University of Michigan), Betty Anne Younker (music education professor at the University of Michigan), Maude Hickey (music education professor at the Northwestern), Julie Evans (music theorist at Western Michigan University), and Karen Fournier (music theorist at the University of Michigan) participated in the panel. Incidentally, a technology ‘first’ for the SMTE Symposium was achieved when the panel assembled with some members present at the event and others being ‘teleconferenced’ in, including Mark Clague and Karen Fournier from Ann Arbor Michigan and Maud Hickey from Evanston Illinois. Liz Wing, music education professor at the Cincinnati College Conservatory of Music, presented the closing keynote address titled, On Elephants and ASPAs, reframing
the fable of a group of blind men trying to describe an elephant based on what they were able to feel—each one coming up with a completely different description from the others. She presented this as a cautionary tail not to allow the work of the ASPAs to become too fragmented at the risk losing sight of the SMTE’s broader purpose.

The ASPA work was, again, pursued during a short Friday morning session designed to educate newcomers and to give all attendees an opportunity to choose a working group. Likewise, ASPA groups met for a two-hour working session Saturday afternoon. The groups emerged with several more title changes reflecting a further clarification of purpose and work being pursued. When compared with ASPA title changes in 2007, fewer titled were changed in 2009, providing evidence that the areas and their purposes were becoming stabilized. The new area titles, with changes bolded and underlined below, included:

- Critical Examination of the Curriculum
- Cultural Diversity and Social Justice
- **Music Teacher Socialization**
- **Pathways to Licensure**
- **Policy**
  - Preparing Music Teacher Educators / Supporting Current Music Teacher Educators
  - Program Admission, Assessment, and Alignment
  - Professional Development for the Experienced Teacher
  - Professional Development for the Beginning Teacher
  - School/University Partnerships
  - Teacher Recruitment
  - Teacher Retention

Similar to the 2006 and 2008 MENC biennial meetings, the SMTE membership met at a 2010 MENC event in Anaheim (CA). Unlike past MENC biennial meetings, however, this event was primary for those in higher education, and specifically intended for those in music education research and in music teacher education. The SMTE membership met for a three-hour pre-conference session, following a similar protocol of ASPA facilitators presenting brief reports on recent actions and pending objectives, and then attendees meeting for two hours in their working groups.

**Fourth Symposium and Follow-up at the NAfME Biennial Meeting**

The fourth SMTE Symposium took place on September 15-17, 2011 on the UNCG campus and was titled, “Intersections of Practice, Research, and Policy.” The event continued with its general structure similar to previous SMTE symposia, however, the 2011 schedule did not include a closing keynote presentation.

Dr. Deborah Meier, Senior Scholar at the NYU Steinhardt School and a past recipient of a McArthur Foundation ‘Genius’ Award, presented the keynote address titled, “Art is the First Language of Humanity.” Plenary sessions addressed the topic of music teacher evaluation from various perspectives. On Friday morning, Janet Barrett (Northwestern University) and Scott Shuler (NAfME President) discussed the national landscape of music teacher education. On Friday afternoon, the state-level perspective was explored as Keitha Hamann (University of Minnesota) and Douglas Orzolek (University of St. Thomas) presented ways music teacher evaluation is being addressed in Minnesota. Abby Butler (Wayne State University), Colleen Conway (University of Michigan), Phillip Hash (Calvin College), and Cynthia Taggart (Michigan State University) addressed music teacher evaluation in Michigan. Finally, Linda Thompson...
(Lee University) described ways music teacher evaluation is occurring in Tennessee. In the Saturday morning plenary session, Kelly Parkes (Virginia Tech) and James Raths (Professor Emeritus at the University of Delaware) addressed evaluating dispositions in music teacher education.

The ASPA work was, again, pursued during a short Friday morning session and during a more in-depth two-hour working session Saturday afternoon. The groups emerged from the Saturday session with one title change and a full slate of actions plans reflecting a further clarification of purpose and work being pursued. The area titles, with changes bolded and underlined below, included:

- Critical Examination of the Curriculum
- Cultural Diversity and Social Justice
- Music Teacher Socialization
- Pathways to Licensure
- Policy
- **Music Teacher Educators: Identification, Preparation, and Prof. Development**
- Program Admission, Assessment, and Alignment
- Professional Development for the Experienced Teacher
- Professional Development for the Beginning Teacher
- School/University Partnerships
- Teacher Recruitment
- Teacher Retention

Since the 2011 SMTE Symposium, the Pathways to Licensure ASPA has been suspended. However, due to interest generated at the 2011 event and an emerging recognition that teacher evaluation is a topic of increasing import, a Teacher Evaluation ASPA has been proposed and will be introduced at the 2013 SMTE Symposium.

Similar to the 2006 and 2008 MENC biennial meetings and the 2010 MENC event, the SMTE membership met most recently at the 2012 NAfME Music Research and Teacher Education National Conference in St. Louis (MO). Similar to the 2010 event, this event was primary for those in higher education, and specifically intended for those in music education research and in music teacher education. The SMTE membership met for a three-hour pre-conference session, following a similar protocol of ASPA facilitators presenting brief reports on recent actions and pending objectives, and then attendees meeting for two hours in their working groups, reporting on completed initiatives and planning future actions for presentation at the 2013 SMTE Symposium.

**Conclusions**

Since its inception in 2005, the SMTE Symposium has earned it place as a mechanism for promoting ideas and actions intended to further the causes of music teacher education. Most obviously, this positive effect is reflected in the number of participants and the products presented at each SMTE Symposium. Since 2005, each successive event has drawn increasingly greater numbers of attendees (including graduate students) and increasingly greater numbers of poster and session presentations (see Table 1).
Table 1.  
**SMTE Symposia by the Numbers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sessions</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Posters</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Posters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Presentations*</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Attendees</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Attendees</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of States Represented</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Total number of presentations includes, for each year, the combined number of primary sessions, primary posters, and graduate posters.

The attendance records alone are remarkable in that these increases have occurred over a period in our county’s history of a widespread economic recession. Logically, fewer individuals were receiving institutional support for professional travel, yet the SMTE Symposium numbers continued to increase.

Reasons for such a ground swell of interest for this event seems to emanate from several sources. First, the SMTE Symposium began at a time when there was not a consistent opportunity for those in music teacher education to gather and share ideas. Second, the flagship organization for music education at the time (MENC) had announced the discontinuation of national biennial meetings in 2008. Although the organization, under the new name “National Association for Music Education,” actually did continue to hold regular meetings, those interested in music teacher education seemed to recognize the SMTE Symposium as more consistent and germane event for like-minded individuals than the MENC/NAfME events. Third, and most important, were the formation of the ASPAs. Unlike any mechanism before, the ASPAs provided an ongoing opportunity for those involved in music teacher education to share ideas and further the knowledge base across a variety of music teacher education areas. Finally, the SMTE Symposium has encouraged unmitigated participation by the next generation of music teacher educators, namely the graduate students. In addition to the graduate research forum, graduate students have been welcomed and encouraged to submit and present primary sessions, and to participate in the ASPA meetings to the same degree as the higher education faculty. As a result, the graduate students have ‘grown up’ in the profession developing ideas and moving them forward. A substantial number of graduate students who attended the first several SMTE Symposia are now holding positions in higher education, and a few are serving in leadership positions as an ASPA facilitator or on the SMTE Executive Committee.

The SMTE Symposium was started at a point in time when the constituency of music teacher educators were in need of an opportunity to meet and share ideas. The forward thinking approach that the SMTE Executive Committee has taken with this
opportunity, through the development of ASPAs and the encouragement of graduate student participation, has resonated with music teacher educators. The SMTE Symposium is a powerful event that will likely continue to maintain relevance to the degree that the SMTE Executive Committee continues to use the event to address current critical issues in music teacher education.
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Appendix A

2005 SMTE Symposium on Music Teacher Education: Rethinking, Researching, Revitalizing

Symposium Outline

Thursday, Sept. 15, 2005 (UNCG School of Music Atrium and Recital Hall)

6:00—10:00 PM Welcome and Opening Activities

6:00—7:00 PM Registration
7:00—7:15 PM Welcome
7:15—7:30 PM Introduction of SMTE Board Members, Special Guests, and Keynote Speaker
7:30—8:30 PM Keynote Address: Richard Ingersoll, University of Pennsylvania (Sponsored by MENC)
8:30—10:00 PM Reception

Friday, Sept. 16, 2005 (Elliott University Center, UNCG)

7:30—8:00 AM Morning Amenities (Coffee, Juice, Bagels, and Fruit provided)

8:00—10:30 AM FINDING FUTURE MUSIC EDUCATORS

8:00—8:30 AM Panel Presentation: Challenges We Face with Finding Future Music Educators
8:35—9:40 AM Presentations of Research, Position Papers, and Best Practices
9:45—10:30 AM Discussion/Group Summary of Presentations

10:30—10:45 AM Break (Beverages provided)

10:45—12:30 PM PREPARING FUTURE MUSIC EDUCATORS, Part I

10:45—11:15 AM Panel Presentation: Challenges We Face with Preparing Future Music Educators
11:25—12:30 PM Presentations of Research, Position Papers, and Best Practices

12:30—2:30 PM Lunch (on your own)

Graduate Research Forum: Graduate students present works-in-progress over lunch and receive feedback from JMTE Editorial Board members. Box lunches are provided for all graduate students and JMTE Editorial Board members who participate.

2:30—5:15 PM PREPARING FUTURE MUSIC EDUCATORS, Part II

2:30—4:10 PM Presentations of Research, Position Papers, and Best Practices
4:15—4:30 PM Break (Beverages provided)
4:30—5:15 PM Discussion/Group Summary of Presentations

5:15—8:30 PM Dinner (on your own)

8:30—10:00 PM Poster Session & Dessert/Coffee
(Sponsorship: Music Research Institute at UNCG)
Saturday, Sept. 17, 2005 (Bryan School of Business, UNCG)

8:00—8:30 AM  Morning Amenities (Coffee, Juice, Bagels, and Fruit provided)

8:30—11:45 AM SUPPORTING THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF MUSIC EDUCATORS

8:30—9:00 AM  Panel Presentation: Challenges We Face with Supporting the Professional Development of Music Educators

9:05—10:45 AM Presentations of Research, Position Papers, and Best Practices

10:45—11:00 AM Break (Beverages provided)

11:00—11:45 AM Discussion/Group Summary of Presentations

11:45—12:30 PM Lunch (buffet lunch will be provided for all participants)

12:30—6:00 PM STRATEGIC PLANNING AND ACTION FOR THE FUTURE

12:30—1:45 PM Presidents’ Roundtable: Karen Wolff (NASM), Tayloe Harding (CMS), David Circle (MENC)

1:45—2:15 PM Synthesis Presentation by the Robert Werner (Past President of CMS, ISME, and NASM; Dean Emeritus, Cincinnati CCM)

2:15—2:30 PM Break (Beverages provided)

2:30—4:30 PM Participants break out into several Special Actions Groups (Strategic Planning)

Purposes:
(a) Document names and contact information for all members of each group.
(b) Prepare a set of questions and sub-questions.
(c) Prepare a list of actions for the next six months (leading into 2006 MENC) and documenting responsibilities.
(d) Prepare a list of needed resources and plans for securing those resources.

4:30—5:30 PM Participants re-assemble to report on the six-month action plans

6:00—10:00 PM Banquet & Closing Festivities (UNCG School of Music Atrium & Recital Hall)
Appendix B

ASPA Actions

- Teacher Recruitment
  - Recruitment tool: list of websites, organizations & best practices
  - Pilot project: implement interview checklist in five different universities informally, then formally later

- Program Admission, Assessment & Alignment
  - Disseminate survey results (MTE): share data with CMS & NASM
  - Lit review re: teacher dispositions

- MT Socialization
  - Form subASPA splinter cells with liaisons to ASPAs
  - Defining key issues and themes, then report
  - Primary to secondary methods: transition from UC to career music performance teacher, professional lifelong

- Critical Examination of Curriculum
  - Invite cross-community dialogue (IASTN, IAJE, ASTA, SEM, NCPA, ATMA)
  - Draft a response to Tanglewood II declaration
  - Propose LMS session: musicianship skills for ME majors

- Social Justice for MTE
  - Develop a blog or workspace for communication: continue to articulate concepts related to social justice
  - Propose dedicated issue of MTE on social justice

- School/University Partnerships
  - Develop collection of case studies
  - Develop an outlet for consultation: partnerships & us

- Policy
  - Conduct lit review
  - Develop cross-ASPA working matrix

- Prof Dev: Beginning Teacher
  - Examine Dept of Ed mandates re PD
  - Continue Clearinghouse of BT mentoring resources
  - Disseminating mentoring info to associations/entities outside of music education (ASA, etc)

- Prof Dev: Experienced
  - Develop research agenda related to policy

- Pathways to Licensure
  - Research existing licensure programs—what pathways?
  - Interview 2 teachers who followed “other” path
  - Construct a national survey re pathways
  - Refine & recast call for current practices

- Preparing MTE/Support Current
  - Compose bib related to retention/demotion of MTE review
  - Refine interview for “stayers”

- Literature Review
  - Search for meaningful & transformative models

- ASPA Actions
Change in Music Education: The Paradigmatic and the Praxial

Jere T. Humphreys
Arizona State University

Keynote Speech
Desert Skies Symposium on Research in Music Education
University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona
February 21-23, 2013
This paper is about the phenomenon of change in music education: its nature and how it comes about.\(^1\) Hopefully it will stimulate some thoughts about areas for historical, philosophical, and sociological research in our field.

One type of change is widespread, systemic change that we will call paradigmatic, after a concept put forward by Thomas S. Kuhn in his 1962 book entitled *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Kuhn's premise was that major changes in science occur relatively suddenly in the form of paradigm shifts,\(^2\) a concept that has since been applied to many fields. My premises today are that major changes in music education result from large, paradigmatic shifts in society, and that these shifts are propagated not by music educators, but by societal forces beyond the control of the profession. The other category is comprised of smaller changes that result from the day-to-day work of music educators, a category we will call praxial, after the Greek word *praxis*—in this case the practice of music educators.\(^3\)

All this seems rather straightforward: that is, there are large, paradigmatic changes in society and smaller praxial changes resulting from our own efforts. The problem is that we tend to confuse the two types of change and their causes. This conflation happens regularly, such as when music educators, working individually or collectively through professional organizations, beseech the profession to bring about system-wide, paradigmatic change. In other words, they insist on the profession doing the impossible. The calling for and then failure to achieve unattainable goals is a part of our heritage that stretches back to the days of colonial singing school masters and the cultural pundits at Harvard. Those folks strove for paradigmatic change in the form of reforming the musical tastes of the general public, and they failed completely.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Presented as a keynote speech at the Desert Skies Symposium on Research in Music Education, sponsored by the University of Arizona and held in Tucson, Arizona on February 21-23, 2013.


\(^3\) Praxialism was added to the lexicon of music education philosophy after the publication of Philip Alperson, “What Should One Expect from a Philosophy of Music Education?” *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 25, no. 3 (autumn 1991): 215-42. The concept has since been expanded by David J. Elliott, Thomas Regelski, Wayne Bowman, and others. Aristotle defined *praxis* as “right actions” on the part of humans.

Because it continues to be misunderstood, this morning we will focus on paradigmatic change, and not praxial change, at which we excel. In an attempt to shed some light on the phenomenon of change in music education, we will take a look at what actually happens instead of what pundits think should happen. Perspectives based on evidence, historical and current, could help balance perspectives based on ideologies, about which we hear and read so much.

Paradigmatic Change

To start at the beginning, in ancient Athens formal schools for citizen boys were operating by the early sixth century B.C.E. (“Before the Common Era”), and in Sparta even earlier. In the Athenian schools all students learned their “letters,” and almost all learned to play the lyre and participated in athletics. The students’ fathers determined the curriculum de facto by selecting and paying tuition to particular schools, all of which were private. Beginning in the fourth century B.C.E., Plato and other philosophers expressed views about what music should be taught, and to whom and how it should be taught. Plato even described an ideal city-state ruled by philosopher-kings, and frequently punctuated his prescriptions with the pronouncement, “I’ll make it a law.” Unfortunately, we tend to read Plato’s philosophy as history, in other words, we confuse what he wanted with what actually happened. This misreading may contribute to the modern myth that the music education profession can bring about paradigmatic changes in schooling,

---


when in reality even Plato couldn’t do it, much less the Greek music teachers, whoever they were in those days.

Skipping forward to the late Roman period, early Christian leaders supported music in religious services because they believed it would help make people more receptive to church teachings. Thus, singing schools called *schola cantorum* evolved as part of the shaping of Christian worship services. Music then became an important subject in monastery and court schools during the early Middle Ages due to its place in Greek and Roman schools and the needs of the Christian church. In the second half of the Middle Ages, music remained the most important of the seven liberal arts, the core curriculum in the emerging universities. In some universities it also played a role in “the embellishment of academic ceremonies.”

Now, fast forward to the Reformation, when Catholic leaders and Martin Luther founded quasi-public school systems in Germany. Both systems, Jesuit and Protestant, placed heavy emphasis on music instruction because religious leaders, who were in effect political leaders during this period of major change, wanted to enhance the musical aspects of their church services. The prominent place of music in these schools set the stage for future public school music education aimed at Europe’s gradually expanding middle class.

While German religious leaders were establishing Europe’s first modern school systems, the Spanish explorer Hernando Cortez defeated the Aztecs in Central America. He then sent for a Franciscan missionary, who founded a cathedral school for the Spanish crown in what is now Mexico City. This singing master and organ builder taught music and other subjects to Spanish and indigenous children, primarily for religious reasons. He taught the first generation of European-style music teachers in the Western Hemisphere, and in doing so capitalized on one of the largest upheavals in world history, the Spanish conquest of the Americas. Two and a half centuries later, their descendants taught at the Spanish colonial mission that stands just south of Tucson, a functioning church where music is still practiced.

Let’s fast forward again, this time to the 1820s and 1830s and the beginning of the common school movement in the United States, when schooling became universally available. This movement resulted from increasing democratization and a growing middle class during the Andrew Jackson administration. Music and other

---


12 Ernest F. Livingstone, “The Place of Music in German Education from the Beginnings through the 16th Century,” *Journal of Research in Music Education* 15, no. 4 (winter 1967): 263-77. Luther’s important collaborator in education reform (and other things) was Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560).

new subjects were added to the narrow elementary school curriculum,\(^\text{14}\) continuing a trend begun by Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s book on childhood, published in Paris in 1762, and extending through the work of Johann Pestalozzi and others. Thus, it was not a coincidence that Lowell Mason—an energetic singing school master, composer, and promoter—helped secure a permanent place for music in the Boston school curriculum in 1838. Mason’s considerable abilities notwithstanding, it should be noted that during this period of curriculum expansion music also entered schools in other cities, in some cases a bit earlier.\(^\text{15}\) He and others took advantage of the expanding curriculum; they did not cause it.\(^\text{16}\)

The next major changes in American school music grew out of the industrial revolution. Industrialization led to increasing immigration and urbanization, which resulted in the passage of child labor laws, which in turn led to the passage of compulsory school laws beginning in 1852. The industrial revolution also spawned the progressive education movement, which opened doors to new subjects and athletic programs,\(^\text{17}\) mainly in high schools, which doubled in number between 1890 and 1915.\(^\text{18}\) Orchestras, choirs, and bands entered high schools during the early years of progressivism, much like vocal music instruction had entered elementary schools during the common school movement.\(^\text{19}\)

Music for elementary general students began as sight-singing instruction during the 1830s, but under progressivism music listening and simple instrument performance were added to general music programs. These additions were facilitated not only by a liberalization of the curriculum under progressivism, but also by the player piano, phonograph, and eventually radio, all of which provided access to music beyond what could be performed live.\(^\text{20}\)


\(^{16}\) Birge acknowledged that the idea of public school music was not unique to Mason or Boston (pp. 36-37), but he repeatedly credited both, falsely, with being the first to implement it. Edward Bailey Birge, *History of Public School Music in the United States* (Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference, 1966; reprinted from rev. and augmented ed., Boston: Ginn and Company, 1937), 1, 57-58, 63-85.


\(^{19}\) Humphreys, "Instrumental Music in American Education," 45.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 44.
So far, we have mentioned some important changes in music education that resulted from major intellectual, religious, social, economic, political, and demographic practices and shifts in ancient Greece, during early Christendom and Reformation Germany, and in Spanish America and the United States. If time permitted we could examine other cases, such as early teacher education in Prussia and later the United States, and the singing school movement in colonial and early America. In all these cases and more, individual music educators did the work, but broad paradigmatic changes provided the opportunities, including spreading egalitarianism and democratization, new religious practices, and advances in technology.

Our Improving World

Society

Today, life for a majority of the world’s population is better in most ways important to the human condition than ever before in history. And, conditions continue to improve at increasing rates. This argument runs contrary to most of what passes for news these days, but here are a few observations.

The vast majority of the world’s population is better sheltered, fed, entertained, and healthier than ever before. In his book entitled The Rational Optimist, Matt Ridley claims that the decade of the 1950s was a period of “unprecedented abundance” worldwide. Yet, over the next half century, to 2005, per capita income increased almost three hundred percent worldwide, and people ate one-third more calories, lived one-third longer, and “were less likely to die as a result of war, murder, childbirth, accidents, tornadoes, flooding, famine, whooping cough, tuberculosis, malaria, diphtheria, typhus, typhoid, measles, smallpox, scurvy or polio . . . ; were] less likely . . . to get cancer, heart disease or stroke. . . ; were] more likely to be literate and to have finished school . . . ; and were] more likely to own a telephone, a flush toilet, a refrigerator and a bicycle.” The environment is also much cleaner and safer, and life expectancy has increased at an incredible rate of a quarter of a year annually for the past two centuries—yes, that’s 50 years. Further, “[d]espite a doubling of the world population, . . . the raw number of people living in absolute poverty has declined. . . . The United Nations estimates that poverty was reduced more in the last 50 years than in the previous 500.”21 According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, by the year 2022 the world will be mostly middle class instead of mostly poor for the first time in history.22 Now that is something to celebrate.

Height and IQ scores have also increased, while differences among individuals and nations have decreased. One of the biggest areas of improvement is in the amount of work required to acquire specified amounts of goods and services. An hour of artificial light from a sesame oil lamp in 1750 B.C.E. required over 50 hours of work; a tallow candle in the 1800s over six hours, a kerosene lamp in the

---


1880s 15 minutes, a filament lamp in 1950 eight seconds, and a compact fluorescent bulb today less than one-half second. Archeologists attribute many long-standing problems to overpopulation relative to resources, mainly food, but currently a quarter of the “world’s population on a country-by-county basis is either stable or slightly declining, and the rate[s of growth in] . . . most . . . high-growth areas . . . are also declining.”

We could go on and on about improvements in goods, services, and physical wellbeing, but what about happiness? Recent research suggests that contrary to earlier beliefs, increasing wealth is leading to higher levels of reported happiness. However, social and political freedom correlates even more strongly with happiness than does material wealth; in recent decades advances in individual freedoms account for the increases in reported happiness in 45 of 52 countries. According to historian Francis Fukuyama, by the early 1990s a majority of the world’s countries, approximately 140, had adopted democratic forms of government.

**Music education**

Like most aspects of society, music education has improved over time. Hard data are scarce, but we can hear huge improvements in the performance levels of school and university ensembles during the spans of our lifetimes, and from recordings before that. The performance levels of some of the renowned early college and university bands and choirs were far below those of the top groups of today. Recently, I heard someone speculate that the best university bands today probably play better than the Sousa Band in its heyday. The performance repertoire has also expanded dramatically in quality, scope, and diversity.

And as mentioned earlier, general music instruction has become more sophisticated than the singular teaching of sight-singing. We have adopted, adapted, and created new teaching methodologies such as those by Dalcroze, Orff, Kodály, and Gordon. Our teaching materials are of higher quality in every way, increasingly aided by advances in technology, and a larger percentage of schools and students are served by music specialists than in the past—and also more than in most, if not all, other countries today.

In music teacher education we have developed more effective curricula, teaching materials, and strategies. We do a better job of training teachers through the use of lesson planning, grading rubrics, more sophisticated materials of all types, better insights into which things matter most in terms of teacher skills and

---


knowledge, and more time spent in actual school environments, plus recording and other technologies.

**Sources of Negativity**

Unfortunately, the successes achieved by society in general and by music education in particular tend to be overshadowed by allegations of decline and decay over time, and by doomsday prognostications about the future. A sociologist at Arizona State University believes that increasing use of the word “fear” by the mass media since the mid-1990s partially explains why, despite dramatically lower crime rates, the healthiest, safest, most affluent people in history are among the most fearful. He reports, for example, that residents of Scottsdale and other upscale, low-crime areas in metropolitan Phoenix, Arizona apply for the most concealed weapons carry permits and keep more weapons in their homes than residents of other parts of the metropolis.28

Excessive fear leads to a host of ills, such as homophobia, harsh sentencing and inhumane treatment of prisoners, the stoking of fears about “the other” in the case of minorities and immigrants, propaganda against targeted groups in the so-called war on terror; 29 and negative portrayals of foreign nations, soldiers, even entire populations based on different religions, ethnicities, political systems, dress, and so on. According to *Mother Jones* magazine, survivalist propaganda and products have surged since the election and re-election of the nation’s first minority-race president. Today, a child-size tactical vest can be yours for $499, and “8,671 servings of . . . gluten-free, vegetarian emergency rations goes for $1,799.99 . . .” at Costco. And ten acres of land in a secret community right here in Arizona, replete with a 40-foot-long underground survivalist tube designed for a family of six, can be yours for only $72,000.30

The music education profession also tends toward negative attitudes and outlooks. One reason may be that music educators are among the most idealistic of the species. American music education is rooted in two highly idealistic worlds. One is the world of classical art music, a product of the sharply hierarchical Western European monarchies. This music is hierarchical in formal, tonal, and melodic structure, and it came to be construed on the ideal of non-contextual contemplation31—in other words, as elitist and idealist.

---


29 Ibid., 22.


In addition to European classical music, American music education is rooted in the world of formal education. Unlike classical music, modern-style education evolved to serve all children and adolescents. Therefore, the idealism in formal education stems not from its intended beneficiaries, but from the humble roles played by teachers throughout the history of modern schooling. During the common school movement, Horace Mann and other leaders propagated an idealized service motive to teachers because society offered little in the way of compensation, future advancements, or other enticements. A substantial proportion of the teachers were young females, many of them teenagers, and their pay was low and the conditions poor. Teaching is still seen today as a service profession, with the attendant expectations of idealism on the part of teachers.

Thus, the music education profession adopted an elite classical music whose meanings, even existence, were purportedly not dependent on context—or the “real world,” if you will. And music entered the schools when schools and teachers were expected to function with negligible tangible support. The two idealistic worlds of classical music and formal education continue to shape identities and ideologies in music education.

The field doubled down on idealism during the post-World War II Cold War era, a period when national and corporate agendas increasingly influenced education. As education came under pressure to justify itself, some leading music educators saw fit to try to justify their field in new ways that could be construed as unique to music education. Thus, they adopted an eighteenth-century German philosophy of absolute music as a philosophy of music education. “Music education as aesthetic education” (MEAE) did not address the national or corporate agendas for education, but it did provide philosophical underpinning for music education. Above all, this idealistic philosophy filled a perceived void.

---

32 Robert B. Downs, *Horace Mann: Champion of Public Schools* (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974), 38, 40-42, *passim*. In 1842, Mann, as head of the Massachusetts Board of Education, complained, not for the first time, about female teacher salaries being less than 40 percent of the salaries of male teachers; ibid., p. 42.


In recent decades, the idealistic goal of teaching aesthetics has been partially supplanted by new idealistic goals such as the fostering of “creativity,” “democracy,” “brain development,” and others. The impetus for teaching “creativity” stems from corporate desires for workers who can “create” a continuous supply of new, high-quality, marketable goods and services for the global economy. As for “democracy,” according to education historian Lawrence A. Cremin, American promotion of “democracy” and “social justice” to the world dates from the very beginnings of the republic. The current iterations of these ideals in music education draw heavily from the writings of John Dewey, despite the fact that Dewey lived in an era when democratizing hordes of immigrants was a national agenda (they called it “Americanizing”). Nevertheless, Cremin notes that “in the end Dewey’s vision of a democratic socialist society and politically reformist schools did not triumph,” as schools became, “if anything politically conservative.” That conservatism was manifested in the sponsorship of bands at federal Indian schools in Oklahoma and Arizona, which were to “Americanize” Native American youth (they called it “civilizing”).

Modern calls for the teaching of “creativity” and “democracy” in music education draw additional sustenance from notions about popular music groups being more creative and democratic than traditional conductor-led ensembles. But just look around: most amateur popular groups do little more than “cover” music “created” by other groups, and many if not most successful groups, amateur and professional, appear to rely on leaders within the groups. The point is that music and other groups comprised of voluntary participants form part of the fabric of democracies, whether their leaders are elected or appointed.

---


37 Ibid., 651.


I am an advocate for teaching popular music because it is part and parcel of democratic societies, because many of the lyrics concern important social issues, and especially because it is the most important music of our time and nation. At the same time, I try to discourage myths about any inherently superior qualities of democracy, justice, or creativity in popular music in comparison to other musics and performance mediums.

My concern with MEAE, democracy, and the rest is that we continue to try to force paradigmatic change by adding more idealistic but unrealistic goals, things to fail at that are not central to our mission and arguably could be done better by others. Given more time today, we could discuss the so-called standards and increasingly high-stakes testing, both corporate-driven attempts to improve reading and math test scores via mechanistic, factory-model schools. The music education profession has been lukewarm at best toward standards and generally hostile toward testing, and the implementation of both adds to our sense of negativity.

Over a half-century ago, music education historian Allen Britton said this about Lowell Mason’s adoption of Pestalozzian principles during the 1830s:

... the student of the history of music education is confronted with a disheartening spectacle. The most important historical figure in music education exerted himself over a long period of years in promoting a teaching method the principles of which he did not understand, holding before him as the bible of the method a work he had plagiarized from a nonpertinent source. ... And to the present day many American music educators have demonstrated what may be considered an easy readiness to climb aboard any intellectual bandwagon which happened to be near by, and to trust it to arrive at destinations appropriate for music educators, or worse, to adopt its destinations as their own without careful enough scrutiny of the intellectual proprieties involved.

Nearly a decade later, Britton wrote: “[w]e have probably been reformers long enough.” He was concerned about the constant striving for major reforms that began during the colonial era, well before Mason came onto the scene, and showed no signs of abating during Britton’s own time.

---


44 Britton also wrote: “A spirit of reform has permeated ... ever since 1721,” and “has manifested itself in an always evident willingness to discard the old for something new and presumably better. But ... the new was not always better.
Things We Can and Cannot Do

During the 1980s, the Music Educators National Conference campaigned for the issuance of a postage stamp commemorating music education. The fact that this large professional organization was unable to accomplish such a seemingly modest goal should serve as a cautionary tale about the kinds of things we can and cannot do, about the limits of our power and influence. We should continue to exercise our real power for good on behalf of our students and programs, in the here and now. At the same time, we should recognize our decidedly limited ability to realize fantasies about grandiose paradigmatic changes. It might help to remember that although we could not bring about the issuance of a postage stamp, last month the U.S. Postal Service announced the upcoming issuance of a stamp commemorating “The Man in Black,” country/rock crossover singer Johnny Cash. Our failure to achieve the postage stamp fantasy has no bearing whatsoever on our ability to contribute significantly to our students, schools, communities, and society at large.

It is exceedingly difficult to predict paradigmatic shifts, in part because they occur so seldom, certainly not more than once in a music educator’s career and typically not at all. Nevertheless, slowly and more-or-less surely music educators, professional organizations, and universities capitalized on major paradigmatic shifts in society that greatly affected education. Understandably, no one anticipated the changes, but when the common school movement opened the door for music in the American school curriculum and there were no school music teachers available, singing school masters filled the void. When universities delayed offering music teacher education programs, summer “singing conventions” and textbook company schools stepped in. When ensembles entered the schools and universities were slow to train directors, students and teachers of other subjects volunteered, many of them members of community ensembles. In other words, people responded and they got the job done when the time came.

What we have not done well is adapt to changes in the world of music. The evolution and spread of modern popular music, most of it with roots in this country, is the obvious musical paradigm shift that we have essentially ignored. The field was hostile to blues, ragtime, and jazz; oblivious to white upland, mountain, western, and country musics; and we remain cool toward styles derived from both of these streams, such as rock and its offshoots. Linda Ronstadt, the most popular female rock star of the 1970s, lives here in Tucson, and the international star Alice Cooper lives in Scottsdale—two of dozens of famous popular musicians with strong Arizona connections. Music educators eventually took advantage of the paradigmatic changes in education discussed earlier, but we have failed to capitalize on the several

Sometimes it was not really new either. . .” Britton, “Music in Early American Public Education,” 205.


paradigmatic sea-changes in music, probably due to our musical training that includes more than a little indoctrination.47

Some Recognitions and Realizations

It is important to recognize that we have confused correlation with causation; that is, music educators took advantage of some large structural shifts but did not cause them. And we have confused praxial with paradigmatic change—the things we can and cannot do. It is also important to recognize that things are not deteriorating, that over time our profession has improved in virtually every way due to our day-in, day-out praxial efforts and because our predecessors did respond to some important paradigmatic shifts.

At the same time, our misreading of history leads us to conclude that if our predecessors in effect created something from nothing, we could and should do likewise today. Moreover, our ignorance about music education in other countries leads us to conclude that we are behind, when this is manifestly not true (our foreign colleagues are being told the same things). All this results in unwarranted negativity about the present state of music education.

Then, to our mis-readings of the past and present we add doomsday scenarios about the future, about things that might happen. We even have doomsayers who see precursors of their negative prognostications at every turn. All these doomsday scenarios about the past, present, and future pave the way for generalist doomsayers, who sweepingly pronounce music education a colossal failure.

Most music educators understand that most, if not all, of the doomsday scenarios about the past, present, and future are based on false assumptions and idealistic ideologies, not facts on the ground. Moreover, observers from outside the field, such as parents of our students and others, seem quite pleased with what we are doing. I personally don’t know of any major critics or criticisms of music education emanating from outside the field. But we don’t need outside critics because we have our own, seers who conjure problems and then, presto!, step forward with solutions, kind of like the doomsday survivalists who offer solutions to the problems they prognosticate. All the doomsaying can lead music educators to despair, paranoia, even nihilism, not to mention burnout and turnover.48 We face enough praxial challenges daily without having to suffer self-inflicted wounds from within.


48 As discussed above, the drive to locate and adopt a philosophy of music education after World War II resulted in part from fears over possible changes in status for the field. There were similar expressions of fear, even paranoia, early in the progressive education movement. For more on the latter, see Jere T. Humphreys, “Applications of Science: The Age of Standardization and Efficiency in Music Education,” *Bulletin of Historical Research in Music Education* 9, no. 1 (January 1988): 18-19.
the profession. It would be prudent to dial back the drumbeat of negativity that envelops the profession like a shroud and distracts us from the important tasks at hand. We need to recognize that paradigmatic change in music education does not result from the wishes or efforts of music educators or our organizations, and certainly not from university professors’ writings or seminar rooms. In fact, major changes do not start in teacher education programs at all, but in the schools themselves, always in response to societal shifts.

American music educators continue to make important praxial changes in response to evolving societal conditions. A short list includes the continuing improvement of curriculum, musical teaching materials, and pedagogies; initiation and development of programs for middle and junior high schools; instruction in multicultural music; instruction for handicapped, disabled, and adult learners; and increasing use of new technology. These and other praxial changes have and will continue to result in incremental but monumental improvements over time.49

The Future

In addition, it appears that we are poised for some paradigmatic changes, because surely schools must transition from the current industrial age model to a post-industrial information age model. This transition has already taken place in the U.S. economy, but not yet in education. Eventually, societal forces must realize that successful schooling will require more choices for students and their parents, not fewer; and that schools are not factories, teachers are not assembly line workers, and students are not Toyotas to be tested endlessly in the name of quality control. When these realizations occur, appealing electives will likely become the “name of the game” in education,50 much like they did during the progressive era when elective ensembles entered the schools, and maybe more so.

Today, those who are trying to force a standards and testing structure on the schools, in other words trying to make the outdated industrial model of schooling work in the information-age world, are doing everyone a disservice. Music educators who try to force an information-age model into the antiquated industrial-age schooling model are equally in error. Attempts to create paradigmatic change in music education before the structure of schooling changes are counterproductive. When the education system finally does transform from its industrial-age model to an information-age model, we will know it, but nothing on the scale of the common school or progressive education movements has occurred for about a century now. Granted, it is possible to find exceptions at the teacher or even program level, but on a scale of the sweep of history, the paradigm shift from industrial age to information

49 Jere T. Humphreys, “2006 Senior Researcher Award Acceptance Address: Observations about Music Education Research in MENC’s First and Second Centuries,” *Journal of Research in Music Education* 54, no. 3 (fall 2006): 186. In the past there were also programs directed toward national priorities in Latin America and the nation’s efforts during both world wars.

age schools has hardly begun. In the meantime, sending new teachers out with vague notions about information-age schooling models, but inadequate training for coping with current realities in the schools, is poor practice indeed. Going forward, we need to take advantage when paradigmatic changes occur—not before.

As we look for ways to expand and otherwise improve our existing programs, we should distinguish between our compulsory music programs for general students and our elective music programs, at present mostly performing ensembles. The century-long debates over listening versus performance have not served us well, and have led us to miss things. Historians bear some of the blame because they have failed to make it clear that, for example, compulsory vocal general music morphed not into choirs, but into compulsory modern general music. Elective classes, mainly ensembles, came from a different place. The fact that both of these transitions occurred during early progressivism adds to the confusion.

For example, we need to think hard about whether instruction in “creativity,” “composition,” “democracy,” “brain development,” and all the rest, not to mention the nine standards, can be crammed into the less than one hour per week of general music instruction. And will we continue to fantasize about somehow cannibalizing elective performing ensemble classes and turning the student interest and curriculum time into new types of secondary general music classes? Do we really believe that if we could just rid our world of the uncreative, undemocratic performing ensembles we could somehow install general music classes in secondary schools? And if so, would they be elective classes or would they be compulsory and thus universal? Or are we going to gradually change the centuries-old, music- and culture-bound performing ensembles into general music classes—a modern-day version of the profession’s old musical bait-and-switch tactics? If none of the above, where and how will all the proposed new content fit in?

One possible solution lies in the realization that in all previous cases of paradigmatic change discussed earlier, additions were made, not subtractions. In other words, existing programs were not destroyed as part of the process of adding new content to the curriculum. Music was added to the German and then the American public schools, new general music approaches and ensembles were added, and so forth. Future changes are also likely to come in the form of additions, not destruction followed by additions. This realization should make us wary of the alarmist “tipping point,” “elephant in the room,” and other doomsday scenarios.

---
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not to mention the diatribes seeking to discredit existing programs through straw man arguments coupled with hackneyed use of Foucaultian mythology.  

A better understanding of where the elective music and general music classes came from, plus accurate assessment of where they are today, would help us realize that loss of our elective offerings would simply leave a hole and not make room for anything else. It is important to recognize that the elective offerings represent our best chance of adding other electives, much like jazz education entered through existing elective instrumental programs. Let’s be clear: any future curricular gains will likely come in the form of elective programs in composition, popular music, and other types of ensembles, to name a few examples, whereas additional curriculum time for compulsory general music is highly unlikely, in elementary or secondary schools.

I think we should continue to buckle down and do the hard, praxial tasks of developing the field in ways that work and forego the grandiose attempts to force paradigmatic change prematurely. It is troubling when teachers are told they are failing because “all” they do is help their students learn about music, perform it, even compose it, while engaging in wholesome music-related activities. So, let’s stop conflating correlation with causation and praxial with paradigmatic change, and concentrate on improving the praxial aspects of our work, things we can do well. We should remember and be grateful for the fact that both our profession and the world continue to improve in most ways that matter. All the negativity notwithstanding, we really are doing a good job, a very good job indeed. Thank you.
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Ruminations on research competence:
Oh, and now you're supposed to be the expert?

I wish to thank Shelly Cooper, the Symposium National Advisory Board, and the University of Arizona for giving me this opportunity to address the 2013 Symposium. Desert Skies has made important contributions to the development of research and researchers in music education since its beginnings in 1989.

A few weeks ago Shelly emailed to ask if Jere (Humphreys) and I would mind losing 15 minutes from our speaking time to allow for more research presentations and allow enough time for discussion. Jere replied that folks probably would be happy to hear him for 45 minutes rather than an hour, but that they might want to hear me for an hour. I wrote back that more research is always to be preferred over speeches (in fact, I was thinking of asking Don Hamann to use about 10 or 15 minutes of my time to warm up the crowd—but then I started thinking that he would be too tough an act to follow), so I will just tell you a story that depicts just how clever Don Hamann is:

There were three roommates who slept through their midterm exam in Don's String Methods Class on Monday morning. Since they had returned together by car from a weekend outing in the desert late Sunday evening, they concocted a great little story to tell Professor Hamann. They met with him on Monday afternoon and told him that an ill-timed flat tire had delayed their arrival until noon. Don was somewhat skeptical but agreed to give them a makeup exam on Tuesday.

When they arrived Don issued them the same makeup exam but ushered each to a different room. The first student sat down and noticed that the exam would be divided into Parts I and II weighted 10% and 90% respectively. Thinking nothing of this disparity, he proceeded to answer the three questions in Part I. These he found rather easy: how many strings on a cello? (he confidently answered 4), the number of instruments in a string trio? (he happily answered 3), and how many upper strings have solo parts in the Concerto known as the "Bach Double" (he quickly wrote 2). He thought he was seeing a pattern here, and then moved confidently to Part II on the next page. Suddenly his eyes grew large and his face paled. Part II consisted of one very short and very pointed question . . . "Which tire was it?"

I want to explain what my title means. Rumination means to chew a cud, to meditate or reflect, and I always (probably incorrectly) like to add an extension of the definition when I think of this word and that concerns how ruminants graze: a little here, a little over there, and so on. So I feel this gives me license to present a series of loosely associated reflections with no immediately discernable pattern; although I am hopeful a pattern will emerge over time.
Creating Strategic Confusions

I am fortunate to have a named Professorship at FSU. When I was hired I was asked to choose an emeritus professor from the College of Music in whose honor the Chair would be named. I chose Lewis Pankaskie, a music theory professor from whom I took every course I could. He was not everyone’s favorite. For example, his first course was "An Introduction to Graduate Music Theory". The first day (or possibly two) we spent the entire period discussing the meaning of the word "introduction." He did not lecture, he merely asked questions and gave no answers. Perhaps now you can see at least one place where I experienced thoughtful "ruminating." The next day the class met (and the day after that), we discussed what "graduate" might mean. You get the idea. Eventually we got to "theory." He frustrated many graduate students, as you might imagine, but he was a wonderful teacher. He was the most skillful person I have ever witnessed at asking questions at just the right moment such that one could, with enough focus and thinking things through, come up with an appropriate response for his queries, often when one didn’t really know all the connections. He was extraordinarily adept at creating strategic confusions, which leads me to the first issue that I want to raise: the role of the chase, the struggle, the challenges in our education culture; and the apparent benefits of making at least some things "strategically confusing." Certainly one of the reasons I think research is so interesting is the challenges and confusions that it presents.

The Chronicle of Higher Education reports the results of a survey of college freshmen done at UCLA annually. The latest version, "Perceptions of Freshmen in 2012," was completed by more than 192,000 first time college students. Similar to previous surveys, freshmen consider themselves a cut above their classmates academically: 69% rated their academic ability either above average or in the top 10% compared with their peers. Obviously, there is a mismatch between perception and reality. This affirms the notion that students are all better than average (sometimes referred to as the Lake Wobegon effect). Obviously, freshmen think they are experts!

When we were kids in school, we got report cards and if we had passing marks we were then pronounced ready for the next grade. After fifth grade, we were supposedly ready for middle school—mostly because we had survived fifth grade—and so on. In college you got transcripts, and if you sat through enough classes and had passing marks, that eventually lead to a bachelor’s degree. In graduate school, things changed. You relied less on those external symbols and begin to receive more direct feedback from advisors and professors with whom you worked. Then you graduated, and if you were really fortunate, you got a tenure-track job in your field. Now, all of a sudden, no one is looking out for you. There’s no safety net. It’s probably even worse if you’re an adjunct. Who will even know if a paper gets accepted? Who will care? Where do you get your professional “high fives”? The "annual review" (or third-year review) really doesn’t mean much unless major problems have surfaced. You are supposed to know what the expectations are. Who is going to notice? When you do your job well, no one notices.

Scholarship as we all know requires a belief that what you’re doing is worthwhile. You have to invest copious amounts of time and energy without much immediate or even intermediate payoff. No one asks to see chapters. No one helps you set and meet deadlines. You have to keep going. No one applauds when you figure out that elegant design, or have a good day in the archives. You’re supposed
to be a grown-up now (viz., you’re supposed to be the expert now, remember?). And by the way, when you get elected or appointed to an editorial board, the same thing happens. All of a sudden, you’re supposed to be the expert!

How did it get to be this way? Perhaps some of it is related to the history of doctoral degrees. I’m sure that Jere Humphreys or Phillip Hash could expand upon this notion, but American doctoral degrees come from the European (especially German) research tradition of requiring an original, independent research product as the *sine qua non* of the doctorate. This practice reaches the height of incongruity for applied music degrees. After studying and practicing their instrument for some 20 years or more, students are then exhorted that “oh, and by the way, you need to do independent and original research and write a dissertation.” This situation remains novel enough for most music educators, who have spent years of their professional lives teaching music and working with ensembles. Then they are informed that in addition to being adept in music performance and pedagogy, they should be “expert” research scholars.

The following description comes from an NPR story I heard while driving to school last fall. It captured my interest and I went and found the transcript. It has to do with how we deal with challenges in learning, and possible differences in the approaches of Eastern and Western cultures (excerpted from the transcript found at National Public Radio, Morning Edition, November 12, 2012, by Alix Spiegel):

In 1979, when Jim Stigler was still a graduate student at the University of Michigan, he went to Japan to research teaching methods and found himself sitting in the back row of a crowded fourth-grade math class. "The teacher was trying to teach the class how to draw three-dimensional cubes on paper," Stigler explains, "and one kid was just totally having trouble with it. His cube looked all cockeyed, so the teacher said to him, 'Why don't you go put yours on the board?' So right there I thought, 'That's interesting! He took the one who can't do it and told him to go and put it on the board.'"

Stigler knew that in American classrooms, it was usually the best kid in the class who was invited to the board. And so he watched with interest as the Japanese student dutifully came to the board and started drawing, but still couldn’t complete the cube. Every few minutes, the teacher would ask the rest of the class whether the kid had gotten it right, and the class would look up from their work, and shake their heads no. And as the period progressed, Stigler noticed that he — Stigler — was getting more and more anxious.

But the kid didn’t break into tears. Stigler says the child continued to draw his cube with equanimity. "And at the end of the class, he did make his cube look right! And the teacher said to the class, 'How does that look, class?' And they all looked up and said, 'He did it!' And they broke into applause." The kid smiled a huge smile and sat down, clearly proud of himself.

Stigler (now a professor of psychology at UCLA) said "I think that from very early ages we [in America] see struggle as an indicator that you’re just not very smart." "It's a sign of low ability — people who are smart don't struggle, they just naturally get it, that's our folk theory. Whereas, in Asian cultures they tend to see struggle more as an opportunity; it's just
assumed that struggle is a predictable part of the learning process. Everyone is expected to struggle in the process of learning, and so struggling becomes a chance to show that you, the student, have what it takes emotionally to resolve the problem by persisting through that struggle. Granted that there are counterexamples in each, for the most part in American culture, intellectual struggle in schoolchildren is seen as an indicator of weakness, while in Eastern cultures it is not only tolerated but is often used to measure emotional strength.

Jin Li is a professor at Brown University who compares the learning beliefs of Asian and U.S. children. She says that to understand why these two cultures view struggle so differently, it’s good to step back and examine how they think about where academic excellence comes from.

She analyzes conversations to see how mothers talk to their children about school. Here is one conversation between an American mother and her 8-year-old son. The mother and the son are discussing books. The son, though young, is a great student who loves to learn. He tells his mother that he and his friends talk about books even during recess, and she responds with this:

**Mother:** Do you know that’s what smart people do, smart grown-ups?

**Child:** I know ... talk about books.

**Mother:** Yeah. So that’s a pretty smart thing to do to talk about a book.

**Child:** Hmmmm mmmm.

Li says this drop of conversation contains a world of cultural assumptions and beliefs. Essentially, the American mother is communicating to her son that the cause of his success in school is his intelligence. He’s smart — which, Li says, is a common American view. "The idea of intelligence is believed in the West as a cause." "She is telling him that there is something in him, in his mind, that enables him to do what he does."

But in many Asian cultures, Li says, academic excellence isn’t linked with intelligence in the same way. "It resides in what they do, but not who they are or what they’re born with," she says.

She shares another conversation, this time between a Taiwanese mother and her 9-year-old son. They are talking about the piano — the boy won first place in a competition, and the mother is explaining to him why.

"You practiced and practiced with lots of energy," she tells him. "It got really hard, but you made a great effort. You insisted on practicing yourself."

"So the focus is on the process of persisting through it despite the challenges, not giving up, and that’s what leads to success," Li says. All of this matters because the way you conceptualize the act of struggling with something profoundly affects your actual behavior.

Obviously if struggle indicates weakness — a lack of intelligence — it makes you feel bad, and so you’re less likely to put up with it. But if struggle indicates strength — an ability to face down the challenges that
inevitably occur when you are trying to learn something — you’re more willing to accept it.

Stigler did a study many years ago with first-grade students. "We decided to go out and give the students an impossible math problem to work on, and then we would measure how long they worked on it before they gave up. The American students worked on it less than 30 seconds on average and then they basically looked at us and said, 'We haven’t had this,' " he says.

But the Japanese students worked for the entire hour on the impossible problem. "And finally we had to stop the session because the hour was up. And then we had to debrief them and say, 'Oh, that was not a possible problem; that was an impossible problem!' and they looked at us like, 'What kind of animals are we?'

I am not making a case for East versus West. Each has its strengths and weaknesses, which both sides know. Westerns tend to worry that their kids won’t be able to compete against Asian kids who excel in many areas but especially in math and science. Li says that educators from Asian countries have their own set of worries.

Stigler says, in the Japanese classrooms that he’s studied, teachers consciously design tasks that are slightly beyond the capabilities of the students they teach, so the students can actually experience struggling with something just outside their reach. Then, once the task is mastered, the teachers actively point out that the student was able to accomplish it through hard work and struggle. "And I just think that especially in schools, we don’t create enough of those experiences, and then we don’t point them out clearly enough."

In the December 2012 issue of MEJ, Bob Duke wrote an article concerning how learners develop independence and what seems to get remembered. "Students must have many opportunities to identify and correct their own errors (even though this takes much more time than telling them the answers or doing the correcting for them). The more teachers correct student errors, the less likely the corrections will become a lasting part of the student’s thinking and behavior." Bob wrote about "The Value of the Muddle," that confusion is unsettling and frustrating, but it is how learners deal with the unsettled feeling and frustration has everything to do with how well they learn and how independent they become. Students have to get to where they feel that they can figure it out. He used the example of an infant learning to crawl to get where and what she wants. It’s 1) highly goal directed, and 2) it’s full of errors. In contrast, schools tend to teach kids how to follow directions and instructions. This is not a good way to teach flexibility. Flexibility would seem to be a good tool for graduate students and young faculty to have in their toolkit for whatever lies beyond, particularly in these days of MOOCs (Massive Online Open Courses) and the rapidly changing world of academic publication.

To say this yet another way, in January 2011, in the journal Cognition, researchers demonstrated that college students who read material in difficult unfamiliar fonts learned it more deeply than those who read with more conventional familiar fonts. Recall was significantly higher 15 minutes after learning. This is an example that learning material easily or fluently may sometimes produce shallower
levels of understanding. The study was replicated with different materials with high school students. Learning material in fluent conditions (easy to read, presented linearly with clear causal connections) is like driving a familiar route on cognitive autopilot. You get from point A to B, but you are not really paying attention and therefore unlikely to remember your trip in detail. Learning material in more disfluent conditions would be like having to navigate an unfamiliar route with unfamiliar road signs. You have to slow down and pay attention and you are more likely to remember details of the experience.

Now, obviously, we don’t want to make it too difficult. How do we create desirable difficulties? We want enough of a challenge to promote deeper learning without disabling the motivation of our students. Some possibilities: 1) Require students to argue on behalf of unfamiliar positions or opposite to those held personally (Cliff Madsen does this frequently in his classes), 2) Ask students to find or identify mistakes (I provide many of these often without even trying!), 3) Process material in alternative modes - pictures instead of words, adopt word limits, nonverbal behaviors, etc., and 4) Plan for failure - give assignments that will allow for learning from failures. Experiments, for example, and research projects of any kind almost never proceed exactly as you had planned them and there is much to be learned from such situations.

It is a challenge to do research. It is a challenge to publish. We can do a better job of preparing graduate students for these complexities.

Importance of Mentoring

I recently read a short anecdote that serves to introduce the topic of mentoring. At a graduate school commencement ceremony, the PhD Advisor has finished hooding the newly announced doctorate, and says, "now that you’ve finished your doctorate, Barbara, you can call me Bob." The recipient of the newly minted doctorate smiles and says back to her advisor, "Well, Bob, now that I’ve finished, you can call me Dr. Hopkins!"

(I then asked the symposium participants if they had heard the dissertation fable involving a rabbit, fox, and wolf. Very few responded affirmatively, so I re-told the following which I first heard in the 1970s and can be found readily on the Internet)

A Fable On Mentoring

One sunny day a rabbit came out of her hole in the ground to enjoy the fine weather. The day was so nice that she became careless and a fox snuck up behind her and caught her.

"I am going to eat you for lunch," said the fox.

"Wait," replied the rabbit, "you should at least wait a few days."

"Oh yeah? Why should I wait?"

"Well, I am just finishing my thesis on 'The Superiority of Rabbits over Foxes and Wolves.' "
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"Are you crazy? I should eat you right now! Everybody knows that a fox will always win over a rabbit."

"Not really, not according to my research. If you like, you can come into my hole and read it for yourself. If you are not convinced, you can go ahead and have me for lunch."

"You really are crazy!" But since the fox was curious and had nothing to lose, it went with the rabbit. The fox never came out.

A few days later the rabbit was again taking a break from writing and sure enough, a wolf came out of the bushes and was ready to set upon her.

"Wait," yelled the rabbit, "you can't eat me right now."

"And why might that be, my furry appetizer?"

"I am almost finished writing my thesis on 'The Superiority of Rabbits over Foxes and Wolves.'"

The wolf laughed so hard that it almost lost its grip on the rabbit.

"Maybe I shouldn't eat you. You really are sick . . . in the head. You might give me something contagious."

"Come and read it for yourself. You can eat me afterward if you disagree with my conclusions."

So the wolf went down into the rabbit's hole . . . and never came out.

The rabbit eventually finished her thesis and was out celebrating in the local lettuce patch. Another rabbit came along and asked,

"What's up? You seem very happy."

"Yup, I just finished my thesis."

"Congratulations. What's it about?"

"The Superiority of Rabbits over Foxes and Wolves."

"Are you sure? That doesn't sound right."

"Oh, yes. Come and read it for yourself."

So together they went down into the rabbit's hole. As they entered, the friend saw the typical graduate student abode, albeit a rather messy one after writing a thesis. The computer with the controversial work was in one corner. To the right there was a pile of fox bones, to the left a pile of wolf bones. And in the middle was a large, well-fed lion.
The moral of the story: The title of your thesis doesn’t matter. The subject doesn’t matter. The research doesn’t matter. All that matters is who your mentor is.

Jere Humphreys in his 2006 Senior Researcher address gave his view that “the single most effective thing we could do to improve research in music education would be to ensure mentoring by at least one competent, practicing (my emphasis) researcher for all doctoral students.”

I am one who has benefited greatly from a network of music colleagues, researchers, and yes, students who have been supportive yet honest in reviewing my work. Even highly distinguished scholars have noted these benefits. Georg von Békésy (who was a Nobel Prize winner in 1961 for his pioneering work in explaining the mechanics of the ear and hearing) remarked that he always sent his designs and his manuscripts to both friends and enemies for critical examination. He noted that “The trouble is that really capable enemies are scarce; most of them are only ordinary. Another trouble with enemies is that they sometimes develop into friends and lose a good deal of their zeal.” It was in this way that von Békésy lost his three best enemies.

In an earlier Senior Researcher address, Al LeBlanc (1992) urged us to improve the mentorship of new researchers after the point at which they complete their doctorates. He highlighted the attrition point that occurs in the period immediately following graduation with the doctoral degree. Although he acknowledged the importance of the dissertation article, he thought it might be best to recognize the first new major research project completed and published after the doctorate research.

Before I share with you some data and responses that I collected from others, let’s look at a couple of mentoring ideas. Like most suggestions, the relevance of these is very dependent upon context, school, level, and so on (adapted from an essay by David Perlmutter in The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 29, 2012).

1. Will it count? Many departments (don’t forget that college- and university-wide committees are reviewing your work as well) will give zero weight to non-refereed publications and presentations, or book reviews. As an example, take a book chapter – that may count but not as much as a refereed article in a major journal. Use your time in a way that produces value in the coin that matters.

2. Getting back down safely: Sir Edmund Hillary’s definition of successful mountain climbing included getting back down to tell about it. Research is both a) studying something and then b) publishing it for the world to see and peers to review. The two must occur in sequence for “research” to be completed.

3. The extended hand: You want to be a good mentor yourself for that graduate student. Helping is a good thing, but help should not be an entanglement. Set stop-loss limits on how much time, effort, and sanity you are willing to expend.
4. In search of perfect research: Research is an archipelago, not a single island. Some suggest that your dissertation will be the worst thing you ever write. Move on. Your goal is improvement.

The last suggestion is reminiscent of one of the main points made by Patricia Flowers in her senior researcher address last year in St. Louis.

The process of conducting research over many years does more than answer questions or build theories. There is value added for the person doing the research: interaction, collaboration, observation, problem solving, analytical decision-making, and then the writing and dissemination. The incidental learning gathered along the way may enrich and redirect the way a researcher extends her work over many years. Doing research again and again IS the goal. Results do accumulate, and so does experience. It’s a spiral curriculum.

Informal Data

Last winter holiday I drove with my family to North Carolina from Tallahassee. Along the way, we noticed a lot of license plates with the inscription, “In God We Trust”. That reminded me of the cliché often heard at various conferences both in academia and in business: In God We Trust, but everyone else should bring data.

So here are some data from this Symposium: I counted the number of presenters from individual schools and found that of the 19 schools represented, six schools had at least three representatives. All six are doctorate granting research universities, with the Carnegie classification as “very high research activity.” There is probably no surprise there. When I counted authors listed on presentations, I also noticed that there is a majority of females listed (26 versus 17), although this difference is not significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 43) = 1.48, p = .22$.

I would like to present some data from written responses I collected in the past few weeks. I contacted people in three categories: some journal editors, some recent PhDs—including two who just finished their tenure review (successfully!)—and a few first- and second-year people, and some current PhD students. I asked them what they thought would be important for young scholars in music education to know. In the case of the current students, I asked them what questions they have regarding research for their first job.

Comments from journal editors

These suggestions & comments mostly come from Wendy Sims and Steve Morrison (current Chair and Associate Chair, respectively, of the JRME Editorial Committee) and a few of my own observations.

- Have a mentor or peer read the manuscript before submitting.
- Perceived sloppiness in writing often leads reviewers to assume sloppiness in thinking and researching.
- It is invaluably helpful to read several published articles from the journal to
which one wishes to submit.

- The manuscript should *explicitly* answer the “so what” question with regard to setting up the purpose and drawing conclusions/implications.

- The proportion of “non-statistical paradigms” published is close to the proportion of submissions. With an acceptance rate of about 18% in some 154 submissions to *JRME* per year, there are a lot of manuscripts not accepted (a quick calculation shows that at least 124 people will not be happy, not counting co-authors – that’s a lot!).

- One related aspect concerns the “page limits” that are thought to be “restrictive” to certain kinds of research. The *JRME* has length guidelines, not limits, and that has been the wording since 2004 (see April 2010 and January 2012 Forums). Over the past few years there is a variety of types of research represented. A great example of a large mixed-methods study (see Kate Fitzpatrick’s article in the October 2011 issue) made good use of the online supplemental material (virtually unlimited space). The Forum in that issue also discusses manuscript length.

- Since methodology follows from the question asked, the "certain types" of research favored by the *JRME* (or any prominent journal, really) are those that best address the problem at hand. There is clearly no disagreement about the tremendous scholarly contributions made from every methodological direction. No methodology will save a poor question; likewise, the wrong methodology may sink a great question.

- I added that different methods often produce different answers (and I don’t see that as a bad thing) - Context Matters!

*Some additional thoughts about getting published*

- Sometimes it appears to be "Luck of the Draw." But, of course, it’s not all luck: Success is a function of: who are the reviewers, writing style/accuracy, rigor of method, rigor of analysis, problem importance/interest, and then some luck.

- Write it up following the style manual faithfully and to the letter. That includes Tables, Figures, Effect sizes, and so on.

- Use appropriate analysis techniques. Use appropriate methodology and follow the rules of that method (citing a few sources probably helps unless it’s a common method). Let the reader know that you know the specific protocols of that method.

- Review of Literature should tell a story, and it must be correct - especially if you are citing someone who is likely to be a reviewer. If you don’t get right what they did and what they found, it’s not going to help your chances.

- Have an interesting problem (though this may be in the "eyes of the beholder").
Sometimes I get the impression that reviewers think every paper is submitted by novices, and that your job is to convince them that you are not, that you are an expert (there's that word again).

Another comment I would add here - someone deemed the reviewers "experts" - whether by nomination & election, appointment, or whatever. So, they, the reviewers, take on that role. They really think they are the Experts! That's their job, and they take it seriously -as they should. It's a lot of work to do, especially if done responsibly.

Comments & Observations from several PhDs 1-7 years out

Honestly, when it comes to research, my head still spins. Hopefully it's spinning for good reasons. I really like it, but I still feel like I'm sitting on the bench of the freshman reserve team.

Not everyone gets a job at a research heavy institution and that's okay. I'm definitely not at a research institution and it took me a while to figure out that I have the freedom to research anything I want. Maybe that's also true at larger schools?

It's good to understand that professors in graduate school are there to help you learn the difficult skills of researching without getting totally discouraged . . . and that reviewers' comments are NOT THAT!

Professors are educators and reviewers are reviewers. They shouldn't read review comments like they are coming from their teacher. The comments are coming from a professional colleague who is intent on keeping the integrity and quality of the journal they represent. NOBODY has the right to feel bad about being rejected from a journal. Just submit.

Submit something to a journal while you are still in school. Your advisor can help make heads and tails of it. Having at least one publication while you are looking for your first job is helpful.

Browse and read anything that remotely sounds interesting. If you only read that which you perceive to be immediately related to your current research, I think you will miss out on a lot of things. I spend my Friday mornings just reading through the latest journals. Not for any purpose, other than the same one people have for visiting a museum during a vacation: I wonder what this is about?

As a professor, become a research resource for the teachers in your community. They may not have access to the research, but you do. I never give a presentation without including research in it somehow. I do a "research highlights" session at our state conference each year.
Questions, Comments, & Observations from current PhD students

- What is the expectation for publishing? Is there a certain number of articles/presentations that one should do, or does it vary?

- I was told by someone to always have three projects going . . . one in planning and data collection mode, one in review mode, and one in print mode.

- For tenure process - what kinds of things count? I’m sure this depends on the school, but does every published article need to be some sort of research endeavor, or would it depend on the job description? (I’m thinking of publications in something like MEJ where you could write something like a commentary or a best practices thing).

- If your institution doesn’t have funding for research, what are other avenues you can look at for funding? If the music department itself doesn’t have funding, are there other places within a university where there might be funding?

- Should you publish solo right off the bat, or is it okay to begin with joint projects with researchers at your school or other schools? What are some of the pros/cons to consider when researching independently or with others? Are there certain aspects that can become problematic on either side of that answer, how can you protect yourself? How do you handle other colleagues when working to make your own? How do you make your own presence without threatening someone else’s position or stepping on toes?

- If you’re in a school that doesn’t have an established music research area or many supporters of that, how could you go about trying to encourage that without rocking the waters? Or is there always a place for that at every institution, or should you do your own research on the side if you’re interested in that, or collaborate with other people at schools where it is?

- What types of things should we be doing now to prepare us for the future?

- After a selection is made, how does that person learn the culture of the environment/learn what the expectations of their position will be? In public schools, we always are assigned a "mentor" teacher; is it similar at the university level or are we expected to gain the information on our own?

- When is it acceptable to start (gently) pushing the envelope instead of keeping the status quo?

Coda: We then had a productive and open discussion among attendees regarding these and related questions. I asked those who have been recently appointed to the JRME Editorial Committee (Phil Hash & Peter Miksza) to comment on their impressions from their first 6 or so months reviewing. Several experienced researchers in attendance also added helpful comments including Shelly Cooper, Don Hamann, Jere Humphreys, Steve Kelly, Mitch Robinson, Joanne Rutkowski, Sandra Stauffer, and David Teachout.
Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the frequency and the time that middle and high school orchestra directors engaged in seven specific and operationally defined teaching behaviors in a rehearsal setting: (a) nonmusical behavior, (b) nonverbal instruction (direction), (c) verbal instruction (direction), (d) noninteractive listening, (e) nonverbal feedback, (f) verbal feedback, and (g) conceptual teaching. Of particular interest was the amount of time orchestra directors engaged in conceptual teaching behaviors operationally defined as verbal behaviors of orchestra directors in which they attempt to make students aware of, have an understanding of, and/or be able to transfer any musical concept. Participants ($N = 12$) were full-time middle and high school orchestra directors teaching in three states located in Northwest and Western Divisions according to the six National Association for Music Education (NAfME) Divisions. Each participant submitted a video recording of two regular orchestra rehearsals. Teaching behaviors were analyzed using the Simple Computer Recording Interface for Behavioral Evaluation (SCRIBE) of Duke and Stammen (2007). The data were reported in the form of the frequency with which each behavior occurred, the average time for each behavior expressed in minutes and seconds, and the percentage of time used on each behavior.

The results indicated most instructional time was used on nonverbal instruction (28.15%) followed by verbal instruction (27.76%). Orchestra directors observed in this study used the least amount of time (2.42%) on nonverbal feedback. On average, orchestra directors spent slightly more than 5% of the observed rehearsal time on conceptual teaching. The discussion provided implications for practicing music educators and suggestions for future research.
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The research that investigated the relationship between teaching behaviors and students’ learning outcomes offers evidence that students learn what they are taught during class, what they practice in a given time, and what they think about during and after class (Doyle, 1983; Driscoll, 2005). Madsen and Yarbrough (1985) condensed these findings into a simple observation that “what the teacher does is what the students get” (Madsen & Yarbrough, 1985, p. 8). “What the teacher does” translates into the teaching behaviors and teaching strategies teachers elect to use during instruction time.

Teaching strategies represent “actions and interactions that take place in classrooms and studios after curriculum goals have been established” (Tait, 1992, p. 525). Some teaching strategies are specifically developed to support developmental needs of students, and successful teachers utilize these strategies in their teaching practices (Shulman, 1987).

Piaget’s theory of cognitive development (Piaget, 1951, 1970b, 1971) proposes that as adolescents progress through the biological process known as puberty, their cognitive abilities transform as well, as they head through a formal operational stage of cognitive development. Upper-grade middle and high school students are capable of thinking hypothetically and abstractly, they can evaluate and analyze, they can solve problems and come up with creative solutions – all higher levels of thinking (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956). Piaget’s theory of cognitive development also suggests that adolescent students might exhibit homogeneous thinking behaviors.

However, while data from cross-sectional studies of children seem to support Piaget’s assertion that biological development drives the movement from one cognitive stage to another (Renner et al., 1976), data from cross-sectional studies of adolescents do not support the assertion that all adolescents automatically move to the formal operational stage as they biologically mature (Kuhn, Langer, Kohlberg & Haan, 1977; Martorano, 1977). This research indicated that only 30 to 35% of high school seniors attain this stage of cognitive development. It appears that while maturation establishes the basis, a special learning environment and teaching that aims at development of higher levels thinking skills are required for more adolescents to attain the formal operational stage (Beyer, 1997, 2008). One of the teaching strategies that may support middle and high school students’ cognitive development is conceptual teaching (McClain, 2005).

While recently an investigation of conceptual teaching received some attention at higher education levels (Feldman, 2003; Klausmeier, 1992; Mackenzie, 2008; Maclellan, 2005; Mayer, 2002) and in academic subjects in K-12 settings (van Boxtel, van der Linden, & Kanselaar, 2000; Gunel, Hand, & McDermott, 2009; Khalil, Lazarowitz, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2009; Lawton, 1977; Pugh, Linnenbrik-Garcia, Koskey, Steward, & Manzey, 2010), the research on conceptual teaching in music education settings has been very limited. The importance of this teaching strategy in music education settings is based not only on cognitive needs of adolescent students but also on the premise that “all of music teaching should occur for one overriding purpose: to instill in our students the ability to conceptualize music as a craft, an art, a body of knowledge, and a medium of self-expression and creativity” (Froehlich, 1992, p. 563). Of particular interest to the present study was the amount of time that middle and high school orchestra directors engage in conceptual teaching operationally defined as “verbal behaviors of orchestra directors in rehearsal settings by means of which the directors attempt to make students aware of, have an understanding of, and/or be able to transfer any musical concept” (Blocher, Greenwood, & Shellahamer, 1997, p. 459).
One way to organize the studies in music education concerned with the utilization of time would be by the co-relational variable. Certain studies that took place in varied music education settings simply reported the amount of time teachers used on different teaching behaviors (Blocher, et al., 1997; Brendell, 1996). Other studies investigated the use of time in relationship to different variables, such as the level of instruction and type of class (Caldwell, 1980; Madsen & Geringer, 1983; Watkins, 1993, 1996; Witt, 1986) or the level of teaching experience (Goolsby, 1996, 1997, 1999; Henninger, Flowers, & Council, 2006; Wagner & Struel, 1979). The general conclusion was that music teachers at the elementary level use more time on instruction, while secondary music teachers spend more time on performance.

Music education researchers have also examined verbal and nonverbal teaching behaviors of music teachers. The findings of studies on verbal behaviors of music teachers in relationship to the use of time were not consistent. While some studies reported that more than 50% of the time during applied lessons and ensemble rehearsals was spent on teachers' verbal behaviors (Carpenter, 1988; Kostka, 1984; Yarbrough & Price, 1989), other studies hold that verbal deportment occupied less than 50% of the total instructional time in the same instructional settings (Caldwell, 1980; Strauser, 2008). In either instance, it appears that music teachers spend most of their instructional time on some kind of verbal behaviors.

Various forms of nonverbal behaviors such as performance, modeling, conducting, and listening were also the subjects of research in music education. In general, when it comes to time spent on performance, across various music education settings, students perform for approximately half of the total time (Hendel, 1995; Kostka, 1984; Schmidt, 1985). Interestingly, the overall proportion of the students' performance time does not appear to be positively related to learning outcomes (Siebenaler, 1997; Speer, 1994; Yarbrough & Price, 1989).

The music education community in the 1960s recognized the need for teaching practices that would support developmentally appropriate learning at all ages. For instance, prompted by the translation of Piaget's research into English, Bruner (1960, 1966) introduced the theory of conceptual teaching and developmentally sequenced curricula known as spiral curriculum. Both of his theories were discussed at the Tanglewood Symposium (1967) and three sessions of the Ann Arbor Symposium (1978, 1979, & 1981). Soon after, spiral curriculum and conceptual learning became the foundations of elementary music classes (Mark, 1996). In addition, Bruner's theory of conceptual teaching served as the basis for developing teaching strategies that would promote the goals of Reimer's aesthetic education (Teatle & Cutietta, 2002).

Harding (1986) investigated the application of Piaget’s fourth stage of cognitive development, the formal operational stage, on undergraduate music majors. He used the Classroom Test of Formal Reasoning (CTFR) (Lawson, 1978) to test 195 undergraduate music majors for their ability to think at the formal operational stage of cognitive development. Harding found that only 40% of the participants in his study demonstrated thinking consistent with this stage. His recommendations for music education practitioners included the suggestion that methods should be developed to help learners’ progress from the lower stages of cognition to the stage of formal operations.

Although research in teaching strings and orchestra has investigated the use of time (Allard, 1992; Colprit, 2000; Duke, 1999; Witt, 1986), verbalization (Coding, 1987; Colprit, 2000, 2003; Duke, 1999; Salzberg & Salzberg, 1981; Witt, 1986), and teaching strategies in various string teaching settings (Andrews, 2004; Gholson, 1998; Mishra, 2000; Nelson, 1983), no study conducted in school orchestra rehearsal settings measured those behaviors in a
comprehensive way. Furthermore, there is no study in orchestra settings that investigated the use of time on conceptual teaching. The aforementioned reasons warrant the need for a study concerned with teaching behaviors in orchestra rehearsal setting.

The present study is a replication of the descriptive study conducted in middle and high school band rehearsal settings by Blocher, Greenwood, and Shellahamer (1997) in which they investigated the time allotted for the seven specific teaching behaviors (nonmusical, nonverbal instruction, verbal instruction, non-interactive listening, nonverbal feedback, verbal feedback, and conceptual teaching), with particular attention given to the time spent on conceptual teaching. Operational definitions of seven teaching behaviors observed in this study are presented in Figure 1.

The present study sought answers to the following three questions:

1. How frequently do middle and high school orchestra directors engage in each of the seven specific teaching behaviors during the typical rehearsal time?

2. How much time (average time and percentage of time) do middle and high school orchestra directors engage in each of the seven specific teaching behaviors?

3. Of particular interest to this study was how often and how much time do middle and high school orchestra directors engage in conceptual teaching as operationally defined?
Figure 1.
Operational Definitions of Seven Teaching Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Behavior</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal instruction (direction)</td>
<td>Teacher gives instruction through proactive conducting. Teacher’s facial expressions, body language, and other nonverbal cues instructor elicit responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal instruction (direction)</td>
<td>Teacher gives verbal instructions or directions that deal with specific musical attributes of the performance at hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-interactive listening</td>
<td>Teacher purposely listens to student performance but takes no active part in the performance. Students play with no visible or aural teacher interaction. Teacher beats time but does not attend to musical performance through conducting gestures, facial response, eye contact, or verbal response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal feedback</td>
<td>Teacher provides nonverbal reaction that is based on student responses that reinforces, shapes, or changes further student responses. Teacher responds in a nonverbal manner to something students do in such way that the teacher lets the students know something about their performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Feedback</td>
<td>Teacher provides verbal reaction to student response that reinforces, shapes, or changes further student performance. Teacher verbally responds to something that students do in such a way that the teacher lets the students know something about their performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual teaching behaviors</td>
<td>Verbal behaviors of orchestra directors in rehearsal settings by means of which the directors attempt to make students aware of, have an understanding of, and/or be able to transfer any musical concept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology

The participants in this study \((N = 12)\) were six \((n = 6)\) full-time middle school and six \((n = 6)\) full-time high school orchestra teachers teaching in states of Washington \((n = 1,\) middle school orchestra teacher), Oregon \((n = 10,\) five middle school and five high school orchestra teachers), and California \((n = 1,\) high school orchestra teacher). One of the four string instruments was the primary instrument of all participants. Two independent observers in this study were recruited from the pool of the senior Suzuki teachers teaching
applied and group lessons in the university’s Suzuki program because of their seniority in teaching strings and their experience in teaching strings in music education settings.

Participants were given three weeks to record two of their regular orchestra rehearsals in their entirety. The participants were instructed to follow the specified recording directions and were asked to record both rehearsals within the same week. The instructions asked that the recording device be positioned in the back of the room so that it captured only the teacher’s body and face.

Using MPEG Streamclip (freeware program for splitting and transcoding video clips), the researcher segmented each source file into the maximum number of consecutive 20-minute segments, ranging from two to eight segments per rehearsal depending on the length of the rehearsal. Each segment was then transcoded into QuickTime format and saved to a file. To establish a random play order of the segments, the researcher used 12 computer-generated, random numbers and sorted them along with numbers 1-12 which resulted in a random sequence. Segments ordered in this fashion were loaded on a new SCRIBE file for the independent observers to start their observations.

The inter-observer reliability level ($R$) between independent observers was calculated at 0.86 ($R = 0.86$) by using standard reliability procedure that has been used in a number of published studies in music education research (Duke & Madsen, 1991; Henninger, Flowers, & Councill, 2006; Salzberg & Salzberg, 1981). Observers were given fourteen days (two-weeks) to observe and collect data. The independent observers selected a specific teaching behavior every time they recognized it by clicking on an appropriate color-coded and word-labeled tab. When two or more behaviors occurred simultaneously, observers agreed to select each behavior for its duration in order of occurrence. At the conclusion of each observation session, observers saved and then printed the raw scores and the summary of collected data. The reliability level for the independent observers while doing the study was calculated by randomly selecting three segments (25% of all twelve selected segments) and calculating the overall level of agreement for frequency and time. The reliability level from three observations during the study was 0.76 ($R = 0.76$).

An electronic copy and a printed copy of all observational data were given to the researcher for further data analysis immediately after the last observation was completed. The researcher verified the submitted SCRIBE data for both number of observations and inclusion of all specific data analyses such as frequency, time, percentage of time, mean and standard deviation and found that the submitted data were complete.

**Results**

The observed frequency and duration (minutes and seconds) of each of the seven selected teaching behaviors served as raw data for analysis. The values in Table 2 represent the mean frequency, average time, and percentage of time of two observers’ data for each behavior, categorized by middle school only, high school only, and both levels combined.
### Table 2: Frequency and Use of Time on Seven Teaching Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Behaviors</th>
<th>Mean Frequency</th>
<th>Average Time</th>
<th>Percentage of Time</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20:03.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmusical</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>02:29.0</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Instruction</td>
<td>34.46</td>
<td>04:38.5</td>
<td>23.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Instruction</td>
<td>46.79</td>
<td>06:23.4</td>
<td>31.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-interactive Listening</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>02:08.9</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Feedback</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>00:26.1</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Feedback</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>02:20.2</td>
<td>11.65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Teaching</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>01:29.0</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19:55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20:02.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmusical</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>03:24.6</td>
<td>17.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Instruction</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>06:38.7</td>
<td>33.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Instruction</td>
<td>45.08</td>
<td>04:44.3</td>
<td>23.65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-interactive Listening</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>01:43.7</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Feedback</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>00:32.1</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Feedback</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>02:11.4</td>
<td>10.93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Teaching</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>00:38.6</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19:53.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMBINED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20:02.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmusical</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>02:56.8</td>
<td>14.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Instruction</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>05:38.6</td>
<td>28.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Instruction</td>
<td>45.94</td>
<td>05:33.9</td>
<td>27.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-interactive Listening</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>01:56.3</td>
<td>9.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Feedback</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>00:29.1</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Feedback</td>
<td>28.73</td>
<td>02:15.8</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Teaching</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>01:03.8</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Figure 2, participants in this study spent most of the rehearsal time on nonverbal instruction (a little over 28% of the observed time) followed by verbal instruction (a little under 28% of the observed time). The next most-represented teaching behavior was nonmusical behavior (a little under 15% of the observed time) followed by verbal feedback (a little over 11% of the observed time). Non-interactive listening was the
fifth most-represented behavior (a little under 10%) followed by conceptual teaching (a little over 5% of the observed time). Lastly, participants used the least amount of time on nonverbal feedback (a little over 2% of the observed time). The sum of the two categories of verbal behaviors (verbal instruction and verbal feedback) revealed that the orchestra teachers spent approximately 39% of rehearsal time on some form of verbal behavior.

*Figure 2. Percentage of time spent on seven teaching behaviors.*

This graph illustrates the use of time of middle and high school orchestra directors’ combined on the seven specific teaching behaviors.

As illustrated in Figure 3, a comparison of data between the two levels (middle and high school) revealed a noticeable difference between the average time that middle school participants engaged in conceptual teaching behaviors, in comparison to the average time spent by high school teachers. While middle school participants spent 1 minute 29 seconds, high school participants spent only 38 seconds on conceptual teaching. Middle school participants engaged in conceptual teaching almost twice as long. However, a comparison of frequencies for conceptual teaching at the two levels revealed that middle school orchestra teachers engaged in this teaching behavior about three times while high school orchestra teachers engaged in conceptual teaching a little more than one time, meaning that the duration of episodes of conceptual teaching were approximately the same at both levels.
Figure 3. Comparison of conceptual teaching between high and middle school.

This graph illustrates the difference in frequency and time spent on conceptual teaching by middle school and high school participants.

Summary and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the frequency and time that middle and high school orchestra directors engage in seven specific teaching behaviors as operationally defined. The orchestra directors’ time spent teaching conceptually was of particular interest to this study.

The findings of this study revealed that orchestra directors spent most of their instructional time on nonverbal instruction (direction) followed by time on verbal instruction (direction). These two behaviors, when combined, occupied more than half of the regular rehearsal time. Further findings revealed that orchestra directors used a considerable amount of time on nonmusical behaviors, followed by verbal feedback. Directors utilized much less time on non-interactive listening and nonverbal feedback. While the time spent on conceptual teaching was low, it is encouraging that conceptual teaching was not the least represented teaching behavior among orchestra teachers. The most interesting finding of the study was that middle school orchestra directors used more time on conceptual teaching than high school orchestra directors. The most concerning finding of this study was the significant amount of time orchestra directors used on nonmusical behaviors, especially when this time is compared to the very limited time they used on non-verbal feedback and conceptual teaching.
When compared to the time spent on the other teaching behaviors observed in this study, nonverbal instruction (direction), operationally defined as “conducting and other expressive physical gestures”, was the most prominent teaching behavior among orchestra directors. This supports the findings of a substantial number of studies on the use of time in secondary music classes (Brendell, 1996; Caldwell, 1980; Carpenter, 1989; Hendel, 1995; Witt 1986; Yarbrough & Price, 1981, 1989), which all found that most of the instructional time in secondary music classes is spent on students’ performance and other forms of nonverbal instruction. The finding of the present study, however, is somewhat inconsistent with MacLeod’s (2010) findings; she investigated 12 teaching strategies used by experienced band and orchestra teachers when teaching beginning ensembles an unfamiliar song and found conducting to be the third most represented teaching activity among band directors, and only the sixth most represented teaching strategy among orchestra teachers.

The finding of this study that verbal instruction (direction) was the second most represented behavior during the orchestra rehearsal is consistent with several studies on the use of time on verbal instruction in secondary music classes (Goolsby, 1996, 1997; Witt 1986). Like this study, these studies revealed that “teaching episodes” including verbal instruction represent the second most prominent teaching activity. On the other hand, MacLeod (2010) reported verbal instruction as the most frequently used instructional strategy for both band and orchestra teachers. Consistent with MacLeod’s findings on verbal instruction, Colprit (2000) reported that in applied lesson settings, Suzuki string teachers used most of the instructional time on instructional verbalization (45%). Whether verbal instruction is the most prominent teaching activity as found in MacLeod (2010) and Colprit (2000), or the second most represented teaching behavior as found in this study, as well as in the Goolsby (1996, 1997) and Witt (1986) studies, the conclusion may be drawn that secondary music teachers use a considerable amount of time on verbal instruction, probably because conveying musical information to students through nonverbal means may not be a sufficient way of instructing.

While the average percentage of time devoted to conceptual teaching (5.30%) seems low, especially when compared to the time used on nonmusical behaviors (14.70%), this figure is actually a little higher than figures reported in other studies that were concerned with the use of time on various strategies aimed towards the development of higher level thinking skills for students (Strauser, 2008; Watkins, 1993, 1996), or with the use of time spent on conceptual teaching itself (Blocher et al., 1997). These studies reported even lower percentages of time used on this teaching behavior.

Probably the most interesting finding of this study in regard to conceptual teaching was that middle school orchestra directors used over twice as much time on conceptual teaching (1 minute and 29 seconds) than high school orchestra directors did (38 seconds). This finding is contrary to Watkins (1993, 1996) who studied the use of nonperformance time in regard to time spent on developing students’ higher level thinking skills, and who found the exact opposite: high school choir directors used more time (1.30%) than middle school directors (0.84%) on this kind of teaching.

The finding of this study in regard to conceptual teaching and orchestra levels (middle or high school) could be explained by the greater need of middle school students for verbal explanation of musical concepts and playing skills, as they are just beginning to be exposed to them. This assumption is exemplified in string method books that are primarily designed for use in middle schools and beginning high school orchestras in which the authors—string education specialists and scholars—provide pages of suggestions on teaching musical concepts, as well as suggestions for teaching playing techniques in conceptual ways. At the same time, high school music ensembles tend to spend most of
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their class time in repertoire performance, which possibly leaves them with less time for teaching concepts or teaching conceptually. Using more time on performance at the expense of conceptual teaching, however, can't justify the low percentage of time used for this kind of teaching. Several studies (Garafolo & Whaley, 1979; Hendricks, 2010) showed that students in performance classes that utilized conceptual strategies not only developed a higher degree of understanding of the structural elements of music, but also improved the quality of their performance through conceptual learning.

The most concerning finding of this study was the considerable amount of time orchestra directors engaged in nonmusical behaviors, with high school directors spending more time on this behavior than middle school orchestra directors. This finding is in accordance with Witt (1986), who investigated the use of time during secondary band and orchestra rehearsals; she found that, as in this study, “getting ready” time was the third most represented time. In his study on the use of time among experienced, novice, and student band teachers, Goolsby (1996) found that the use of time on non-teaching activities (time spent in preparation, initial and final talk, breaks between musical selections, and the dismissal period) was affected by the teaching experience of the participants.

The least represented teaching behavior in this study was nonverbal feedback, as it occupied only 2.42% (or 29 seconds) of the instructional time. This finding supports Blocher et al. (1997) as researchers in that study found that middle and high school band directors used even less time on nonverbal feedback (1.21%). Several studies that investigated the use of time spent providing feedback in secondary music classes (Cavitt, 1998; Goolsby, 1997; Price, 1989), all suggested that secondary music teachers tend not provide feedback on students’ performance.

Even with the limited scope and applicability of its findings, this study provided intriguing information on the teaching behaviors of orchestra directors. The amount of time used on nonmusical behaviors is concerning, but the amount of time that orchestra teachers use on conceptual teaching seems to be promising as it is higher than in other performance-oriented music classes. Some implications to practicing middle and high school orchestra teachers could be geared towards suggesting that they look for ways to minimize the time spent on nonmusical teaching behaviors and to strive for learning more about conceptual teaching as one of the possible ways to support the cognitive development of their adolescent students. At the same time, researchers should keep investigating teaching strategies that may maximize instructional time in orchestra rehearsal settings, as well as look for ways that would make conceptual teaching more appealing to practicing orchestra teachers for the benefit of students and their future.
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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to discover what effect the performance and study of world music has on middle and high school summer music camp participants' development of international-mindedness and attitudes toward world music. The following research questions were the focus of the study: 1. Does the performance and study of four world music pieces from four different cultures make a significant difference in participants' international-mindedness? 2. Does the performance and study of four world music pieces from four different cultures effect students attitudes and preference for world music? The participants in the study (N=35) were students enrolled in the summer choral music camp at a mid-sized university in the United States. Results of the study indicate that when middle and high school students study and perform world music, their international-mindedness grows and they develop more positive attitudes about world music and the cultures from which they come.
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Learning about different world cultures and including world music in the music education curriculum has become increasingly important in the United States in recent decades. “The National Association for Music Education specifically emphasizes understanding music in relation to history and culture” (MENC, 1994). Multicultural and international education continues to be an important issue as the world becomes more interconnected through technology, business relations, and economic and political ties. Demographic changes require teachers to increase their effectiveness in addressing minority students’ needs as well as to inform all students about the diversity of cultures surrounding them.

Intended to provide an educational environment that values cultural and global diversity, multicultural education has the potential to help bridge the widening gaps between people of different backgrounds (Gollnick & Chinn, 1994). Multicultural musical experiences assist in opening students’ minds toward other cultures while developing acceptance and understanding of people from different parts of the world (Blair & Kondo, 2008; Fung, 1994b). Shehan (1988) suggests that experiencing world music “can make a significant contribution to students’ emerging musical understanding, taste, and tolerance for other peoples of the world” (p. 23). The generation of children currently sitting in the world’s classrooms is entering a future unlike any previous generation. A realistic expectation for these children includes connecting with people and organizations from all parts of the globe socially and throughout their careers. How are these children being prepared to interact in a global society? What skills will they need? Is it possible through education, and particularly music education, to enhance children’s development of international-mindedness?

Campbell (2000) reinforced the importance of teaching music of other cultures: “Our understanding of people of cultures different from our own is aided by knowing how they express themselves through performance and discovering why they value particular timbres, tunings, forms and functions. While musical understanding deepens, our perspective on cultural others also is shaped and reshaped. And as it is true for us, it also is true for our children” (p. 52).

The notion of international-mindedness (though it is often referred to as global- or world-mindedness) figures prominently in education discourse of international schools and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs. According to Ian Hill, IB deputy director general, an integral part of the outcomes of internationally-minded education includes an understanding that people of different backgrounds hold different views and provides opportunities to examine the origins of those beliefs. The opportunities lead to understanding and respecting various viewpoints. According to Haywood (2007), international-mindedness has five characteristics that all children need: (a) a curiosity and interest in the human and physical geography of earth, (b) an openness to different cultural approaches (tolerance), (c) a scientific understanding that the earth is valuable and common to everyone, (d) awareness that people are interrelated, and (e) respect for differing cultural backgrounds.

Rodway’s (2008) research on international-mindedness suggests that the most influential factors affecting international-mindedness development are travel, family, and education. Travel experiences are most significant when the traveler is immersed into the
local culture within a foreign environment. Ideally, all children would be provided opportunities to travel and study abroad. Realistically, however, travel is a not a common practice in American education. Families are also very influential, especially those who have lived abroad and/or are representative of recent immigration to the USA. According to Rodway’s (2008) research findings, students who grow up in rural communities have limited experience with people of different cultures. Conversely, children who grew up in urban neighborhoods identified—from an early age—the diversity of the families in their communities a key influence. This factor leads to open-mindedness, a characteristic included in the definition of international-mindedness. Being first-generation Americans to immigrant parents appeared to be a key influence on international-mindedness of many students. Education serves as an influential factor, and may be the only factor, especially for students raised in a mono-cultural environment. Cultural exposure during school years, as well as multicultural content, is a powerful tool for the development of international-mindedness, preferences, and attitudes toward music from world cultures.

A number of researchers have examined students’ preferences and familiarities with regard to music of other cultures. Research findings indicate that musical preference is affected by several factors. Familiarity, musical characteristics, and students’ characteristics have a significant effect on students’ preference and attitudes for music (Brittin, 1996; Droe, 2006; Fung, 1996; LeBlanc et al., 2000; LeBlanc et al., 2002; Montgomery, 1996; Walker, 2006). From these considerations, music educators can create lessons that expand students’ musical preferences and attitudes. World musics include many musical characteristics different from Western music, such as scales, rhythmic construction, micro-tonality, notation, and performance practices (Darling, 2004; Elsner, 1997). Fung (1994a) investigated the relationship between musical characteristics and college students’ preferences for world music. The characteristics examined were rhythm regularity, similarity to Western music, tonal-centeredness, consonance, tempo, number of different pitches, melodic clarity, pitch range, and loudness level. Fung found that music with similar characteristics to Western music and music from cultures geographically closer to the United States had higher familiarity and preference ratings. In another study, Fung (1994b) explored the relationship between music preferences and attitudes of undergraduate, non-music majors. After listening to randomized excerpts from Africa, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, the Middle East, and Thailand, participants responded on a 7-point Likert-type scale for music preference. Fung discovered that social and cultural attitudes affect world music preference and that students preferred instrumental musical styles above vocal musical styles. In a subsequent study, Fung (1996) investigated the relationship between musical characteristics and musicians’ and non-musicians’ preferences for world music. Results indicated that musical characteristics played a significant role in world music preference ratings. Fung specified that “the entire sample (N = 449) preferred excerpts that were characterized as relatively fast, having many different pitches, tonal-centered, consonant, bright timbre, smooth, loud, complex or moderately complex in texture, and moderate in the richness of embellishment” (p. 71). Similarly, Montgomery (1996) found a significant relationship between tempo and preferences in his study that examined undergraduate, non-music majors’ familiarity with and preference for Arabic music as compared to other world music.

Shehan (1984) indicated that active instructional methods—such as emphasizing performance through singing and playing instruments—may increase students’ preferences for the world music style under examination to a greater extent than other methods (e.g., lectures, visual media, and guided listening). Burton (1986) suggested that active participation may be of particular importance in world music instruction as it provides students opportunities to develop a greater appreciation for the unique musical processes employed in the performance of specific world music styles. Volk (1998), in *Music, Education, and Multiculturalism*, asserts that “Educators tend to agree that what is currently
missing, and is most needed for music students, at this point is performance opportunities in a wide variety of cultures.” Results of a Flowers (1980) study indicated that musical activities such as analysis, performance, directed listening, and extra musical information increased college students’ preference for specific African music selections to a greater extent than mere exposure; however, the preference increase did not transfer to untaught selections. Similar results were discovered in Shehan’s (1985) study of performance-oriented world music instruction with sixth-grade students. Research indicated that instruction increased student preferences only for taught selections of each music style. Fung, (1997) after conducting research involving college students, recommended that transfer of world music preference from taught to untaught pieces may occur if (a) the instructional period is extensive and intense, (b) various teaching approaches are used, and (c) instruction includes in-class and out-of-class assignments and activities.

Another important concern relates to how to teach world music as authentically as possible. Palmer (1992)—in the context of world music—defines “absolute authenticity” as: (1) performance by culture’s practitioners, recognized generally by the culture as artistic and representative; (2) use of instruments as specified by the composer or group creating the music; (3) use of the correct language as specified by the composer or group creating the music; (4) performance for an audience made up of the culture’s members; and (5) performance in a setting normally used within the culture. He suggests to consider authenticity on a continuum between absolute authenticity and compromise, with emphasis placed on context and intent. Campbell (2004) in Teaching Music Globally, identifies world music pedagogy as “a newly emergent phenomenon” representing the middle ground between ethnomusicology and music education. “The pedagogy of world music strives to reach beyond queries of ‘what’ and ‘why’ to the question of ‘how’ (Campbell, 2004, p. 26). She writes:

World music pedagogy concerns itself with how music is taught/transmitted and received/learned within these cultures, and how best the processes that are included in significant ways within these cultures can be preserved or at least partially retained in classrooms and rehearsal halls. Those working to evolve this pedagogy have studied music with culture-bearers, and have come to know that music can best be understood through experience with the manner in which it is taught and learned. (p. 26)

Music educators should be “conscious of and pay tribute to other notational systems (or their applicability), oral/aural techniques, improvisatory method, and even what customary behaviors precede and immediately follow lessons and sessions within particular traditions.” (Campbell, 2004, p. 27)

Quesada (2002) discusses methods for transmitting world music and suggests learning the music using the same transmission method as the culture of origin. She suggests considering the musical culture’s stylistic traits when determining the appropriateness of adaptations made to transmission methods. World music instruction should incorporate the aesthetic value systems, performance practices, transmission procedures, and functional contexts of the culture surrounding the music. Providing such comprehensive instruction in world music is a demanding task considering the limited world music background of some music teachers, time constraints, and limitations of school music instructional environments. Teaching students authentically about music of world cultures and performing world music continues to be a challenging responsibility for music teachers.
The purpose of this study was to discover what effect the performance and study of world music has on middle school and high school summer music camp participants’ development of international-mindedness and attitudes toward world music. The following research questions were the focus of the study: 1. Does the performance and study of four world music pieces from four different cultures make a significant difference in participants’ international-mindedness? 2. Does the performance and study of four world music pieces from four different cultures effect students attitudes and preference for world music?

PROCEDURES

Participants

The participants (N = 35) included in the study were middle and high school students enrolled in a World Music Choir and/or a World Music Class at a summer music camp in the upper midwestern region of the United States. Students included one boy and 34 girls. They ranged in age from 13-17. Twelve students were in grades nine through twelve (14-17 years old), and the remaining 23 were in grades seven and eight (11-12 years old). Students came to camp from a variety of places, with a nearly an even representation between rural areas (N = 18) and suburban areas (N = 17). No students participating were from urban centers. All students were born in the United States; however, five students indicated their parents had been born elsewhere. No students had lived outside of the United States, but fifteen students indicated they have friends from a culture different than their own. In addition, eleven students noted having a teacher from a different culture.

Timeline and Personnel

This study was designed to be completed over the course of six consecutive days. World Music Choir students participated in two choir classes every day—one 60-minute class and one 75-minute class. In addition, students participated in World Music class for one hour every day. The administration of the pre-test survey occurred during the first day of the classes. At the conclusion of the six-day camp, just before the Final Concert, the survey was given to all participants in attendance as a post-test.

The researcher served as the instructor for World Music Choir and World Music Class while treatment was administered. The researcher/instructor is an Assistant Professor of Music Education at a mid-sized Midwestern University where her teaching responsibilities include teaching music education courses and one World Music course. The researcher, originally from Belarus, has worked as a musician and taught at public and private schools in Belarus, China, and Bahrain. The other researcher, an Assistant Professor of Music Education at the same university, teaches secondary choral music education courses and conducts choral ensembles. Originally from Minnesota, she has taught at an international school in Germany. Both researchers developed and administrated surveys.

The Dependent Measure

The researchers developed the survey instrument based upon prior research experience related to international-mindedness and other international-mindedness research studies (Baker & Kanan 2005). The survey was divided into three sections. Section one included questions related to demographics, section two included questions related to international-mindedness, and section three included questions regarding participants’ attitudes and preferences for world music.
Three instrumental examples of traditional music from Russia, Egypt, and China were selected for listening. All excerpts used musical instruments of the original cultures and included small ensemble sizes of two and three instruments. The order of the excerpts—each 60 seconds in duration—was randomly determined. Students listened to the musical examples and answered closed- and open-ended questions. The response procedures for each of the 3 excerpts were comprised of questions related to familiarity with the music and attitudes toward it. During the pre-test, the first listening example was a traditional Chinese song *Fisherman* from a CD the researcher brought from China. This musical selection featured the guzheng, a traditional Chinese stringed instrument. The second listening example was a traditional Egyptian piece from a *Zaffa* wedding procession from the CD/book *Music in Egypt*, featuring the traditional instruments mizmar, dumbek and hand drums. The last example was the Russian song *Kalinka* from the CD “Kamchatka” performed on traditional Russian instruments, including the bayan, balalaika and bass balalaika. The researcher used different musical examples from the same CDs for the post-test. All post-test musical examples possessed similar musical characteristics as those used in the pre-test. Post-test musical examples included *Svetit Mesyac* (Russia), *Zaffa Music* (Egypt), and *Jasmin* (China).

**Treatment**

The treatment for the World Music Choir included musical and dance rehearsal and performance of four pieces from Russia, the Middle East, China, and New Zealand. Students were provided with cultural and contextual information, which included historical, geographical, political, and economic information about the countries. The indigenous music of each country and its cultural role was discussed. In addition, students were shown pictures and videos of instruments representative of each country and were provided hands-on experiences with native instruments of the Russian, Middle Eastern and Chinese culture. Representative listening examples included recordings of appropriate pieces for each cultural group. The traditional Russian song, *Korobushka* (The Peddler), arranged by Emily Crocker for SA voices and published by Hal Leonard Corporation was selected for the study. The instructor/researcher—Russian by origin—taught in Belarusian schools and performed in traditional ensembles for several years. The researcher taught the song as it had been taught in Russia. Instruction included learning traditional movements and proper pronunciation of the Russian lyrics. For the final performance a professional Russian bayan player accompanied the choir.

The medley of traditional Lebanese and Egyptian folk songs for treble voices in four parts and percussion *Ya Faraoule*, arranged by Stephen Hatfield, was selected for study and performance of Middle Eastern music. The structure for teaching Arabic music is different than Western music, with specific rules regarding notation, performance, tonality, and concepts. In addition to learning the music, students experienced the demanding task of learning a new musical thought process that included the concepts of maqam, micro-tonality, embellishments, and rhythmic modes. The instructor/researcher has taught and worked with professional Arabic musicians for 3.5 years in Bahrain and is very familiar with teaching and performance practices. A native Arabic speaker helped to teach pronunciation and provided detailed translation. Belly dancing and traditional attire were introduced in class and became a part of the performance.

The popular Chinese song *Farewell* was selected for the study and performance of Chinese music. One month before the choir camp, the researcher visited China and collected resources for teaching Chinese music. Many Chinese natives recommended the song *Farewell* as it is based on a famous poem and is a popular song in China. As is appropriate for the culture, *Farewell* was introduced to the choir in traditional Chinese
numbered notation “jianpu.” Students had to learn how to transcribe and read the notation. Image 1 demonstrates a fragment of Farewell and the numbered notation with which it was taught.

Image 1: Fragment of the song Farewell

Students were taught the pronunciation of Farewell with careful attention to accurate reproduction of the Mandarin language. Students were provided hands-on experiences with traditional instruments, including the guzheng, pipa and erhu. They also learned traditional movements with Chinese fans.

The traditional song Tama Tu from the Maori culture, arranged for SSA choir by Sally K. Albrecht was selected for study and performance. In conjunction with rehearsals and subsequent performance of this piece, the choir learned traditional Haka dance movements. They were provided with cultural contextual information, which included historical, geographical, and cultural information about the country.

During World Music Class students learned about the culture and music of Russia, the Middle East, and China through lectures, discussion, dancing, and hands-on experiences with traditional instruments. Lectures and discussions addressed historical, geographical, political, and economic information about the countries. The traditional and popular music of the countries and its role in the cultures was discussed. Students listened and watched examples of representative traditional and popular music from each cultural group. Students learned the basic steps of the traditional Russian dances Troika, Kalinka, and Barinya, basic movements of traditional Middle Eastern belly dancing, and traditional movements from the Chinese culture. Students had opportunities to play Middle Eastern rhythm modes on dundbek and frame drums. They also explored the basic techniques of how to play the domra (a traditional Russian instrument) and the guzheng (a traditional Chinese instrument).
METHOD

The study was designed using a Mixed Methods approach to research. According to Creswell and Plano Clark’s (2007) designations, data was collected and analyzed utilizing a Triangulation Design. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected simultaneously, and each was analyzed. The results of the analyses were used for the final interpretation with both data types informing the conclusions and directions for future research.

In this case study, the comments and responses of 35 participants enrolled in a world music choir or world music class during a summer music camp in the midwestern region of the United States reveal some of the musical and demographic factors that effect middle and high school students’ development of international-mindedness. Data were gathered from the pre- and post-test surveys, interviews, and field notes. The analysis includes frequencies, descriptive statistics, Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, Kruskal-Wallis Test using SPSS, and open and axial coding was used for the qualitative data analysis.

Following approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects at the university hosting the camp and consent from participants and their guardians, quantitative and qualitative data was collected through pre- and post-test surveys. The survey included three sections. The first section was largely demographic in nature, including eleven questions regarding sex, grade, location, which class or choir in which they were enrolled, their birthplace, their parents’ birthplace, and questions about the cultural background of friends and teachers. Part two included twelve questions related to characteristics of international-mindedness. Participants responded to these items based on a Likert-type scale. The third section included questions about music samples in which the students listened, some of which were open-ended and were part of the qualitative data collected.

The questions in part two of the survey were created in alignment with the definition of international-mindedness from Haywood (2007). Haywood (2007) indicates five characteristics of international-mindedness that can be included in the curriculum and assessed: a) curiosity and interest in the world around us related to the human and physical geography of the earth, b) open attitudes to other cultural approaches/tolerance, c) understanding scientifically that the earth is a valuable entity common to everyone, d) recognition that people are interconnected, and e) respect for other cultural backgrounds – situated in concern for the welfare of all people. The twelve survey questions aligned with three of Haywood’s (2007) characteristics (a, b, and e) of international-mindedness.

Internal reliability of the instrument was addressed using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. Survey items related to the international-mindedness measures (12 items in section 2) were tested for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is in the acceptable range ($\alpha = .83$) for the international-mindedness measures (A. Field, 2005; Pallant, 2007).

In addition to completing surveys, participants ($N = 8$) could volunteer to participate in individual interviews allowing them to relay more of their ideas and feelings about the musics studied or performed throughout the week. Additional qualitative data were collected from the instructor who taught both the World Music Choir and the World Music Class in the form of reflective comments and field notes. The qualitative data was analyzed using open and axial coding, and common themes emerged. The data were all considered, and conclusions were drawn based equally on both forms of data.
The Development of International-Mindedness

Because a violation of normality existed in some of the Part 2 survey items, a Wilcoxon Signed Rank test (non-parametric counterpart to a repeated measures T-Test) was conducted to evaluate whether there was a change in international-mindedness measures from the pre- to the post-test surveys, related to the first research question. There was a significant main effect for growth in the international-mindedness for each of the three characteristics measured, including a significant growth in international-mindedness on 33% of the survey items in Part 2 ($\alpha = .05$). For instance, growth occurred in “curiosity and interest in the world around us” based upon a significant increase in post-test scores on survey items 16, 18, 20, and 25. Table 1 includes the items and its significance from the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test.

Table 1: Significant Growth in International-Mindedness for 33% of the Survey Items in Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Significance ($\alpha = .05$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I would like to be aware of what happens in different parts of the world.</td>
<td>a and b</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I like to read books &amp; magazines that are related to international cultures.</td>
<td>a and e</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Our school should teach the history of the whole world rather than of our country only</td>
<td>a and e</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I believe that other cultures have the right to behave according to their beliefs in their own societies.</td>
<td>b and e</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants demonstrated internationally-minded tendencies within their interviews. One student indicated she would like to learn to speak Russian someday, and several shared they would like to continue learning more music and more about these cultures. They wanted to know more about the music—what people would wear during a performance, where they perform, and the performance practices utilized in other types of music from these cultures. One student indicated “everyone should learn music like that.” She also noted that she wished it was a more “accepted thing,” although she did not elaborate on her meaning. Finally, one student felt her peers should be more accepting of unfamiliar or cultural musics. “Make sure that you accept all the cultures and kind of feel that they’ve been doing the same that we have.” She was concerned with the “negative
input“ of some people regarding unfamiliar cultural music-making. She compared the tradition of American music that she had grown up knowing with the fact that other cultures do likewise. Her primary concern is that it would be taught with that perspective in her school rather than just the idea that is unique or unusual.

**Relationship Between Recordings Students Will Purchase and International-Mindedness**

The relationship between students’ willingness to purchase recordings of the music and international-mindedness on the post-test was investigated to address the second research question (Does the performance and study of four world music pieces from four different cultures effect students attitudes and preference for world music?) using Spearman’s rho Correlation Coefficient. Although not demonstrating cause, based on Pallant’s (2007, p. 132) and Cohen’s (1992) scale for correlation strength (small effect: $r = .10$ to .29; medium effect: $r = .30$ to .49; and large effect: $r = .50$ to 1.0) there was a medium or strong, positive correlation for all five of the twelve items ($p \leq .05$) measuring international-mindedness on the post-test survey. Items 16 ($r = .353$), 17 ($r = .440$), 24 ($r = .453$), and 26 ($r = .401$), were moderately correlated ($p \leq .05$). Item 23 was strongly correlated ($r = .755$). Table 2 includes all of the items and $r$ values.

**Table 2: Relationship Between International-Mindedness and Recordings Students Will Purchase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Significance at $\alpha = .05$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I would like to be aware of what happens in different parts of the world.</td>
<td>a and b</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am interested to know about other beliefs &amp; points of view.</td>
<td>a and e</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I am receptive of people form different religions or different cultures.</td>
<td>a and e</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I would like to travel to other countries.</td>
<td>a, b, and e</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I want to be considerate &amp; tolerant to individuals coming from different cultures.</td>
<td>b and e</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From pre- to post-test, the number of students who indicated they would purchase the music increased for the Russian and Chinese listening examples. A Wilcoxon Signed Rank test was utilized to evaluate whether a significant increase existed in the number of students who would purchase the music between the pre- to the post-test surveys. There
was a significant main effect for growth in the number of students who would purchase Russian music ($p = .003$).

The third section of the survey allowed participants the opportunity to discuss why they would or would not purchase the music listening examples for 99¢. One student indicated the Russian music was “cool to dance to and listen to.” Another student noted she liked the Chinese music “because it makes me feel like I’m in China.” This could certainly be in a touristic sense, but the fact that she was excited about the prospect of being in China indicates an interest in Chinese culture—a characteristic of international-mindedness. On the other hand, those who responded that they would not purchase the music largely indicated it was because they either did not have an ipod on which to play it, or they just did not like the music enough to pay for it. Others indicated they would find it on Youtube and watch it for free.

DISCUSSION

Effect of World Music Instruction on International-Mindedness

The students’ responses on the survey indicate that time to study, learn, and perform unfamiliar cultural music positively affects their development of international-mindedness characteristics. The increase in scores on the international-mindedness measures on 33% of the survey items in Part 2 was related to each characteristic of international-mindedness included in the study. As the treatment focused on providing students with opportunities to learn and perform as well as learn about each culture, this indicates students’ growth in international-mindedness was connected to the cultural and musical instruction experienced.

As a colleague, watching the students perform their songs in the concert, I marveled at their passion and intensity and the manner in which they portrayed each song. Each song looked and sounded different as it related to a particular culture with specific performance practices, timbres, movements, and musical practices. According to responses on the open-ended survey questions and from data collected from interviews, students described characteristics of each culture’s music and performance practices. For instance, most students noted the differences in notation between the Chinese numerical notation and the Western notation they experienced in their school choirs. Several students even said reading Chinese notation was easier for them to learn than Western notation had been. Many students mentioned they enjoyed the guzheng, the traditional Chinese instrument used to accompany the Chinese music. Students learned how the instrument is played, its prevalence in Chinese musical culture, and one student who was interviewed excitedly talked about getting to play the guzheng during class time. Another student noted that the “vibrato was very prominent in [Arabic] songs, and they generally don’t use a time meter.” Also regarding Arabic music, another student said, “they can’t really put all the notes that they do [on paper] because they move around with their voice a lot. They do a lot of little notes.”

Students also indicated learning about the culture as important to their understanding and appreciation for the music they learned. Regarding the Maori music, one student said she thought it was particularly interesting that their music was connected “to spiritual things, like how to be a warrior, and a lot of the times that they would do dances were to intimidate others, or to celebrate their strength.” Regarding the Russian music, one student noted, “I like the words and the meanings behind them.” Several elaborated on the importance of learning about the culture and context, not simply the meanings of the words. Students also learned about other art-forms associated with the music they studied. For instance, many indicated they enjoyed the dancing and movement
associated with the songs they sang in choir. They recognized the importance of understanding the movements’ meanings in relation to culture – if it was just a dance or if each movement had specific meaning and purpose.

Students’ concluding comments reflected their wish to know and understand more about one or more of the musical cultures studied during camp. This, too, indicates international-mindedness characteristics. For instance, one student said, “I would like to know more about what instruments they would use.” Another girl indicated she “would like to get more into the music theory of the Chinese scores and the vibrato of the Arabic music.” Another participant wanted to know more about the songs’ origins and how they have been embedded in culture—“I want to know how they write those songs—what gets them to write them. If it has to do with past legends, if it has to do involving family, if it has to do with love, whatever it has to do with the inspiration.”

Student responses during the interviews were enthusiastic, and they were excited about continued participation in world music learning and performance. Furthermore, one girl suggested that people should be open-minded and understand the cultural background and commitment to the music of the culture being studied. “They need to broaden themselves. And go into everybody’s [culture] and learn everything and just experience – if they’re going to be real musicians, just experience feelings of each song and the emotions put into it.” Finally, a student’s appreciation of learning world music in her own school was clear - “I wish they would do more with world music in school because it’s really fun.” Not all instruction in school is fun, but learning that is fun translates to “lasting learning” and can become a catalyst for more in-depth study.

**Effect of World Music on Attitudes and Preferences**

The survey included questions regarding whether students would spend 99¢ to purchase each of the songs heard during the administration of the survey. This was the measure used to determine if students enjoyed the music or simply did it because it was expected. Although there was not a significant increase in desire to purchase all three (Russian, Chinese, and Arabic) pieces, there was an increase in each one. Additionally, there was a significant increase in those who wanted to purchase the Russian music. It is likely this is related to the fact that their instructor is Russian and modeled her passion for Russian music and heritage. Many students also indicated they loved doing the dance movements with the Russian music, and they really loved the “up-beat” nature of the Russian songs they sang or heard.

Perhaps more importantly, there was also a moderate to strong correlation between international-mindedness measures and students’ willingness to purchase the music. Those whose international-mindedness scores were higher were also interested in purchasing the music. This seems to suggest that students who are more internationally-minded enjoy world music more than those who were less internationally-minded.

**Recommendations For Future Research**

Although this study reveals a connection between the development of international-mindedness and world music immersion, more research is needed to investigate other factors that effect international-mindedness in the music classroom—factors that could include past cultural experiences, musical background, and/or propensity for languages. It seems that music instruction that is rich in contextualization is a fundamental component that effected students’ enjoyment of their music. Perhaps, an extended or expanded study of musical and cultural exploration into one culture might lend insight to international-
mindedness outcomes if a school spent time frames greater than one week focused on one culture and its music. Those who were more internationally-minded appeared to enjoy the music more than those who scored less on international-mindedness. A study examining other factors that effect students’ appreciation for the music they study is warranted. Another interesting trajectory of research would be to discover whether the development of international-mindedness through the study of world musics is transformative relative to other cultures and musics. Perhaps a longitudinal study to determine how new and unfamiliar cultures and musics are effected by the growth in international-mindedness from prior cultural musical study and performance would shed light upon the transformative nature of world music study.

As the world becomes more interdependent, children need adequate skills to function and flourish in a globally-connected society—the society awaiting them in subsequent generations. The characteristics of international-mindedness enable people to appreciate, tolerate, and respect cultural practices. Furthermore, the depth of international-mindedness is linked to the enjoyment and appreciation for world musics. If music educators can foster the characteristics of international-mindedness in their classrooms, students will enjoy and understand their music more, regardless (and because) of the cultural origins. Creating world musics authentically and with attention to context helps to build international-mindedness. As our students enter an increasingly international society, their attitudes and willingness to work with people of varying cultures will hinge on their prior education and experiences. As music educators, we can use the medium we love—music—to enlighten and effect change in the lives of our students, both musically and culturally. Can we do it? Can we afford not to?
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INTRODUCTION

Previous research in music education has identified the need to address the issues that music teachers face when working with a culturally and linguistically diverse student population (Carlow, 2004; Abril, 2003; Campbell, 2002; Robinson, 2002; Standley, 2000; Volk, 1998). Yet, coursework focused on developing and implementing curricula for diverse populations in school music programs, is not traditionally included in music teacher education programs. Although many colleges and universities are finding ways to incorporate world music and multicultural methods in their traditional general, choral and instrumental methods courses, there are still many deficiencies in pre-service preparation for working with English-language learners (ELLs). At best, most pre-service music teachers receive minimal training in working with language-minority children (Abril, 2003).

Robinson (2002) argued that teacher education is the most powerful and pervasive barrier to effective multicultural music education practice. She wrote, “Music educators are expected to teach musical and cultural content and perspectives for which they have little to no education” (p. 229). She also suggested that while many colleges and universities acknowledge the importance of moving beyond Eurocentric curricula that stress Western literature, philosophy, political theory, history, art, and music, many educators and others do not embrace this multicultural initiative. She continued, “the American music education curriculum has changed very little since the early 1900s” (p. 230).

Additionally, most of today’s teachers completed music education programs prior to the current emphasis on teaching multicultural content and perspectives (Robinson, 2002). Furthermore, many current music teachers have had little instruction or guidance in
working with linguistically diverse students. In a study of immigrant students in a high school choral classroom Carlow (2004) found a high level of teach dependence on contextual language as the main vehicle for transfer of musical knowledge and that ELL students are often placed at a disadvantage in music classrooms because of this reliance.

The letter below is an excerpt of an email the author sent to music education students enrolled in an elective course entitled “Teaching Music to Special Populations” to prepare them for an upcoming class discussion on linguistic capital. Aware that her students were non-Spanish speakers who would soon be student teaching students whose first language was Spanish, the instructor deliberately sent this letter in Spanish only by email to all students in the class with the assignment for the next week attached – also in Spanish.

Dear Students,
Thanks for your part in a wonderful class discussion last night. Our discussions highlighted the powerfully complex issues associated with linguistic diversity within a classroom. Some of the broad themes we touched upon were:
- English Only – a policy of exclusion.
- Whose language and culture is it anyway?
- You can’t teach me until you know me.
- You can’t really know me if you don’t know my culture.
- Language and culture are intricately connected

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

American public education has been charged with the job of homogenizing and balancing the many cultures, languages and religions in our communities. The very nature of this intermingling offers the potential to create a new and broader environment (Dewey, 1916). However, throughout the history of American education, traditional schooling has mostly proven itself at odds with Dewey’s vision. From its beginnings, the function of school was to disseminate the values of the officially defined culture and language. Clearly, there were striking ethnic, racial, and class differences between schools and their communities, and this clash produced many stresses (Seller & Weis, 1997). These differences surfaced as overall cultural difference as well as a disjunction between popular and official culture. Education had to narrow the distance between the classroom and the outside world.

Linguistic Diversity and Social Capital

Linguistic diversity in communities and schools is widely accepted and embraced, and it is also widely assumed that ethnic, racial, linguistic, cultural, and other differences should play no part in our understanding or treatment of people (Nieto, 1999). However, this is often not the case in schools. An illustration of this assertion is the blocking of ELL students from certain classes or tracking them in vocational programs due to linguistic status. Language is usually the primary vehicle for identifying, manipulating, and changing power relations among people, so power is often exerted through verbal channels (Corson, 2001). Because of ELL students’ lack of linguistic capital (Corson), many face discrimination in school. The majority of educators in U.S. schools were taught in classrooms where styles of teaching reflected the notion of a single norm of thought, and these educators were encouraged to believe in a universal norm (Banks, 2001; Hooks, 1993; Sleeter, 1999).
This universal norm is a broad example of a discourse. *Discourse* is defined by O’Toole (1994) as a historically, socially, institutionally specific structure of statements and terms. Each discourse, then, promotes meanings that are particular to a specific group, culture, and historical period. In the classroom, discourse refers to how teachers and students use language to make meaning and share ideas. Our capacity to produce contradictory meanings highlights an important problem in education with regard to the language used in classrooms. Britzman (1991) referred to Foucault’s *regimes of discourse*, which she defined as the authoritatively sanctioned and conventionally taken-for-granted ways of understanding, speaking, and acting. Popkewitz (1999) argued that these pedagogical discourses are a way of including and excluding students and can set up some students up for failure in the classroom.

Findings in educational research have revealed that teacher attitudes, tolerance, and expectations greatly affect the classroom performance of linguistically diverse students. Young (1996) surveyed 30 elementary and middle-school teachers to sample their attitudes, philosophies, and levels of comfort with diverse students and the concept of multicultural education and reported a majority of respondents felt unsure of how to deal with students from cultures different from their own.

Standley (2000) created a course to increase prospective music educators’ tolerance of students identified as culturally diverse. In this study, the Pluralism and Diversity Attitude Assessment (PDAA) was used to assess teachers’ attitudes about diverse learners in the music classroom. Norrid-Lacey & Spencer (2000) sought to identify the educational experiences of Latino immigrants as related to their graduation rate Pappamihel’s (2002) study addressed issues of English language anxiety in two settings, ESL classes and mainstream classrooms.

While not specifically targeting ELL students, Gay (2000) synthesized much of the research on multicultural education (Banks, 1999; Nieto, 1992; Sleeter, 1999) and proposed the concept of culturally responsive teaching. Key components of culturally responsive teaching include teacher caring, teacher attitudes and expectations, formal and informal multicultural curriculum, culturally informed classroom discourse, and cultural congruity in teaching and learning strategies.

Significant to this report, research on culturally relevant programs and coursework for minority students in teacher education programs was examined in order to study effective strategies, materials, and class formats. Bennett (2002). Bollin (2007), Ernst-Šlavit (1998), and Goulet (1998) examined culturally responsive teacher education for First Nation student teacher reflection.

The notions of reflection-in-action, and reflection-on-action were central to physicist Schon’s (1984,) efforts in this area. The former is sometimes described as ‘thinking on our feet’. It involves looking to our experiences, connecting with our feelings, and attending to our theories in use. It entails building new understandings to inform our actions in the situation that is unfolding.

Bollin, (2007). examined student journals and guided reflections to formalize coursework study documenting the process of a tutoring program that joined pre-service educators s and struggling ELL students. Content analysis was used at the thematic level on student journals written to accompany the semester-long experience of tutoring. Overall, the pre-service teachers gained an understanding of the challenges facing the immigrant families, developed respect for the families’ home cultures, and gained confidence in their ability to teach children from diverse backgrounds.
In a similar program, Ernst-Slavit, et. al (1998) reported of a three year partnership program between a research university and a local elementary school in the creating of a K-5 weekly Spanish program staffed by college students majoring in elementary education with bilingual or ESL education endorsements. A central component of this program was the FLES (foreign language elementary school) methods course for preparation of college students. A salient feature of this form of pedagogy is the use of reflection for pre-service, secondary-level teachers.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

This article is based on qualitative interpretive analysis of student work, journals, and class discussions of a course entitled “Teaching Music to Special Populations.” Data was collected over two semesters of the course (in 2005 and 2007) The class was an upper level elective open to both graduate and undergraduate students who wanted to explore issues of linguistic diversity, social justice and culture through the lens of music education. While primarily focusing on issues of music education, this course was cross-listed with upper level special education courses so there were a number of students from the special education department in the class. These students were paired up with music education majors for their service learning assignments.

The premise of the formation of this course were my own years of teaching music to students who were linguistically different than myself – as well as my own feelings of being unprepared for such diversity. Despite the fact that this course was being offered at a university in the American southwest, and that the school districts within the vicinity had a majority of non-English speaking students enrolled, the author was aware that most students in the music education program were monolingual (English as their first and only language) and felt unprepared to teach music to student who did not speak English.

The primary research question was “How do music education majors perceive their readiness to work with English Language Learners (ELL)? Subsidiary questions were as follows:

- What are crucial aspects of culturally responsive music teaching?
- How can music teachers create learning environments that maintain the cultural integrity of every child while enhancing their students’ music and educational successes?
- How does a service learning experience focused on ELL students impact pre-service music teachers perception of their readiness?
- What are some teaching strategies that reflect culturally responsive music teaching?

The context of this research was centered around 2 semesters of student reflections, teacher journals and individual students’ video analysis of their own teaching. There were twenty-two participants involved in this research over the two semesters. For purposes of this report, identities and stories of participants from both semesters were combined and merged and pseudonyms were created and used throughout the analysis and interpretation. This report will highlight six students. Specifically, two undergraduate music education majors; two undergraduate special education majors; one music education graduate student and one graduate student in special education. Data also included my own teaching journal as well as course assignments and class notes from both semesters.
The course was organized around two areas, teaching music to ELL students and teaching music to students with special needs. Texts, class discussions, reflection prompts and lectures were organized around these broad categories. The course started with several weeks of broad discussions of social justice, diversity and stereotypes. A service-learning component to this course functioned as the capstone event of the semester. Each student was assigned to teach four music lessons to ELL students at a predetermined field site as well as four music lessons to children with special needs at a different field site.

With regard to the ELL learning service component, sites were chosen for their concentration of ELL students and some did not occur in music classrooms. With the exception of the two students (Josh and Sandy) who were sent to a school for deaf and hard of hearing (DHH) students, the only reflections that were analyzed were the course work aimed at ELL students. Josh and Sandy’s reflections provided insight to assumptions about sound and aural understanding that are often a part of traditional music education programs. The textbook used for the course was Culturally Proficient Instruction: A Guide for People Who Teach (Lindsay, et. al, 2002) and provided a number of writing and reflection prompts as well as a series of worksheets for examining individual bias and prior beliefs.

FINDINGS

Students came to class with many assumptions about multicultural music education and special education and their function in the larger role of culture, diversity and schooling. Many assumed that multicultural music education was primarily about repertoire. From my own research as well as my own experiences as a music teacher of linguistic and cultural minorities, in K-12 settings, I knew this was a very small part of the equation of teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students. From the very beginning coursework, readings and assignments were focused on the intersections between language and culture the examination of individual biases.

One of the first steps teachers can take is to engage in reflective self-analysis to examine their own attitudes toward different ethnic, racial, gender, and social class groups (Banks 2007; Delpit, 1995; Nieto, 1999). In general, all the students except for one started the class with more or less a colorblind view of music education in which music was the “universal” or common element in the classroom. The opening narrative, A Unifying Force, highlights this phenomenon playing out the early part of the semester.

Another example of assumptions of the political correctness of cultural blindness juxtaposed with feelings of guilt is illustrated in the assignment immediately following the above incident. The topic for the next class was general discussion of culture, stereotyping and a reading by Nancy Balaban (1995).

Critical to truly seeing and understanding the children we teach is the courage to reflect about ourselves. Facing our biases openly, recognizing the limits imposed by our embedded-ness in our own culture and experience, acknowledging the values and beliefs we cherish, and accepting the influence of emotions on our actions are extraordinary challenges. (p. 49)
I don’t see color.

I asked the students to comment on the reading as well as their own thoughts on the last class drumming and singing activity. This assignment was clearly an “on-action” reflection—with the action as previous class experience (Schon, 1984). The reading, though previously assigned served as a springboard for discussion of the events of the prior week’s class. Evelyn, the student from the above vignette was the only student to note her feelings of being singled out in a negative way in the singing activity. She wrote in her journal:

. . . I couldn’t agree more—but I think we are kidding ourselves if we think that we are truly looking at our own biases. I get so tired of being the Angry Black Woman in the classroom. It’s like she started that song knowing full well I was in here – and then she starts singing in that imitation of a Black Church Lady—and then they start laughing. Are you actually going to pretend that you have the right, the knowledge and the background to sing a song like that without being Black? (Journal Entry, January 2004)

Maxine, one of the undergraduate instrumental majors wrote of her impressions of the drumming and singing activity.

. . . My mom is an ESL teacher and so I have been in many situations – especially on the pueblos where I tried to make my white “self” invisible and just pretend that I am one of them. I think if you respect someone, they know it. I thought Evelyn’s reaction was totally overblown. We were just singing a song—and isn’t music a universal language anyway? (Journal Entry, January 2005)

Adele, who at first seemed oblivious to the interaction during her presentation later, wrote:

I can’t understand why Evelyn became so defensive. I was really working from the same set of assumptions that I did in my fieldwork for my thesis – that we have to be as authentic as possible in our presentation of multicultural material. I wasn’t trying to do a parody. After I confronted her at break she seemed a little calmer, but I really sensed she hated my presentation. (Journal Entry, January 2005)

Michael, also an undergraduate in instrumental music education answered the question from his perspective as a Hispanic man. He wrote:

I think this is an important thing to think about. I am Hispanic—but I don’t speak Spanish. I think we make many assumptions about someone when we look at their skin or hear about their last name. Because I have a Spanish last name, and I am brown, people assume I am a gang banger from the barrio and that I am going to steal the band instruments and sell them for drugs. (Journal Entry, January 2005)

Barbara, a second career student, had worked as a counselor in several local Indian pueblos and was returning back to college to get a degree in music education. She shared these thoughts from that first class:

What am I doing here? What in the world am I trying to prove. I have a nice, safe middle-class life, piano students and plenty of affirmation from my church job. I thought I wanted to be a part of the solution to what I think is broken in education. But now I am questioning my motives. Am I trying to be the savior – I really did
think that music could be used to mediate conflict, isolation and the inequities of poverty. But after reading Neurwith’s article, I feel like an imposter. I know that cultural differences are real – but I never imagined that I would have to confront my own racism. (Journal Entry, January 2005).

The concept of racism, bias and cultural difference played a major role in the early part of class discussion and student reflections. As the semester wore on, students seemed to become more aware of this and began to mention it more consciously in class and in their writing.

If they can’t understand me how can I teach?

When confronted with the prospect of the service learning requirement or the course, students initially reported great anxiety at the prospect of teaching students who were linguistically different from them. Once students were given their assignments with a short description of their individual field sites they were asked to write a one or two sentence reaction to their placements. Annie wrote, “I know I am too white, too rich and too …what is the word? English dominant? I will never be able to get students to listen to me.” Michael commented “I only know swear words in Spanish. At least they can’t cuss me out to my face.”

Being the senior member of the class (in age as well as educational experience) Barbara generally displayed a more developed ability to be reflective. Despite her degree in music education and a master’s degree in communications, her prior teaching did not include any group instruction except for her student teaching more than 20 years prior to taking the course. Her reaction to learning about her service-learning placement was “Goodness, this is frightening—I have several Hispanic friends who are of the same social economic status as my husband and me. I know they are bilingual but I have never heard them speak any language but English. I feel like such a colonialist.”

Evelyn, the most experienced teacher in the group was the only full-time teacher in the class. For practical reasons, she chose to work in her classroom for her field experience. She noted in her journal:

While I have been far too aware of my own feelings of marginalization, this course already has me thinking about my students, most of the from a completely different culture and linguistic background than me. I wonder how they must feel to be taught by a Black teacher. I wonder what “vibes” I am giving off. (Journal Entry, February 2005)

Adele’s fieldwork in an elementary school music classroom in New Orleans (pre-Katrina) with children who were mostly African American and Native American caused her great worry as well. She seemed to understand there were cultural differences between her own Anglo experiences and the worlds of these children, but she did not know how to work around them. She wrote:

I can’t believe there is such a stigma about holding hands and clapping and touching another child. I used these same games in the last school I taught at—granted it was a more rural, White population, but my game activity just fell flat. I wonder if I sang the song too fast or missed some steps in the teaching? (Journal Entry, March 2005)
Some of the participants’ initial experiences in the field reflecting “on” their Action (Scho, 1984) demonstrated this discomfort and lack of confidence as well. After her first day of her field experience in school with mostly Hispanic and Navajo students, Annie reported feelings of being conspicuously middle class as well as her first conscious experiences of feeling like an outsider. She wrote:

I knew I had aged enough not to be mistaken for a student. I made a point when picking out my wardrobe for that first day to wear clothes that showed I was mature. But as I watched the students with their rich Hispanic complexions stare at me as I stood there – I felt so out of place. I felt and was “other” in a way I had never experienced … I watched as they students filed in and greeted their teacher in Spanish—I have taken three years of Spanish and it serves me little. I understand only a few words here and there an, nothing to carry on a conversation. (Journal Entry, March 2005)

After her first day of teaching in her field site, Barbara noted, not only feeling at a loss that she could not understand the students, but also for the first time recognized that her assumptions about non-verbal communication were somewhat inaccurate.

One of the factors of which I became acutely aware during this class and especially during the teaching experience was the fact that I am not a Spanish speaker. To have been able to communicate at least a little with student in their original language would have been more effective I am sure. There were some things I just could not predict. Such as when my mentor teacher told me that three girls who smiled at me the entire time during the class— had no English whatsoever. I had no idea. How do you find out something like that? (Journal Entry, March 2005)

Michael, the only Hispanic student in the class continued to reiterate his feelings of discomfort about his inability to speak Spanish. Throughout the course he struggled with being seen as “White” even though he was Hispanic. This response highlights his perception that he was unable to connect with his students because of what he perceives as a class barrier.

I am from one of the old Hispanic families from this region – yet, I don’t speak Spanish. I felt so White when I went in to work with these high school kids I understood a little of what they were saying – something about a barrio I think. I know they had no intention of letting me teach them when they saw me the first time. And it was bad – that first time. I felt like I had nothing to give them. They couldn’t understand me – and I was really not sure how to get them interested in music. It wasn’t like I was trying to get them to play anything – I was trying to teach a lesson on the recording industry. I was really frustrated. They had no idea that I was on their side. (Journal Entry, March 2005)

Maxine too felt discomfort when she realized that the language barrier between herself and her students transcended her desire for connecting with the students. She also witnessed first hand the flaw in her long-held belief of music as a universal language. Maxine wrote:

My mom is an ESL teacher – and she only speaks English to her students. I have had many opportunities to watch her teach ELL students. I guess it was because she was working to teach them English so they were more receptive to her. When it was my turn to go out and teach an actual music lesson – I truly was terrified. I felt
completely like a fish out of water. I had always felt that music was a universal language—and I guess that is true with people who already KNOW music—but to go into a middle school and teach ELL students who were not enrolled in a music class and to try to teach them something without relying on speaking English—that was a true baptism by fire. (Journal Entry, March 2005)

Because of their interest in the connection between music and hearing loss, two students, Sandra and Jacob were placed in a field site that was a school for mainly deaf and hard of hearing (DHH) children. Josh, a senior vocal music education student noted an “inaction” awareness (Schoen, 1984).

The children themselves demonstrated to us our own innocent ignorance. Shortly after the lesson began we became aware that our lesson was not working. We looked at each other—and I knew we were done for. We were in our box—we had thought of and made endless accommodations for the population were to work with. But we could not counter the barrier between us. We at once realized that music meant nothing to these children. We were so reliant on sound-producing sound, speaking sound, playing sound, and singing sound that we were unable to engage the students past initial eye contact. (Journal Entry, March 2005)

Sandy, Josh’s field partner reflected on their teaching action:

We were thinking as elementary music teachers and not as instructors of deaf children. This was an eye-opening process in itself, to have to envision a world in which one would perceive existence without the ability to interpret sound as the hearing world does. (Journal Entry, March 2005)

As a whole, the class struggled with their sense that because their students were not able to comprehend their verbal communication (and in some cases, non-verbal) they were not effective as teachers. They began to question the role of music as unifier, began to explore strategies that compensated for more common discursive practices in the music classroom.

**Opening doors to communication**

The final project was a video-analysis of a 30-45 minute lesson in the field site. A portion of the analysis required the completion of a sequential protocol that required students to keep track of frequency of both:

1. Teacher: sing, talk, play
2. Student: sing, talk, play
While each student reported higher levels of comfort in their teaching situations, most students found that teacher talk dominated their lessons. Sandra and Josh noted that once they became comfortable working with translators for their DHH students they found more freedom in their teaching and felt as Josh put it more “in the zone” with the kids. Yet, once they stepped back and analyzed their videotapes, readily discovered that teacher talk dominated their teaching. Josh wrote:

We discussed how a school bus and a motorcycle feel different when they drive by. We discussed how they felt different using balloons.... We also got a chance to explain how woodwind instruments worked. After watching the tape and keeping track of our teacher “talk” I became aware that we were mainly talking to the interpreters. In retrospect, the students themselves were quite kind to us – but I wonder how much the children got from our discussions. We finally stopped talking and started showing. (Journal Entry, 2005)

Sandy’s early analysis was similar to Josh’s discovery of over use of teacher talk. She discusses what she calls the breakthrough:

Once we got out the balloons and showed the different kinds of vibrations possible from a clarinet, I think the students starting thinking about us a the music. (Journal Entry, 2005)

Annie’s videotaped lesson on theme and variation to a high school class was based on her doing a skit that involved using a play list of classical themes that were used as background music for television commercials. She wrote:

This lesson seemed to really engage the kids! My gestures and acting silly and using lots of slang words I heard them use seemed to bring them in. I watched as earbuds came out of pockets and cell phones went INTO pockets. And I think the pantomime skit helped the kids see me. Still many of the students’ eyes started to glaze over after hearing words like “pizzicato or Mendelssohn I remember describing the Imperial March as representing a formidable opponent. Their teacher asked of they knew what formidable meant. I could feel my “relate-ability” with kids rapidly disappearing. Then I pointed to the Word Wall that my mentor teacher helped me create. Whew. (Student Journal Entry, 2007)

Evelyn, the most experienced teacher of the group chose to do her final project in her own classroom and invited me to view the final lesson on her series on the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the settling of the American west. She noted:

I was thrilled that the students were able to do the step dance and poem that they created. It was a gift to see these students – many of them heritage Spanish speakers able to speak the poem in rhythm and dance at the same time. But when it was all said and done, I think I spent too much time reviewing this history of the 9th and 10th Cavalry – when all they wanted to do was to perform the dance and sing the song. (Student Journal, 2005)
Interestingly, Michael who initially worried about his inability to speak Spanish to his students found great success by allowing his students to do most of the talking in his videotaped lesson. He reported:

> The students were divided into groups in which they felt comfortable. The students all worked together to create an imaginative yet very effective storyboard for their presentation. If I felt that there would be a language issue, I ensured that there was a point person in each group that could explain the lesson and its instructions. I was extremely proud to see the students design such an effective plot while still having the courage to stand up in front of their peers and speak with enthusiasm about their project. (Student Journal, 2005)

Students who are preparing for careers as teachers enter into teacher education programs with many biases and preconceived ideas about culture, diversity and communication. Music education students who spend much of their time preparing for careers as musicians often are overwhelmed by the prospect of having to deal with communication and discourse issues when faced with ELL students in their classrooms. In the next section I will briefly discuss implications of the findings of this study as well as the implications for music teacher education programs.

ANAYLSIS AND DISCUSSION

Most participants in this study held rigid beliefs about race, culture and diversity at the beginning of the class. As a group, they were timid in discussions at the start of the semester and seemed to put much energy into not offending their peers with their comments or questions in class. In the vignette A Unifying Force, one student’s attempts at presenting music authentically come unraveled as she senses she is offending another student. The journal entries following that presentation were very much in line with Neurwirth’s (2003) report of her own shifting of cultural content knowledge and consciousness. Neurwirth described many efforts of putting her notions of cultural materials in context only to discover that she didn’t have enough information, material or personal frame of reference to do so.

Students reacted to Evelyn’s body language and Adele’s attempts to compensate; some by giggling and some by shutting down altogether. Adele later confided to me that she had never experienced so much hostility in a teaching situation. Once the two women talked, they were able to understand each other’s viewpoint but Neurwirth (2003) cautions “Good intentions are not enough; sometimes they can be dangerous” (p. 275). Sometimes sources of information are not at all accurate.

Michael’s journal entries about his Hispanic lineage and his feelings of disconnection from in his words the “gang banger” culture of the Mexican immigrants he was teaching suggest a strong sense of what Rumbaut and Portes (2001) call the rainbow underclass, where one generation – usually an earlier generation of a particular immigrant group sees themselves as superior.
This was also apparent in Annie’s early reflections as she described several of her students as typical “gang banger” types. While Annie was speaking from an Anglo perspective her bias and stereotyping were clear and similar to a theme in Michael’s writing. In her early reflections, Barbara indicated that she was much more comfortable dealing with people who shared her same outlook on life. She wrote: “I have come to believe that I need to examine even more closely the attitudes I take with me into any interaction. My assumptions may not be accurate or healthy” (Journal Entry, 2005).

Students reported feeling out of place and awkward in the initial stages of their field experiences. This was likely due to the fact that many of them were not in traditional music teaching situations and that in addition to having to learn to communicate with linguistically diverse students, they also had to set up some kind of frame of reference for music learning. Several students tackled this problem by using popular music, singing, rapping and dancing as strategies to create student interest. Some used gesture, slower speech, as well as a scaffolding approach to vocabulary through word walls and storyboards.

This was by far much easier for the students in the special education program than for the music education students. Michael used the idea of creating a storyboard for a commercial of the “story of their lives” and used students’ selected musical excerpts in the background. Later he used some of these selections and created listening maps with students that highlighted the theme of the song lyrics. Evelyn was able to find ways to channel her love for liturgical dance and hip hop music into a history lesson involving the Buffalo soldiers.

Across both semesters, the traditional music education students struggled at first when bringing music lessons to their field sites as compared with the special education student teachers. Perhaps it was because they “knew too much” as Sandy put it and had difficulty communicating without teaching as they were taught key musical terms, composers and musical works. They discovered that much traditional teaching in music relies heavily on discursive practices and canons that have been associated with school music for centuries.

Finally, perhaps the most significant variable in this study was the fact that half the field sites involved non-traditional music teaching and learning environments. As mentioned earlier, these sites were chosen for their concentration of ELL students; thereby forcing the students to deal with the discursive element of traditional music teaching head on. This was especially true in the three secondary placements. Working in language arts classes and a history class forced the participants to move beyond the traditional cultural meaning systems that have presented for centuries in music education.

Discourses function and circulate by appearing as normal, as common sense, or by claims of truth and scientific knowledge. This became apparent in the beginning of the semester as I presented concepts of cultural diversity in terms of student populations instead of repertoire and curricular issues. Many students brought to the class a belief of music as a universal language; believing music (whatever the context) was something that has cross-cultural meaning.

Josh and Sandy’s field placement with the DHH students seemed to be the one that was the most outlying and unique and therefore helped transform their beliefs about the role of music. Josh wrote:
Ever since that last lesson I have been endlessly questioning music as an aesthetic. I have been wondering if maybe we are going after the wrong goal for our musical expressions. Should we do music for the sake of music or for the sake of what music represents? It was hard to tell what music represented to my students. I wonder if we make those same assumptions about music and students from other cultural and linguistic backgrounds? (Student Journal Entry, 2005)

The broad implications of this study suggest that there are cultural meaning systems in music education that are highly embedded in the everyday teaching of music in not only K-12 settings, but also higher education as well. Issues of racism, bias and stereotyping exist as a natural part of the human endeavor of teaching. The findings of this study show that meaningful participation in discussion, teaching and reflection can help student become aware of these biases in music education and teaching practice can be transformed.

One response to the need to prepare future teachers as multicultural educators is to use service learning with an immigrant population as part of a teacher education program. This article documents the impact of a project that engaged pre-service teachers in tutoring struggling young ELL students- in most cases – when the focus on music was secondary to the focus on student learning/engagement.

Examination of materials and papers suggested the evolving responsiveness, awareness and gradual transformation of pre-service music education students through their reflective writing and interaction with each other. This study revealed some of the central issues and tensions monolingual and mostly white undergraduate music education students faced when considering changing traditional music teaching methods to accommodate ELL students.

Themes that emerged were: either an espousal or refusal of a color-blind teaching philosophy; the roles of cultural and linguistic capital; and discursive power structures of the dominant language group. Findings suggested that undergraduate music education students perceived themselves to be unprepared to deal with ELL students in the music classroom. Results also implied an increased student awareness of a reliance on traditional discursive practices in the music classroom (such as lecture, Socratic questioning, the dependence on verbal imagery from the podium) as well a bias of verbal- only communication with students.
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Historical Beginnings of Historically Black College and Universities

According to the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES, 2011), there are a total of 4,474 institutions of higher education in the United States and of those, 105 are Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Although these institutions represent 2.3% of the number of higher education institutions in the United States, they enroll approximately 11.6% of African American students pursuing a post-secondary degree, contributing to 33% of degrees earned by African Americans (Matthews, 2011).

HBCUs have a shorter history than that of universities in general. Cheyney University was the first HBCU, established in Pennsylvania in 1837. For comparison, Harvard University, the first institution of higher education in the United States, was established in 1636. Throughout the eighteenth century most U.S. universities limited enrollment to whites, although this racial segregation was largely unacknowledged. In response to this racial separation, uniquely designed schools were created to educate and empower African Americans. These schools would become the foundation for what are now known as HBCUs (Allen & Jewell, 2002).

The history of HBCUs is related to the founding of normal schools and state teachers colleges through religious organizations and philanthropic land grants (Harper, 2007). Following establishment of Cheyney University in 1837, other HBCUs were founded, some of them prior to the passage of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of The United States which abolished slavery, and the end of the Civil War, both in 1865 (Allen & Jewell, 2002). The National Land-Grant Colleges Act of 1862, also known as the First Morrill Act, supplied land and federal funds to institutions that provided higher education to low and middle income Americans (Reed, 1998). The First Morrill Act funded institutions that exclusively enrolled white students. However, in 1871, Alcorn State University in Fort Gibson, Mississippi, became the first public HBCU established using Morrill Act funds. In 1890, twenty-five years after the end of the Civil War, Congress passed the Second Morrill Act. This legislation required all states that supported the idea of a dual system in higher education for whites and African Americans to provide at least one land grant to establish and maintain a black college equating to that of a white institution (Reed, 1998).

It is important to recognize that both pre- and post-Civil War HBCUs have, in some cases, even earlier histories. HBCUs did not begin as multifaceted structures of academia, but as small organizations in the early 1800s, operating with very modest resources in efforts to teach freed slaves basic skills and etiquette. According to Allen & Jewell (2002), the pursuit of equal access in the United States has been a very burdensome task for African Americans in education. Due to racial and social restrictions, African Americans were limited to a small percentage of institutions of education that specifically educated African Americans.

Apart from encountering various obstacles of establishing earlier institutions of learning for African Americans, challenging the practices of segregation in addition to societal and legal structures that support such proved to be just as daunting. In 1897, the court case that initiated change within public primary and secondary education in the U.S. was Plessy v. Ferguson. The court’s ruling was that “separate but equal institutions were constitutional in primary and secondary public schools” (Allen & Jewell, 2002). The U.S.
Supreme Court 57 years later overturned those findings in the decision of Brown v. Board of Education (1954), ruling that “separate but equal public primary and secondary schools were unconstitutional,” by granting all students the right to attend any K-12 public school regardless of their race (Allen & Jewell, 2002). The U.S. Supreme Court failed to mandate a timeline to implement the process of desegregation and integration, however, this process was not deliberately initiated in a few states until 1955. Nonetheless, this court ruling only integrated K-12 public schools; it did not solidify equal education opportunity for African Americans (Yosso, Parker, Solozano & Lynn, 2004).

The Brown ruling inspired future efforts to continue to create a better educational environment for all citizens. For instance, in Hawkins v. Board of Control (1956), the U.S. Supreme Court used the same benchmarks of Brown v. Board of Education, allowing equal access to institutions of higher education in the state of Florida. According to Roebuck and Murty (1993), many people did not encourage nor welcomed such rulings, especially in the southern states. For African Americans, eating at the same lunch table, using the same restrooms and even worshiping in the same church with white Americans was strongly discouraged.

In 1964, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title IV of that act stated that no institution could use federal funds that also supported segregation. The U.S. Attorney General issued lawsuits to those public K–12 schools that endorsed segregation and that also received federal funds under Title IV. Six years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund filed suit against the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) in the court case of Adams v. Richardson (1970). HEW was found guilty of allocating federal funds to states with dual education systems designed to create barriers for a particular race, ethnicity, or minority, in this case, African Americans. The next year, the Higher Education Act of 1965 was established. This legislation included Title III, also referred to as “Strengthening and Developing Institutions.” The United States Congress, in Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, defined HBCUs as institutions whose mission was to exclusively educate blacks (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). According to Roebuck and Murty (1993), this legislation was designed as a “direct intercession, favoring black colleges and universities and as a federal commitment to the survival and enhancements of HBCUs” (Roebuck & Murty, 1993, p. 668).

States were not only required to enforce desegregation, but also to increase access to all institutions of higher education for all minorities (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). As a result, HEW was ordered by the federal courts in 1977 to create guidelines for states with dual systems to follow while preparing “desegregation strategies in compliance with Title IV.” In an effort to monitor usage of federal funds, the U.S. Supreme Court required the Office for Civil Rights, now part of the Department of Education, to monitor desegregation plans of those states who were suspect of having segregated systems (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

In 1992, the U.S. Supreme Court found the state of Mississippi guilty of possessing portions of their former de jure segregated system. Allen and Jewell (2002) state that de jure segregation is the enforcing of segregation by law supporting the ideas of a dual system; conversely, de facto is the enforcing of segregation using pre-existing social constructs. In response, the U.S. Supreme Court mandated that all public institutions of higher education in Mississippi, both HBCUs and traditionally white institutions, find ways to eliminate all remnants of a dual system. The U.S. Supreme Court suggested institutions of higher education in Mississippi should implement the following: 1) revise admission policies; 2) consolidate duplicated degree programs; 3) revise their system of institutional mission classification (“comprehensive” v. “regional and urban”); and 4) consider consolidating all public institutions into a lesser number.
Environments of HBCUs

Allen (1992) contends that HBCUs provide a very unique environment of learning for African American students through fostering both social and psychological outlets, thereby contributing to students’ overall success. Allen (1992) found that students tend to engage in their studies and campus activities when they are able to relate to other students through networking, supportive relationships, and multiple social outlets. In regards to psychological outlets, a sense of empowerment or ownership coupled with self-esteem, belonging and comfort positively effects student learning and engagement. Allen (1992) found that experiences of engagement, acceptance and encouragement from faculty, fellow peers, and administration were reported by African Americans attending HBCUs.

A study conducted by Chen, Ingram, and Davis (2007) focused on the engagement of African American students at HBCUs and Predominately White Institutions (PWIs). Their study used data retrieved from the 2005 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Samples included 1,631 seniors from 17 HBCUs and 2,939 seniors from 246 PWIs. Researchers found that African American students at HBCUs were more engaged than their peers at PWIs with the institution and its culture, working with peers and faculty members through collaborative learning opportunities that enriched their educational experience (Chen, Ingram, & Davis, 2007).

Historical Background of Sample Institutions

Howard University (HU) was founded as Howard Normal and Theological Institute in 1867 in Washington, D.C. Howard is not affiliated with a religious organization; at present it is a private institution. Currently, enrollment is approximately 10,623 students (http://www.blackcollegesearch.com). Like other music programs that began in the Normal School era, HU’s music program offered only a few music courses. In 1892, the music program was later established as an conservatory and later recognized as a department of the College of Fine Arts in 1974, functioning as one of three arts areas of the Division of Fine Arts of the College of Arts and Sciences (Mbajekwe, 2006). Today, HU offers bachelor of music degrees in composition, jazz studies, music education, music history, music therapy, performance, and a bachelor of music with elective studies in business. HU also offers a master of music in the following areas: jazz studies, music education, and performance (NASM Handbook, 2012).

Xavier University-Louisiana (XULA) is a private liberal arts college that was established in 1915 in New Orleans, Louisiana. Enrollment is approximately 4,121 students (http://www.blackcollegesearch.com). XULA is also the only black university of 253 institutions in the United States that is associated with the Roman Catholic Church. Xavier is ranked first in granting degrees to African American students in biology, physics, and physical science, in addition to ranking first in enrolling and graduating African Americans in pharmacy (Mbajekwe, 2006). In addition to its national accomplishments in medicine, Xavier also offers a bachelor of arts degree and a bachelor of music degree in music education and performance (Mbajekwe, 2006; NASM Handbook, 2012).

In 1887, Central State University (CSU), located in Wilberforce, Ohio, began as an extension of Wilberforce University, associated with the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church, as an industrial and normal department. The department was designed to educate African American students in education and vocational studies. In 1941, the department evolved into the College of Education and Industrials Arts at Wilberforce. Ten years later,
the college changed its name to Central State University (Mbajekwe, 2006). Enrollment is approximately 1,820 students (http://www.blackcollegesearch.com). CSU offers bachelor of music degrees in jazz studies, music education, and performance (NASM Handbook, 2012).

Prairie View A&M University (PVAMU), established in 1876, is the first state-supported college in Texas of African Americans and the second oldest public institution in Texas (Mbajekwe, 2006). PVUAMU is located in Prairie View, Texas, approximately forty-eight miles west of Houston, Texas. PVAMU has an average student population of 8,350 (http://www.blackcollegesearch.com). This institution is best known for its engineering and ROTC programs (Mbajekwe, 2006). PVAMU offers a bachelor of arts in music and a bachelor of music degrees in music education and performance (NASM Handbook, 2012).

Methodology

Data were collected for this pilot study using the NCES database, NASM directory, and websites of all HBCUs and their undergraduate bulletins. Using the NCES database, I gathered a list of HBCUs, including location, funding type, and website. Through this process, I was able to identify the total number of HBCUs (N = 105). Next, I searched each website to determine whether or not each institution had a music program and offered music degrees. Next, I searched the NASM directory of accredited institutions to determine each institution’s NASM accreditation status. Based on the accreditation standards of NASM, curricula of selected baccalaureate degree programs in music education were examined. Using purposive sampling, four institutions (n = 4) were selected based on the following criteria: 1) location; 2) student population; 3) funding type and; 4) the presence of an undergraduate music education program with licensure. More specifically, I sought two private and two public institutions of diverse sizes with accredited music programs located in different geographical regions. The following institutions’ music education curricula were selected from the 27 schools that were found to be NASM accredited: Howard University, Xavier University-Louisiana, Central State University, and Prairie View A&M University.

The purpose of this study is to examine the commonalities and differences among these four representative curricula. This baseline data are essential to understanding these particular institutions and as a resource for a future study for comparing HBCUs and PWIs.

Results

A total of 74 HBCUs offer music degrees. As illustrated in Tables 1 and 2, 27 of these HBCUs are NASM accredited institutions: 18 public and 9 private. At least one undergraduate degree in music is offered by all accredited institutions. Most institutions only offer a bachelor of music degree, while Howard offers various undergraduate degree programs. It should be noted that Tables 1 and 2 are listed to provide contextual data.
Table 1 Private NASM Accredited HBCUs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REG</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>BMEd</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>MMEd</th>
<th>MSEd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisk University</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University*</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>C/J/ME</td>
<td>MH/MTp</td>
<td>J/ME/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse College</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton University</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claflin University</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillman College</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Memorial University</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CM/J</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spellman College</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier University-</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/ME/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Tables 1 and 2
EST = Established

TYPE: PR=Private, PU=Public

REG: S=South, MW=Midwest

BA = Bachelor of Arts, BM = Bachelor of Music, BS = Bachelor of Science, BMEd = Bachelor of Music Education

MA = Master of Arts, MM = Master of Music, MMEd - Master of Music Education, and MSEd = Master of Science in Education, MSEd = Master of Science in Education

Degrees: M = music, ME = music education, P = performance, C = composition, J = Jazz, MH = music history, MTp = music therapy, B = business, MTh = music theory
Table 2 Public NASM Accredited HBCUs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REG</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>BME</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>MME</th>
<th>MSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>BME</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MME</td>
<td>MSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama State University</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State University</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University*</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ME/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson State University</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State University</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University*</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>J/ME/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City State University</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem State University</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina State University</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling State University</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee State University</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ME/Me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley State University</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The institutions listed in Tables 1 and 2 offer the following number of undergraduate music degrees: Bachelor of Arts in Music = 19, Music Education = 3, Performance = 1, and Music with sound recording = 1; Bachelor of Music in Music Education = 4, Jazz = 3, Performance = 4, Church Music = 1, Music History = 1, Music Therapy = 1, Business = 1, and Music Technology = 1; Bachelor of Science in Music Education = 5 and Music = 5; and lastly Bachelor of Music Education = 5.

Five of these institutions offer a masters degree in music in addition to undergraduate degrees offered. Those institutions include Howard University, Norfolk University, Alabama State University, Tennessee State University, and Morgan State University. Masters degrees offered by these institutions include the following: Master of Arts =1; Master of Music in Music Education = 2, Performance = 2, Jazz = 1, Music Theory = 1, Composition = 1; Master of Education in Music Education = 1; and finally Master of Science in Education (Music Education). None of the institutions listed in Tables 1 and 2 offer a doctoral degree in music.

Obtaining accreditation through NASM requires institutions to adhere to specific structural guidelines. Focusing on music education degrees, curriculum is required in the following: 1) 30 to 35% general education; 2) 15 to 20% professional education and; 3) at least 50% of basic musicianship and performance units (NASM Handbook, 2012). General education units include but are not limited to math, science, history and english coursework. According to Table 3, PVAMU requires students to complete 42 units in general education, contributing 32% to the total program. It would appear that PVAMU is the only institution that adheres to NASM standards; CSU, XULA, and HU lack the number of units to meet general education standards. It should be noted however that many institutions double-count courses in multiple categories; therefore, these percentages as determined by catalog review only may be inaccurate. The same problem in counting credits applies to the other NASM categories.
Table 3 Undergraduate Music Education Curriculum at Selected HBCUs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES/UNITS</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>PVAMU</th>
<th>XULA</th>
<th>HU-P</th>
<th>HU-I</th>
<th>HI-O</th>
<th>HU - V&amp;G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education Units</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Education Units</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; General Education Courses</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based Courses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Play / Accompaniment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Ensemble</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Ensemble</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recital Class</td>
<td>7S</td>
<td>8S</td>
<td>8S</td>
<td>8S</td>
<td>7S</td>
<td>7S</td>
<td>7S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recital Class</td>
<td>7S</td>
<td>8S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Recital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical and Historical Courses</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Theory</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music History</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnomusicology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight-Singing / Ear training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition / Arranging / Orchestration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard Harmony</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Instrumental Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(add.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass Class / Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwind Class / Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion Class / Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Class / Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COURSES/UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>PVAMU</th>
<th>XULA</th>
<th>HU-P</th>
<th>HU-I</th>
<th>HI-O</th>
<th>HU-V&amp;G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice Class/Methods &amp; Pedagogy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar Class/Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Class/Methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Proficiency</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education Courses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro to Mus Ed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed (K-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Trends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Tech Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum/Intern</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp./Prof., Sop., Jr., &amp; Sr. Exams</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Music Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>PVAMU</th>
<th>XULA</th>
<th>HU-P</th>
<th>HU-I</th>
<th>HI-O</th>
<th>HU-V&amp;G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL CREDIT HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>PVAMU</th>
<th>XULA</th>
<th>HU-P</th>
<th>HU-I</th>
<th>HI-O</th>
<th>HU-V&amp;G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key: Table 3**

* = Students studying this specific instrument are not required to take this course
S = Semester
Y = Implies requirement for students

Professional education units are often offered by the school of education within an institution. Courses that are classified as professional education courses include but are not limited to studies in psychological, philosophical and social foundations of education, special education, and the history of education. NASM requires 15 to 20% of curriculum to be composed of professional education units. CSU and XULA require students to complete 28 to 36 units of professional education coursework, allowing both institutions to meet NASM standards, contributing 18% to 22% of the total program of study. PVAMU and HU are slightly behind NASM standards by 1%; however, a Bachelor of Music in Music Education with an emphasis in Organ at HU does meet NASM standards.
NASM requires at least 50% of an institution’s curriculum to be comprised of music study which includes but is not limited to music performance, music theory and history, music education and methods coursework. All institutions listed in Table 3 fulfill NASM standards except XULA. They require students to complete 66 units, contributing to only 40%, falling short of meeting NASM standards by 10%. The following institutions require completion of the following music units and percentages: CSU, 90 units (59%); PVAMU, 72 units (55%) and; HU 83 to 88 units (66 to 71%). XULA’s curriculum exceeds the suggested general and professional education units prescribed by NASM. CSU, PVAMU and HU did not adhere to the those standards; however, they successfully meet the music standards.

For this study, music coursework is divided into four essential areas: performance based coursework, theoretical and historical, methods, and music education. Performance based studies include any course whose primary purpose is to provide the student with musical performance opportunity. Those courses include applied studies, large and small ensembles, and recital class. Common performance units are disbursed throughout every institutions in the following areas; large ensembles, recital class and senior recitals. Table 3 illustrates findings that are specific to studies within music coursework.

Within performance based studies, XULA require students to complete 32 units, emphasizing applied study in both primary and secondary instruments and large ensemble study. Other institutions illustrate an eclectic approach to performance; specifically HU, appears to provide specificity towards performance in the areas of small ensemble work and accompaniment studies for piano majors.

Theoretical and historical areas include music theory and history, music literature, ethnomusicology, counterpoint, arranging and form and analysis. This area appears to be in all institutions except XULA who may appear to place greater emphasis in music literature and theory only; however, it may be assumed that XULA may combine several concepts within literature and theory. For instance, form and analysis and counterpoint may be included in theory; whereas, ethnomusicology may be included in literature.

Methods courses include but are not limited to studies in instrumental methods, pedagogy, class piano, and instrumental survey. CSU require students to complete 20 units in this area. PVAMU and HU require students to take 10 to 14 units. Although these numbers may appear small in comparison to other areas, PVAMU and HU offer their students various courses within the methods area. CSU, PVAMU, and HU illustrate an interest in providing the opportunity for their students to engage in multiple methods courses, while XU does not.

Music education coursework includes but is not limited to coursework in elementary and secondary music education, music technology, introduction to music education, practicum and internship, and conducting. CSU and HU illustrate commonalities in the distribution of music education coursework, requiring completion of 12 to 15 units in introduction to music education, elementary and secondary education and music technology. PVAMU and XULA exhibit less significant number of units in music education.
Discussion

Despite the fact that 105 HBCUs in the U.S. represent less than .03% of the institutions of higher education in the United States and contribute 33% of post-secondary degrees earned by African Americans in the United States, HBCUs continue to excel in the twenty-first century. They provide various learning opportunities for all students, more specifically African Americans. HBCUs have also proven to be successful in academics through extensive research, liberal arts, the sciences, and other disciplines (Mbajekwe, 2006); however, HBCUs are facing present and future challenges regarding their music programs.

Findings of this study show that 74 schools of 105 offer music degrees, of those 74 HBCU music degree-granting institutions, only 27 are accredited through NASM. All institutions offer music performance degrees; while, only 13 of those institutions offer undergraduate music education degrees with licensure. These findings suggest that these institutions do not offer degree programs that larger institutions may offer. A lack of offerings may discourage those students who are interested in programs other than music education and performance at larger institutions. Perhaps a lack of staff and faculty, resources and/or funding may explain why these institutions are limited in non-prevalent music degree areas like music industry, history and theory.

Though all institutions are not required to obtain NASM accreditation, the U.S. Secretary of Education requires institutions that wish to obtain funding through Title IV to seek accreditation from a “recognized institutional agency” (NASM Handbook, 2012). Although all colleges and universities may not need funding, obtaining NASM accreditation provides a framework that allows institutions to adhere to the same standards and expectations in efforts to providing students a quality education.

Data illustrates that only five institutions offer a masters degree in music. In addition, of 105 HBCUs, none offer doctoral degrees. For those students who desire to continue their graduate studies at a HBCU or to transition from an HBCU to a graduate music program at a PWI, may encounter various obstacles. These limitations may discourage students who may want to pursue a doctorate degree at an accredited HBCU. Due to the fact that doctoral music programs are not currently offered at HBCUs, students have no other choice than to attend other institutions. African American students aspiring to attend a graduate institution whose environment is composed of familiar social and cultural cues, contributing to their confidence in the institution and themselves, may not be able to attend a HBCU (Allen, 1992). Funding, resources, and student population may explain limitations discussed in relation graduate degree program offerings at HBCUs. Further research is needed to explore such limitations, but should not be over-looked.

Though HBCUs offer students unique learning environments, students who choose to attend HBCUs for music study face incredible limitations regarding to the availability of degree programs, particularly, non-prevalent music degrees and graduate music degrees. Further research is needed to investigate the lack of offerings of degree programs in music. In addition, minimum offerings of graduate programs in music and the substantially large number of HBCU music programs without NASM accreditation should be examined.
Findings suggest that there are extreme differences in the balance of courses required between various music education programs at HBCUs. Although these institutions are NASM accredited, the researcher found that there are concerns that should be addressed. Curriculum should be balanced in the areas of general education, professional education and music. When one of these areas is over-extended, other areas lack. In table 3, Xavier University’s curriculum is heavily composed of general and professional education units, while music units lack greatly.

It is possible that students who earn music degrees from HBCUs with less balanced curricula may experience difficulty transitioning into a teaching job or into a graduate music education degree program. For example, when programs decide not to include courses like woodwind methods, practicum, elementary and secondary methods in their curriculum, students may lack important information and skills needed to successfully negotiate student-teaching and quite possibly their first years as a novice teacher. Lack of skills and necessary information may also contribute to low retention rates in public schools.

It is also possible that the out of balance curricula have resulted from gradual revisions and addition of requirements to the program. More balanced curricula might result from regular program reviews by faculty at these HBCUs.

Significance of the Study

HBCUs have proven to be impressive institutions of higher learning, offering students a very unique learning environment. Despite their impressive history, music programs at HBCUs are experiencing various challenges that may hinder their effectiveness and existence. The majority of HBCU music programs only offer music performance degrees, limiting student choice. In addition, none of the HBCUs offer doctoral programs in music and only 5 HBCUs offer graduate music programs that are NASM accredited. Should students choose to enroll into a graduate music program at an HBCU, they have limited numbers of NASM accredited institutions from which to choose. On the other hand, should students choose to transition into a graduate music degree program at a PWI, they are more likely to encounter social and cultural obstacles that may possibly interfere with the student’s learning.

Curriculum imbalances and accreditation issues are pressing matters that HBCUs must address to further improve student learning and their programs as a whole. In terms of pre-service teacher development, HBCUs may not provide a well-balanced curriculum that will give music education majors the most effective learning opportunities. Though all music institutions are not required to obtain NASM accreditation, the U.S. Secretary of Education requires institutions who are looking to obtain funding through Title IV to acquire accreditation from a “recognized institutional agency” (NASM Handbook, 2012). Obtaining NASM accreditation provides a framework that allows institutions to adhere to the same standards and expectations in efforts to providing students a quality, yet equal education.
This pilot study provides awareness to specific yet important issues HBCUs are facing; however, additional research is needed to further investigate and resolve these issues. The balance of courses observed in this study was based on catalog review only. Future studies should account for institutional double-counting, variation in course titles and faculty expertise, and course content. Interviews with faculty or detailed surveys may provide more accurate information about the balance of content in curricula. A large scale study of the music curricula with all 27 NASM accredited HBCUs may also provide valuable information.
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