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ABSTRACT

Experts agree: music matters. It is fundamental to the human condition. Studies confirm its particular importance throughout early childhood, and yet, for most American preschool children high quality, developmentally appropriate music instruction is missing from their daily preschool experience. The purpose of this collective case study was to describe and interpret the impact of a site-specific, school-wide collaboration in music education on the attitudes and practices of twelve early childhood practitioners working together in a Reggio-inspired preschool setting. The research questions this study sought to answer were:

Research Question One: How does the collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms?

Research Question Two: How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners?

Research Question Three: How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?

Practitioners participated in a four-month collaboration with a music educator and researcher, based on fundamental tenets of developmentally appropriate practice in music education for young children. The children at the preschool (n = 100) were secondary participants in this study. Participants’ development of individual and community practice in music education was chronicled through interviews, artifacts, and lesson observations. Audio and video documentation of meetings and instruction were transcribed and analyzed. Data analysis
was accomplished through iterative cycles of open, axial, and thematic coding. Conceptual memos guided the researcher to themes emerging across cases.

Study findings illustrate how participants’ self and community identity impacted their adoption of new instructional strategies in music education and that their musical awareness improved over time. Teachers’ assessment of their own and their children’s musical skills and knowledge contributed to their improved practice in music education. Study findings also supported the co-constructed design of the professional development model, and confirmed the importance of researcher flexibility toward participant needs, practices, and the influence of setting on the mentorship. The model holds promise for future collaborations between music and early childhood professionals and asserts the value of site-specific engagements. Future research might investigate similar studies in alternative settings.
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Life is short. Art is long.

Sing what you love with children. They will teach you joy.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Experts agree that music matters: it is fundamental to the human experience, and studies confirm music as a distinct intelligence, among an array of others, worthy of nurture and with its own distinct cognitive characteristics (Gardener, 1983; Gordon, 1990; Wolfe, 2010). Practicing music educators and researchers know how particularly important music is to the overall wellbeing and development of children throughout early childhood (Bruce, 1998; Jordan-DeCarbo & Galliford, 2011; Levinowitz, 2011). Additionally, deVries (2004) found evidence that music instruction for preschool children contributed to extramusical outcomes such as improved motor development, sustained attention, increased spatial reasoning, enriched socialization, and heightened listening skills. In spite of this evidence, recent findings confirm that music education for young children is primarily delivered by classroom teachers with limited musical expertise and those teachers feel ill-prepared to deliver meaningful instruction (Bainger, 2010; Gharavi, 1993; Nardo, Custodero, Persellin & Brink-Fox, 2006).

While the inclusion of music activities in the preschool and early childhood years is strongly advocated by experts from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) (Bredekamp & Copple, 2009) and the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) – formerly known as Music Educators National Conference (MENC) (Boston, 2000), studies cite a self-reported lack of musical expertise and resources necessary to provide it (Gharavi, 1993; Hildebrandt, 1998). This disparity impacts the quality and frequency
of developmentally appropriate music experiences available to children at the time when sound instruction impacts their musical growth the most dramatically (Feierabend, 1995). Levinowitz (1999) has suggested that partnerships between parents, caregivers, and music educators could result in a positive change in music education at the preschool level. In response to this dilemma, music educators and researchers suggest that “a modest amount of well-designed training would most likely provide child-care staff with adequate skills and knowledge to use music effectively” in their day-to-day encounters with young children (Levinowitz, 1999, p. 18).

In-service education delivered through workshops or training sessions has long been the model for professional development for instructors endeavoring to improve the practice of working teachers. These stand-alone events vary widely and are delivered by a myriad of providers with multiple agendas, often with little instructional preparation or reflection that meets the needs of individual participating teachers. The lack of personal relevance and teacher self-efficacy contributes to a lack of implementation of the new skills and strategies experienced in these one-time only events. Nardo, et al., (2006) and Register (2004) suggest we rethink this model and promote improved collaboration between music educators and early childhood professionals. Such collaboration will bring greater focus to changing educative practice in music education among early childhood practitioners. These researchers stress the importance of partnership with and among practitioners: “We [music educators] must listen to the voices of those who are charged with the music education of the youngest students, and provide what they need to deliver meaningful educational experiences” (Nardo et al., 2006, p. 290).
Background to the Problem

A coordinated effort on the part of educators, researchers and policy makers to increase awareness and strengthen the practice of music education for our youngest children has been a long time coming. The National Association for Music Education (NAfME) has promoted the importance of music education in the lives of young children among policy makers and the public for almost 50 years. Likewise, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) has made considerable strides in the advocacy for high-quality, developmentally appropriate educational experiences for our youngest citizens since the organization began in the 1920’s. But it wasn’t until June of 2000 that these two organizations joined with the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) at the Early Childhood Music Summit Start the Music to collaboratively embrace the premise that “music education is basic education and is therefore integral to the education of children at any age” (Boston, 2000, p. 1).

As early as 1975, researcher William T. Young identified the role of the young child’s teacher as a significant factor in music instruction: “A teacher who is relatively untrained and who is basically without musical ability can be taught how to conduct an effective program of remedial music at the preschool level” (p. 108). In a more recent study, Nardo, et al (2006) summarized findings from previous investigations all noting the common practice of ‘using’ music activities to support non-musical learning outcomes such as left-right directions through songs like The Hokey Pokey (LaPrise, 1950). DeVries (2004) refers to these as “extramusical” outcomes, suggesting that preschool teachers need more training in music in order to strengthen focused instruction within the musical activities they lead. The Nardo, et al study (2006), reflecting over 1,000 NAEYC-accredited early childhood education centers from across the country, demonstrated much the same results as those investigations reported over a decade ago.
The salient recommendation from these researchers note “it seems the music education and early childhood professions might need new models of collaboration, inasmuch as the impact of past efforts did not lead to notable changes in educative practice at the national level” (p. 290).

By far, the most frequent barrier to the inclusion of developmentally appropriate music exploration and instruction in the preschool classroom is a lack of musical expertise on the part of early childhood practitioners (Hildebrandt, 1998). The misperception that simply engaging children in “fun” musical activities has the same impact on their long-term learning as well designed, purposefully delivered, age-appropriate instruction in music is common among educators (Saunders & Baker, 1991). The distinction between music activities that promote non-musical outcomes (such as improved behavior during classroom transitions) and outcome-based, music-specific instruction is often lost on those with little musical training. Yet this distinction is critical if we are truly honoring the nurturance of children’s musical intelligence (Levinowitz, 2011).

Teachers with minimal training in all aspects of child development dominate the field of early education. Because early childhood practitioners come to their practice with a wide range of educational qualifications and diverse preparation, greater emphasis is placed on short-term training opportunities such as workshops or collegial support. When musical expertise is marginal or unavailable these practitioners do the best they can, drawing on their own personal beliefs and experiences in music to guide the children in their care. However, to truly improve their practice they need high quality, ongoing, and site-specific professional development in music education tailored to their needs and those of the children in their care (Oreck, 2004).

Early childhood educators’ perceptions and attitudes toward music education also have significance for the inclusion of quality music instruction in the preschool classroom (Kelly,
Their personal and cultural attitudes about music, their own comfort towards personal musical expression, and the self-efficacy required of teachers in sharing music with others are all components with significant influence toward this problem (McMullen, et al., 2006).

Statement of the Problem

Developmentally appropriate music instruction is largely missing in our nation’s preschools because the teachers in those classrooms lack the training to deliver it (Gharavi, 1993; Nardo, et al., 2006; Persellin, 2007). In 2006, Rachel Lee Nardo and her colleagues reported that conditions regarding music education in our nation’s preschools have remained unchanged since the 1980’s: music-specific training for early childhood practitioners is insufficient to prepare them to deliver quality music instruction to the youngsters in their care. Their lack of musical expertise is similar regardless of years of teaching experience or educational background (Kelly, 1998; Nardo, et al., 2006). When surveyed, most practitioners said that they felt comfortable using music as a “break” as opposed to actually “teaching” music. This was a result of their own perceived lack of musical expertise, and that, when available, teachers relied on trained music specialists to deliver focused music instruction (Gharavi, 1993; Nardo, et al., 2006; Saunders & Baker, 1991). Other teachers indicated that they presented music activities to their children based on their own personal experiences and personal preferences with music, and that they allowed their own musical limitations to influence their instruction (Nardo, et al., 2006; Oreck, 2004).

Teacher attitudes towards music education contribute significantly to this problem, and are inextricably linked to their own expertise and practice (Hildebrandt, 1998). Both de l’Etoile (2001) and Gharavi (1993) confirmed the notion that instructional quality and frequency were negatively impacted by lack of teacher self-efficacy toward music instruction. Some practitioners
reported negative behaviors from children during music activities, causing an increased discomfort in guiding music activities. Andress (1991) concluded that the teachers’ expectations were not aligned with the child’s developmental stage, thus causing caregivers to avoid music activities and develop negative attitudes toward them.

The quality and intensity of teacher training in music education is another issue that this study addressed. The simple “workshop” model of professional development is insufficient to change a teachers’ practice (Guskey, 2000; Register, 2004). Without teacher collaboration, ongoing practice, supervisory support, or content-specific guidance surface-level workshop ‘activities’ quickly give way to the next intriguing classroom attraction. Research has repeatedly demonstrated the need for personalized, ongoing, site-specific support when improved teaching practice is the goal (Borko, 2004; de l’Etoile, 2001; Gharavi, 1993; Oreck, 2004). This study addressed teachers’ attitudes and their expertise in music education through a collaborative professional development program to improve music education for the youngest students.

Research Questions

The quality and quantity of developmentally appropriate music education being delivered in most local preschools continues to fall short of standards developed by MENC and NAEYC. Although certified music specialists are sometimes trained to address the needs of preschool children, more often uncertified or untrained practitioners are left to the task. The challenge to be met in this study is a response to the provocation posed by Rachel Lee Nardo and her colleagues:

… future research may involve case studies of exemplary collaboration between [early childhood] programs and [music] specialists. … It is important to note the diversity that exists between centers, negating the use of “cookie-cutter” solutions. Each center comes with a unique array of issues involving resources, space, and staffing, and each will need to be a context-specific solution grounded in guiding principles and grown from site-specific collaboration. (2006, p. 289).
Therefore, the broad research question to be addressed in this study is “How might the impact of a site-specific, school-wide collaboration between a music educator and a preschool staff be described and interpreted?” The investigation will address three critical emergent themes: the importance of teachers’ attitudes and beliefs regarding musical experiences for young children, lack of teacher expertise in music education, and the structure of a collaborative professional development model within this bounded system. The following more specific sub-questions will frame the initial study, however, it is expected that additional avenues of inquiry may emerge as well.

   Research question one: How does the collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms?

   Research question two: How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners?

   Research question three: How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?

**Purpose of the Study**

What competencies do early childhood practitioners need to improve their delivery of developmentally appropriate, meaningful music education to the children in their care? According to Levinowitz (1999), the need for collaboration between music educators and early childhood practitioners is essential if we are to address the lack of developmentally appropriate music instruction typically present in preschools today. Research confirms that the potential musical benefits for children are many (Andress, 1998; Feierabend, 1995; Levinowitz, 1999; Nardo, et al., 2006; Persellin, 2007; Valerio, Reynolds, Bolton, Taggart, & Gordon, 1998), and myriad extramusical benefits have been found as well (deVries, 2004; Jordan-DeCarbo &
The design and implementation of such collaboration will bring to light critical aspects of professional development pertinent to early childhood practitioners and school sites.

The purpose of this collective case study was to describe and interpret the impact of a site-specific, school-wide collaboration in music education on the attitudes and practices of twelve early childhood practitioners working together at the same preschool. The bounded case was conceptualized as an eight-week collaboration as well as investigation. The study presents a glimpse of procedures and strategies influencing the outcomes of this professional development endeavor. In addition, the results offer important insights into the partnerships required between music educators and early childhood practitioners to improve music education among the youngest students.

**Rationale and Significance of the Study**

Research asserts that a child’s earliest years are the most fertile opportunities for intellectual growth (Wolfe, 2010). Musical learning is no exception. There is plentiful data to support the need for quality musical learning opportunities during the early childhood years (Andress, 1991; Custodero, 2010; Feierabend, 1992; Gordon, 1990). However, survey data collected in 2006 conveyed that only 28% of centers reported regular planned, teacher-directed music instruction and another 14% reported no music instruction at all (Nardo, et al., 2006). This study endeavored to address those deficits through professional development.

Studies have confirmed the need for better preparation in music education among early childhood practitioners (Jordan-DeCarbo & Nelson, 2002; Persellin, 2007). Some have suggested stronger pre-service preparation (Gharavi, 1993; Siebenaler, 2006), and others suggest
that on-the-job partnerships between music educators and early childhood practitioners could remedy the problem (Jordan-DeCarbo & Galliford, 2011; Levinowitz, 1999). In spite of the data, this work hasn’t led to significant improvement in instructional practices nationwide (Nardo, et al., 2006). These outcomes prompt the need for a new model of collaboration that demonstrates clear and sustainable outcomes and benefits for all stakeholders.

The constructivist paradigm of this collective case study promoted a close collaboration between researcher and participants. The shared decision-making and ongoing needs assessment kept the needs of each participant at the forefront of the training. This ‘personalized’ approach promoted individual growth and contributed to the sustainability of each teacher’s developing practice. Attention to teachers’ attitudes and beliefs about music instruction also contributed to programmatic sustainability school-wide. Teachers’ demonstration of improved musical skills and knowledge of pedagogy served as indicators of success.

The results of this study contribute to both music education and early childhood education in an effort to design and execute professional development as a collaborative endeavor between both communities of practitioners. Each brings different sets of expertise to the collaboration, and both stand to benefit from the shared exchange of practice (Persellin, 2007).

In her study of workshop training in music education for child-care personnel, Dena Register found that “the workshop experience without follow up support is not enough to effect lasting change” in teachers’ practice (2004, p. 114). Arts educator Barry Oreck suggested that the best professional development for non-arts specialists requires “ongoing support, on-site instructional examples with students, attention to arts-based values and outcomes, and whole-
School faculty involvement” (2004, pp. 66-67). Both studies contributed relevant data to the structure and implementation of this research design.

In the current educational climate lengthy and expensive teacher training is not practical. The “back to basics” movement also pushes music education to the periphery of our curricular agenda (Persellin, 2007). These issues have influenced the brief duration of the research design. Six- and eight-week studies in early childhood music education (Page-Smith, 2011; deVries, 2004) have reported positive student outcomes, although they do not focus on teacher practice. Neither addresses the need to attend to teachers’ values and beliefs about music, although anecdotal commentary discusses improved teacher self-efficacy.

The job-embedded mentorship design of this professional development model will reveal how teacher practice changes and how practices translate into student learning as a result of this collaboration with a music educator. These findings will contribute to the “transformational thinking” required for more rigorous and ongoing professional development support and improved collaboration skills proposed by the Council of Chief State School Officers in their assessment of teachers’ current needs in today’s educational climate (Hill et al., 2010, p. 3).

This study will benefit teachers’ practice in music education through a collaborative mentorship that demonstrates “a context-specific solution [to improving music education] grounded in guiding principles and grown from [a] site-specific collaboration” (Nardo, et al., 2006, p. 289). Additionally, the project brings methodological significance to the practice of professional development in music education through its emergent structure, its collaborative framework, the content of music instruction, and the site-specific details of the collaboration.
Definition of Terms

The following terms apply to this study:

1. Articulation: The attack and release of notes when singing or playing instruments.

2. Atelier: The laboratory or workshop at a Reggio-inspired school set aside for exploring multiple visual languages; the visual art studio.

3. Atelierista: The teacher at a Reggio-inspired school with expertise in visual art. The plural form is atelieriste.

4. “Artful”: The ability to demonstrate aesthetic decision-making in the context of creating or expressing music.


6. Cabasa – A percussion instrument from South America made from a hollow gourd; played by tapping or scraping with a small stick.

7. Chest and Head voice – The categorization of vocal register that distinguishes a lower, stronger vocal production from the higher, lighter qualities of voices; Untrained singers are often more comfortable using the chest voice because it corresponds most closely to one’s speaking voice range.

8. Cloze technique: The procedure used in reading instruction in which words are deleted from a passage of text for the purpose of coaching new readers to supply appropriate missing words. This procedure assesses a number of reading skills such as phonemic awareness, vocabulary acquisition, and reading comprehension.

9. Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP): Teaching practices based on the developmental readiness of the children for which the instruction is intended.

10. Duple meter: The grouping of beats into sets of two.

11. Dynamics: The loud and quiet aspects of music.

12. Early childhood program: “Any group program in a center, school, or other facility that serves children from birth through age eight” (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997, p. 3).

13. Emic perspective: Accounts or descriptions taken from the participants themselves.

14. Etic perspective: Drawing on accounts or perspectives through the eyes of the researcher.
15. Expressive musical sensitivity: The ability to respond to and create music through purposeful aesthetic choices. In this context tempo, dynamics, articulation, and timbre choices are most often made spontaneously as another 'language' of child's play.

16. Extramusical outcomes: The benefits of music instruction or engagement that result in outcomes other than musical ones.

17. In-tune singing – “tuneful”: The ability to sing melodies with reasonable accuracy; keeping a recognizable tune when singing.

18. Locomotor movement: Movement that takes the body through space, such as walking or skipping.

19. Non-locomotor movement: Movement that does not travel, such as bending, twisting, or tapping.

20. Orff Instrumentarium: A collection of child-sized pitched, and non-pitched, percussion instruments designed and developed by Gunild Keetman and Carl Orff. Often included are xylophones, metallophones, glockenspiels, various drums, woods, shakers, and metals such as triangles.

21. Pedagogista: The title given to a teacher with overall vision and management of the children at the school; often co-teachers in each classroom take on this role.

22. Provocation: A term used often in the Reggio-Emilia approach to note the inciting idea or incident intended to engage children in the learning process.

23. Range: The span of pitches between highest and lowest of an instrument or voice.


25. Sonata Form: A musical structure consisting of three main sections: an exposition, a development, and a recapitulation.


27. Timbre: (tám-bur) The character or quality of a musical sound or voice as distinct from its pitch and intensity; sometimes referred to as ‘tone color’ or ‘character’.

Methodological Assumptions

This collective case study is a descriptive method, not an explanatory one, and therefore does not endeavor to draw conclusions related to cause and effect relationships. The highly descriptive nature of this research, however, demands detailed data collection and analysis that is very situational and experiential (Stake, 2010).

This investigation is grounded in five key assumptions associated with qualitative research. First, the study seeks findings that are not predetermined, but rather will evolve throughout the project. This requires a thick descriptive approach that describes, analyses, and interprets data from a wide array of sources (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004). The need for multiple data sets such as observations, interviews, and artifacts establishes the second methodological assumption. The third assumption is the simultaneous need for thematic analysis throughout the data collection period. In an evolving study such as this one, ongoing examination is critical if within-case analysis is to shed light on cross-case interpretation (Creswell, 1998).

The fourth and fifth methodological assumptions support the participant-oriented model of the study. The relationship between researcher and the researched has great impact on the outcomes of qualitative studies and requires an immersion in the culture and context of the setting on the part of the researcher (Stake, 2010). In this study the researcher has taken on both observer and participant roles endeavoring to capture interactions between as well as among participants. The study findings reflect the collaborative nature of the research and rely heavily on the emic perspective (originating from the people) of all stakeholders (Stake, 2010).
Delimitations of the Study

The delimitations represent purposeful choices made by the researcher to narrow the study (Creswell, 1998). This study required three such considerations: setting, participant traits, and stakeholder capacity.

The study site had a narrowing impact on research outcomes because it is a highly rated preschool with many positive physical and affective attributes. The school scored 6.88 out of 7 possible quality points during the site evaluation conducted on April 23, 2012 by the Department of Human Services for the State of Tennessee (V. Flessner, personal communication, May 15, 2012). This 98% rating demonstrated that this school met many state and national expectations for excellence (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997). Another narrowing factor impacting study outcomes was the absence of infants in this early childhood program. These circumstances allowed the research to focus more fully on the stated questions with the expectation of fewer distractions than might have been found influencing studies in less favorable conditions. The choice to focus the study at this site alone allowed the researcher to pursue depth and detail otherwise unattainable through broad scope comparative studies.

The participant population accounted for another delimitation in this study. Participants in this ethnographic case study were delimited to 12 early childhood practitioners teaching at the same preschool through a shared philosophy. The teachers at this school brought high degrees of educational background, training, and teaching experience to the study. These 12 teachers have acquired over 600 hours of staff development this year alone (V. Flessner, personal communication, May 18, 2012). Although none of them had training in music education, their expertise with young children and teaching practices had a positive impact on study findings. The children attending this school came from middle and upper socioeconomic circumstances,
attending school between only six and sixteen hours per week. They ranged in age from two to five years old. “Parents view this environment as enrichment for their children, not daycare. Only about 15% of our families have both parents in the full-time work force.” (V. Flessner, personal communication, May 15, 2012). These delimitations of age and family circumstance have contributed significantly to study findings.

The third delimitation to impact this study is stakeholder capacity. The relatively short research period was designed around calendar constraints at the school and the need for accurate data collection. Studies by deVries (2004) and Page-Smith (2011) indicate that brief, but intensive, studies can render positive outcomes when researcher and participant enter the work collaboratively. As both participant and observer in a qualitative study of 12 participants, researcher capacity must be considered as well. Because of the retrospective nature of the data analysis, the potential for misrepresentation or error in accuracy was considered. Multiple data sources such as observations, interviews, and the collection of artifacts were accessed in an effort to maintain high accuracy standards. A variety of documentation sources such as field notes and videotape and audiotape recordings were used to support data triangulation. All of the delimitations described here contributed to the boundaries established for the study.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of a study are those features of methodology or design that influence the analysis and interpretation of study findings (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Six such limitations are present in this design: generalizability, data collection instruments, setting, participant traits, stakeholder capacity, and the potential for researcher bias.
Because this study is descriptive and not explanatory, generalizability is not an overarching goal although the ultimate value of the study was impacted by the uniqueness of the study site. This bounded system is grounded in a shared philosophy and instructional approach conducive to the goals of the study. Although this initially suggested a limiting effect on the wider application of the study’s findings, it ultimately brought to light the importance of addressing site-specific circumstances and the community identity of study participants.

The instruments designed for data collection have been created and adapted for use at this particular study site. They address the particular needs and contributions of these stakeholders, and will offer future studies a possible framework, not a directly applicable design for broader use.

The setting, participant traits, and stakeholder capacities have been described as delimitations in the study. These circumstances had a limiting impact on the generalizability of the study’s findings.

The potential for bias is high in a qualitative case study in which the dual roles of participant and observer are responsibilities of the researcher. To mitigate the impact of researcher bias multiple data sets were collected and analyzed. Participants’ self-evaluation also shed light on data analysis, as did the descriptive data provided by the center director.

**Research Design**

This collective case study was designed to describe an in-depth analysis of a collaborative mentorship between the researcher, a music educator, and twelve early childhood practitioners at the same preschool. The study was a within-case and cross-case analysis of emerging themes describing effective professional development in music education (Creswell,
Multiple sources of data informed the study’s outcomes. Surveys, interviews, observations, and artifacts such as lesson plans, photographs, and videotapes were collected and analyzed in an effort to explicate the research findings.

The study took place over a four-month period during which time an initial teacher workshop introduced the instructional parameters of the study, and subsequent collaborative planning, model instruction, and reflection took place. The researcher acted as both participant and observer throughout the study, providing greater leadership and direct instruction at its beginning and gradually relinquishing instructional leadership to participants as the work progressed.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

This dissertation follows a five-chapter organizational model. Chapter One introduces the study and includes background to the problem, a statement of the problem and purpose, research questions, overview of the methodology and rationale, and significance of the study. In addition, key terminology is defined and basic assumptions noted, including the delimitations and limitations of the study. A brief summary of the research design and organizational overview concludes the chapter. Chapter Two presents a summary of relevant literature including the history and background of music education in American public schools, the importance of teachers’ attitudes and values towards music education, developing teacher expertise in music education, the philosophy and practice of the Reggio-Emilia approach to early childhood education, and the key traits of effective professional development in an educational setting. Chapter Three discusses the methodology and research design of the study. This portion details the identification of the research design, participants, instrumentation, procedures used and
analysis of data, and describes the role of the researcher in limiting bias and procedures to protect human subjects. Chapter Four discusses the results of the study, and Chapter Five will relate the research findings to recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature that will inform this study is drawn from five broad areas: the history and background of music education in American public schools, the importance of teachers’ attitudes and values towards music education, improving teacher practice in music education, the philosophy and practice of the Reggio Emilia approach to early childhood education, and professional development in an educational context – particularly for early childhood practitioners. Each category has bearing on the work and will inform the design and execution of the professional development program. The following is a summary of research and literature guiding this effort.

Respected music researchers Nardo, Custodero, Persellin, and Brink-Fox (2006) completed a comprehensive study driving this research. These content experts summarized the field of early childhood music education 1984-2000 and created a thorough survey to examine practices being implemented at the time as an assessment of progress in the field. Data were gathered from among 8,000 practitioners nationwide. This study is the most up-to-date overview of data on the topic of early childhood music education.

Nardo, et al. surveyed a cluster sample of 1,000 early childhood educators from NAEYC accredited centers across the country, noting that only 28% of the centers surveyed offered regular, preplanned music experiences for the children in attendance and 79% of those were delivered by teachers who lacked musical expertise. The same study reports a lack of appropriate
music curriculum (69%), a lack of professional development training in music education (less than 1% of typical training requirements) and the services of trained early childhood music specialists in less than a third of the centers. It is these findings that have prompted the current study.

The literature review will initially probe the historical underpinnings of music education for preschool children in American public schools. These include foundational philosophies and key governmental policies that have impacted its implementation.

Teachers’ attitudes and values towards music education will be considered next. These studies address the influence of teachers’ personal beliefs on their practice, the impact of music training on teachers’ attitudes toward teaching music, and the value of establishing ongoing opportunities for the examination, reflection, and refinement of personal beliefs.

The third section in this chapter examines the skills and knowledge most pertinent to developmentally appropriate practice in music education for preschool children. This explication draws on literature identifying developmentally appropriate instructional content and teaching strategies, and identifies appropriate learning outcomes in music for preschool children.

Literature describing the philosophy and practice of the Reggio-Emilia approach to early childhood education is presented next. This exposition examines teaching practices and brings to light the lack of music education present in this model.

The final section in this chapter endeavors to identify tenets of professional development most influential in promoting teacher change. This literature examines key traits of successful professional development and the strategies of implementation best suited to preschool teachers. These studies address issues of collaboration among and between stakeholders and researcher, the impact of teachers’ changing practice on the community, and the flexibility and emergent
nature of effective professional development in responding to the needs of the constituency it serves.

**History and Background of Music Education in American Public Schools**

In Boston, 1838, music education made its debut in the American public school system (Choksy, Abramson, Gillespie, Woods, & York, 2001). At the urging of music teacher, choirmaster, and composer Lowell Mason, the School Board of Boston established music as a part of the *regular* curriculum in an effort to “create musically intelligent adults rather than train professional musicians or performers” (p. 4). Mason’s influence on early childhood music education is most apparent through two of the eight important tenets of his philosophy: “to be most effective, music education must begin with the young child”, and, “music is a discipline involving all the senses and contributing to the total development of the human being” (Choksy, et al., p. 7). It was this philosophy that grounded music education in America. By the 1900’s music was firmly present in schools across the country, and in 1922 Oberlin College (Ohio) was the first institution of higher learning to offer a four-year music specialty for teachers. Prior to that time generalist teachers had delivered music instruction (Choksy, et al., 2001).

Since then, American education has endured many transformations and the political and philosophical winds of change have moved music through many periods of favor and disfavor with politicians and policy makers. In 1983, *A Nation at Risk* (USDOE, 1983) brought the inadequacies of American schools to public attention. This provoked the development of *Goals 2000: Educate America Act:* Public Law 103-227 in 1994 (USDOE, 1990, 2000), and the subsequent creation of the *National Standards for Arts Education* (MENC, 1994a). Drawing on Mason’s original tenet that music contributes to our total development, these standards are
significant in their affirmation that “the arts benefit both the student and society” (Choksy, et al., p. 18).

By 2000, collaborating organizations from the USDOE, NAEYC, and MENC convened Start the Music (Boston, 2000) on behalf of our youngest children, whose needs were not addressed in the National Standards. The premise that music education is an “essential educational component of early childhood education” (p.1) grounded the discourse. Two important challenges were brought to light in the discussion: the need to “find effective ways to train early childhood professionals in music”, and “devise better preparation and professional development programs that include music” (Boston, 2000, p. 2).

Music education continues to be impacted by public policy, and governed under national and state Departments of Education (Americans for the Arts, 2010b; MENC, 1994b). Originally known as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and enacted in 1965, this legislation focused on improving education among disadvantaged students. During this same period, as part of President Johnson’s “War on Poverty”, Head Start was enacted. This federal matching grant program aimed to improve the learning and social skills, and address health issues among preschool children of poverty to improve their school success (Curry & Thomas, 1993). Though music instruction has not been a focus of these initiatives, they impact its presence in the school curriculum and have prompted initiatives like Start the Music, discussed in Chapter One of this paper.

Today, educators are bombarded with rhetoric and data stemming from the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB): Public Law 107-110 (Brenchley, 2013; USDOE, 2002). Although ESEA was reauthorized in 1994, by 2001 the growing public concern about the state of education
provoked a reinvented policy for public education (Bell, Darling-Hammond, Haycock, & Mulgrew, 2011; Klein, 2011).

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was signed into law in January 2002 and is currently under reauthorization (Brenchley, 2013). The legislation has prompted significant changes to the American educational system. With greater emphasis on accountability, schools and teachers have become “obsessed with data” and the academic achievement of their students (Americans for the Arts, 2010a; Cody, 2012). Student success in reading, math, and science/technology has become a priority in the curriculum, negatively impacting arts scheduling and funding, and limiting students’ motivation to explore a broad range of content (Sabol, 2010). Even Head Start programs have initiated high stakes achievement testing for all four- and five-year-old participants of the program (Meisels & Atkins-Burnett, 2004). Although the arts are recognized as core academic subjects, schools struggling to meet achievement benchmarks identified through NCLB have increased instructional time for tested subjects and decreased instructional time in the arts (McMurrer, Jennings, & Rentner, 2007).

In 2009, Tennessee was among the first states in the nation to win federal funds to implement comprehensive school reform through the USDOE initiative, Race to the Top (Tennessee Department of Education, 2010; USDOE, 2009). The five hundred million dollar award has been put to work improving teacher and principal evaluations, gathering data to inform instructional decisions, and turn around the lowest performing schools (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012b). Encouraging student achievement has been the impetus for establishing a priority around STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) initiatives statewide, in an effort to boost students’ test scores (Anderson, 2011; Tennessee Department of Education, 2012a). In a statement released in June 2012, Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan,
praised Tennessee for their efforts toward reform: “Early signs of widespread academic progress are not only encouraging but inspiring, and will help lay the ground work for further success as Tennessee continues its commitment to leading the nation in education reform.” (Gauthier, 2012, p. 1). Tennessee’s most recent achievement data, gathered through the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP), indicates continued improvement for students in grades 3-8 in reading, math, and science (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012). These data support the findings of McMurrer, Jennings, and Rentner (2007) in their assertion that “most districts have changed their ELA and math curricula to put greater emphasis on the content and skills covered on the state tests used for NCLB” (pg. 2).

The U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS) have recently announced that $133 million from the 2012 Race to the Top funds will be earmarked for “The Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge” (USDOE, 2012). Duncan reports that the initiative is intended to “engage more states in furthering their critical work to transition effective early learning programs into systems of excellence (USDOE, 2012, p. 1). The list of states invited to apply for these funds did not include Tennessee.

This policy review illuminates the need for renewed efforts in support for music education (Bruce, 1998). The advocacy established through the Start the Music initiative in 2000 is still required today:

Instead of remaining on the defensive, advocates for music education and early childhood education – and the vital connection between them – can and should take a proactive approach to music education as both a worthy enterprise in its own right and as an essential educational component of early childhood development (Boston, 2000, p.1).
The Importance of Teachers’ Attitudes and Values Towards Music Education

To effectively impact teachers’ changing practice in music education, care must be taken to examine the attitudes, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations each participant brings to the mentorship. Teachers need to know why their practice must change, what skills are important for improvement, and how to develop these new skills if a professional development program is to be successful. Seven relevant articles regarding the importance of teachers’ attitudes and beliefs are reviewed next to address the importance of teacher attitudes to their teaching practice.

James Raths (2001) suggests that greater attention to teacher beliefs is more important than emphasis on teaching methodology in the preparation of effective teachers. To shift our thinking from ‘changing teachers’ beliefs’ toward ‘affecting teaching dispositions’ he advises we engage teachers as professionals to strengthen their value of knowledge, their pursuit and value of collegial relationships, and to heighten their sense of advocacy for their learning communities. In addition, Garvis, Pendergast, and Twigg, (2011) suggest that greater ongoing support for early childhood teachers in the field would strengthen their value for the arts, and increase their willingness to implement arts instruction.

The McMullen, et al. study (2006) affirms the importance of personal teaching beliefs and philosophy as significant influences on actual teaching practice and classroom behaviors. This work examines the concept of ”developmentally appropriate practice”(DAP) among preschool teachers and discusses the differences between self-reported teaching beliefs and observable classroom practices. Teachers cite personal feelings of inadequacy, lack of preparedness, and poor collegial and professional support as factors impacting their reluctance to develop DAP as an ongoing approach. Neuharth-Pritchett and Parker (2006) confirmed these barriers in their study of factors shaping teacher beliefs and practice. These researchers also
identify the need for artifacts such as lesson plans and observational assessments to determine evidence of DAP. In another study McMullen and Alat (2002) determined that educational attainment had a positive impact on the belief and practice of DAP among teachers studied. Those with four years of college or more held stronger DAP beliefs and demonstrated stronger practice than those with less education, regardless of subjects studied. Although music education is not addressed specifically in these studies, these findings shed light on the importance of making explicit research-based evidence demonstrating the value of music education for youngsters a critical foundation of this study. Additionally supported here is the attention to content-specific instruction, ongoing support, and academic preparation necessary to impact teachers’ changing practice.

Garvis and Pendergast (2011) speak specifically to teacher beliefs and attitudes in the context of arts education in their survey of twenty-one early childhood teachers investigating the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and the frequency and quality of instruction in the arts. Their findings indicated that strong teacher self-efficacy was consistently linked to positive teacher behaviors and student attitudes as well as positive student achievement. In addition, their study demonstrated that “when teachers have stronger content knowledge in a subject area, they are more likely to engage in teaching that subject” (p. 10). In light of their positive findings, these authors recommend greater focus on in-service professional development that includes sustained engagement and reflection on the importance of the arts for children.

Shannon de l’Etoile (2001) studied twenty-two early childhood practitioners to investigate the impact of music training on their attitudes toward implementing music activities with young children. In addition, de l’Etoile found both improved attitude and comfort levels in leading music activities evidenced by increased frequency and greater enthusiasm in their
delivery. These outcomes also demonstrated practitioners’ increased knowledge about DAP in music education, implying a sustainable impact of the intervention. The children participating in this study demonstrated increased vocal, visual, and physical engagement during music activities that may indicate their growing attention to and interest in music. This evidence supports the value of content-rich instruction in music as a factor influencing teachers’ beliefs and self-efficacy toward the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms.

Linda K. Thompson (2007) discusses the value of establishing ongoing opportunities for the examination, reflection, and refinement of personal beliefs among pre-service music education students. This context sets a valuable precedent for professional development with working teachers. Thompson’s article examines the powerful impact self-assessments can have on the ways teachers view their work and endeavor to improve it. She suggests, “Only as music teacher educators understand the beliefs of their students will they appropriately identify the kinds of experiences that will require these students to reconsider their beliefs in light of practice, theory, and research” (p. 33). She posits that the ongoing reflection of one’s personal beliefs must be intentional, provoke critical analysis, and must remain evolutionary if our teaching practices are to remain viable. While these recommendations are developed with pre-service music teachers in mind, they provide valuable guidance in the design and implementation of this study. These criteria will impact the structure and content of researcher-participant interviews, and influence the thematic coding of participant responses.

**Improving Teacher Practice in Music Education**

The first step in strengthening teacher practice in music education is to contextualize its value and purpose within the existing curriculum. Research based evidence clearly points to the
cognitive benefits of music instruction for young children (Rauscher & Zupan, 2000; Strickland, 2001; Wolfe, 2010). The identification of musical learning as a cognitive endeavor, worthy of educational effort and instructional attention, is foundational to this study. This project goal addresses the need for teachers to understand why teaching music is important to the development of their children.

Significant scientific research has been conducted in recent years demonstrating critical influence on our understanding of the developing brain. Particularly relevant to this study is research confirming the fertile opportunities for intellectual growth among young children. Evidence asserts that the neural pathways so critical to cognitive function develop at a tremendous rate from birth to age four (Wolfe, 2010). During this period the process known as synaptogenesis grows and expands neural capacities. At about age five the brain begins to prune away inefficient or unstimulated synapses in an effort to gain efficiency. After this period, growth seems to stabilize until about age ten when a short window of adolescent growth occurs. By age twelve, individuals have likely carved out our most fertile capacities and likewise shut down those most neglected or unattended.

Cognitive psychologist Gary Marcus describes ongoing brain development in a musical context in his book, *Guitar Zero* (2012). His assertion is that the musical brain is not a fixed and inevitable being, but rather requires focused effort and “years of hard work… [Our ultimate musicality results] because we have the capacity to slowly and laboriously tune broad ensembles of neural circuitry over time, through deliberate practice, and not because the circuitry of music is all there from the outset” (p. 33). In response to its circumstances, the brain is quite adaptable, and many music researchers (Andress, 1991; Custodero, 2010; Feierabend, 1992; Gordon, 1990) have long agreed that the period known as ‘early childhood’ (birth to age 8) offers educators
critical opportunity into the musical development of our children. Custodero (2010) asserts that early experiences in auditory processing have lifelong impact on the brain, evidenced by brain scan data. This noteworthy information has caused the music education community to recognize important “windows of opportunity” for children before they reach age seven (p. 128). Waiting until kindergarten when music instruction is often first briefly available from a trained music educator robs learners of their most fertile opportunities to acquire and develop musical understanding. In the words of Kodály educator, Helga Szabó:

What a child has heard in his first six years of life cannot be eradicated later. Thus it is too late to begin teaching at school, because a child stores a mass of musical impressions before school age, and if what is bad predominates, then his fate, as far as music is concerned, has been sealed for a lifetime (Feierabend, 1995, pg.1).

There are many organized curricula that offer parents access to this instruction outside of school for their preschool children (e.g., Kindermusik™, Music Together™, Musikgarten™, Music Rhapsody™, and others); however, access to these programs is frequently limited to families for whom the privilege of time and money offer no barrier. If musical understanding is truly a fundamental human capacity, then its place in the ‘standard’ school curriculum cannot be denied (Andress, 1998; Flohr & Persellin, 2011; Gordon, 1990). This constraint necessitates our implementation of improved music education in daily preschool environments nation wide.

The number of families in the United States whose young children participate in some kind of child-care outside of the home prior to traditional school attendance is steadily increasing. In 2010, roughly 8.5 million children under the age of five participated in some kind of organized daycare outside of the home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). These youngsters spend the largest portion of their waking hours each day in organized day care, yet focused music instruction and exposure to developmentally appropriate musical exploration and learning are largely absent.
Another critical component of improving teacher practice in music instruction is the accessible presentation of fundamental skills and knowledge required for quality music instruction (Ables & Custodero, 2010; Andress, 1998; MENC, 1995; Powers, 2012; Valerio, et al., 1998). NAEYC has published widely regarded criteria detailing standards in ‘best practice’ for early childhood educators (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997). These suggested teaching practices address the physical, social, emotional, and cognitive domains of development in young children and offer teachers a clear structure through which to engage their charges. The five broad strands known as Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) - include (1) creating a community of learners, (2) enhancing development and learning, (3) constructing appropriate curriculum, (4) assessing children’s learning, and (5) establishing relations between schools and families (Van Horn, Karlin, Ramey, Aldridge, & Snyder, 2005).

These fundamental structures have influenced music educators (Andress, 1998; Burton & Taggart, 2011; Jordan-DeCarbo & Nelson, 2002) and policy makers alike. The Opportunity-To-Learn Standards for Music Instruction and the Student Achievement Standards for Pre-Kindergarten developed by Music Educators National Conference in 1994 reflect both the spirit and content of NAEYC’s guidelines. At their influential gathering, Start the Music: A Report from the Early Childhood Summit (2000), MENC assembled expert educators and researchers from music education, NAEYC, and the US Department of Education to examine the notion that music education is basic education and is integral to the education of children at any age (Boston, 2000). A goal of this gathering was to launch a systemic effort to “foster the well-demonstrated benefits of experiencing, knowing, and understanding music as central to the learning capacities of young children.” In the words of Donna Brink-Fox, Eastman School of
Music, “How do we make music as integral and embedded in early childhood education as blocks and the sand table” (Boston, 2000, p.1)?

In their publication, *Opportunities to Learn* (1994b), MENC identified four categories through which to envision and evaluate best practices in music education. Through criteria such as (1) curriculum and scheduling, (2) staffing, (3) materials and equipment, and (4) facilities, recommendations are made to ensure that “every student at every level, PreK-12, should have access to a balanced, comprehensive, and sequential program of instruction in music and the other arts, in school, taught by qualified teachers” (pg. 2). The details of these standards for Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten children, ages 2-5, identify age-specific criteria as well as the need to focus on the peculiarities of the staffing needs in day care centers: “Music instruction in every prekindergarten and kindergarten is provided by teachers who have received formal training in early-childhood music. A music specialist qualified in early-childhood education is available as a consultant” (p. 6).

Music educators and researchers have identified fundamental content appropriate to the musical experiences presented in a preschool setting (Andress, 1998; Burton & Taggart, 2011; Custodero, 2010; Feierabend, 1992; Guilmartin & Levinowitz, 2009; Page-Smith, 2011; Palmer & Sims, 1993; Persellin, 2001; Rajan, 2013; Sims, 1995). They include spontaneous and directed music exploration and music-making experiences through singing and playing instruments, creating and responding to music, and building basic musical understanding through multimodal experiences. The Pre-Kindergarten music standards for children ages 2-5 published by MENC reflect this research and practice (Sims, 1995). In summary, they pursue three main musical outcomes for early learners: (1) tuneful singing, (2) beat competency, and (3) expressive musical sensitivity (Feierabend, 1992). These goals have been effectively simplified for parents and
teachers using the phrase “tuneful, beatful, artful” by this prolific researcher and author (John Feierabend, personal communication, August 6, 2012).

Singing, playing instruments, listening, and moving to music are activities through which young children can demonstrate musical learning (Ponick, 1999; Rajan, 2013). A key factor in planning and implementing music instruction for young children is finding the balance between careful preparation for pre-planned musical engagements and maintaining the flexibility to respond spontaneously to the individual and collective needs of the class (Guilmartin & Levinowitz, 2008). It is through frequent, flexible, play-based experiences that young children are best guided to develop musical understanding (Andress, 1998; Berger & Cooper, 2003; Feierabend, 1992; Guilmartin & Levinowitz, 2003; Rajan, 2013; Valerio, et al., 1998).

Singing is the most fundamental musical expression. Children begin creating spontaneous songs around age two (Custodero, 2010). For the youngest children, aged birth to three, singing is best nurtured in the same way as language development – in an informal and exploratory way. Early music babble includes imitation and repetition of modeled melodic patterns without words (Valerio, et al., 1998). Attention to improving the singing abilities of school-age children has been a fundamental aspect of traditional school music instruction since its inception (Flowers & Dunne-Sousa, 1990). Some of these instructional strategies include echoing by phrase songs presented by the teacher, singing that accompanies game-playing, and improvising new words or melodies for known repertoire (Choksy, 1974). For children at the preschool level, a blend of informal and formal experiences is appropriate to improve tuneful singing as these experiences bring greater vocal control, and lead to improved intonation.

Flowers and Dunne-Sousa (1990) suggest we must attend to the child’s singing range when in-tune singing is an instructional goal. Range refers the total span of tones produced by an
instrument or voice (Randel, 1986). The vocal range is determined by one’s physiology and training. Children, therefore, can sing only a limited range of notes, as their vocal cords are small and still growing. When young children are expected to reproduce melodies accurately, songs must be pitched in a suitable range for their voices (Flowers & Dunne-Sousa, 1990). Vocal range is also considered a contributing factor to the common tendency for young singers to modulate between tonal centers as they sing. In-tune singing is a coordinated skill between auditory acuity and muscular agility. The relationship between the use of the singing voice and the development of tonal aptitude is a developmental process that takes time, and is positively influenced by individual and small-group engagement in singing (Rutkowski, 1996).

Beat competency refers to one’s ability to feel and express an underlying musical pulse in response to musical stimulation (Levinowitz, 2011). This fundamental musical skill begins with listening, and is grounded in cultural experiences like the rhythm and accent of speech (Frazee, 1987). Children usually begin demonstrating beat awareness by copying the movements of others (Levinowitz, personal communication, April, 2011). These behaviors begin to appear at around 30 months of age and by around age three, children begin to express their own personal tempo through steady beat expressions (Guilmartin & Levinowitz, 2003). Beat competency is accomplished when “body movements consistently coincide with the beat of the music” (p. 29).

Instructional implications for the development of beat competency are framed in movement activities. They include gross motor activities such as bouncing, patting, and rocking and expand for older children into more intricate fine motor actions like manipulating mallets on xylophones or striking and scraping small percussion instruments such as a triangle (Andress, 1998). Choksy (1981) has urged music educators to begin in duple meter – feeling beats in groups of two – to facilitate natural physical expressions like walking, or patting the legs to the
beat. Initially children are most successful at expressing steady beat when seated or still, moving only the arms. Appropriate non-locomotor movements for preschool children include shaking, bending, and tapping in time with the beat. Expressing the steady beat of one’s own music making (like singing) is the simplest. A more difficult expression comes with external stimulus like listening to recorded music (Weikert, 1982). Researchers Valerio, et al. (1998) suggest that exposure to multiple meters and a wide range of exploratory movement offers young children the kinesthetic grounding through which steady beat is later discovered and developed. Children’s timing through the expression of steady beat is a fundamental musical competency and plays a key factor in many extramusical contexts such as sports, dance, speech development, and reading (Kuhlman & Schweinhart, 2012).

Engaging children in aesthetic musical decision-making prompts them toward creative problem solving and prepares compositional thinking (Andress, 1998; Barrett, McCoy, & Veblen, 1997). Exploration of the expressive qualities of tempo (fast/slow), dynamics (loud/quiet), and articulation (smooth/choppy) are appropriate musical concepts for young children. For example, a lesson that includes a simple lullaby like “Star light, Star bright” offers children opportunity to practice in-tune singing with peers as they determine appropriate dynamics and tempo for this ‘good-night’ song. Barbara Andress (1998) suggests “A curriculum that attends to basic musical understandings can be playful, yet it must include meaning-centered activities that have the potential to promote a sensitivity for and understanding about music” (p. 39).

Timbre (pronounced “tam-bur”) is another musical concept appropriately explored among early learners through instrumental exploration (Crisp, 2007). Timbre is the element of music that addresses sound qualities - the difference between the sound of a flute and the sound
of a trumpet. Also known as ‘tone color’, the New Harvard Dictionary of Music (Randel, 1986) defines this term as “The character of a sound, as distinct from its pitch; the quality of sound that distinguishes one instrument from another” (p. 863). This element of music addresses the skill of knowing one’s materials, musically speaking. Just as an artist must have a practical knowledge of the viscosity and hue of each paint in the palette, so must a composer know which instruments will best express her melodic and rhythmic ideas. The best artists know materials, master techniques, and innovate visual interpretations. Through expressive qualities and timbre, young children can do the same with sound.

Exploratory instrumental play is an appropriate medium through which children explore musical timbre. Through frequent engagements with a variety of instruments, children assimilate the musical palette available, and develop the kinesthetic skills required to play instruments safely and accurately. Suitable exploratory activities include ordering, classifying, improvising, and composing (Andress, 1998; Swanwick, 1988). These musical tasks have demonstrated extramusical benefits such as language development (deVries, 2004; Neville, et al, 2008), literacy (Salmon, 2010), and mathematical thinking (Rauscher & Zupan, 2000).

A third topic relevant to building teacher expertise in music is strengthening the integrity of music instruction when it is partnered with other learning expectations for children (Barrett, 2001; Wiggins, 2001). Nowhere in education is interdisciplinary instruction more relevant than in the preschool setting. Grasping valid and rich musical activities helps teachers understand how to embed quality music instruction meaningfully into their existing curriculum rather than simply “use” music to engage learners in other academic pursuits (Barrett, 2001).

In order to prepare non-musicians for the challenge of music instruction, an examination of studies drawn from college-level pre-service classrooms and professional development
settings for preschool teachers has been conducted. Researchers Ebbeck, Hoi, and Lai (2009), Gharavi (1993), Saunders and Baker (1991), and Siebenaler (2006) have investigated the needs and expectations of classroom teachers who are expected to teach music as part of their daily curriculum. These studies have identified the importance of instruction in singing and the need to help teachers guide stronger “creative experiences” in music.

Ebbeck, Hoi, and Lai (2009) assert that teachers rated singing as the musical activity in which they enjoyed the most confidence and that singing with children was positively linked to student learning. Gloria Gharavi (1993) summarized her findings to conclude that professional development for preschool teachers should not stress reading music or demand instrumental playing skills. Rather, her suggestion is to focus on improving teachers’ in-tune singing at pitch levels appropriate to children.

Saunders and Baker (1991) questioned 159 early childhood teachers to develop an understanding of what skills these teachers viewed as “useful”. While they rated “selecting appropriate songs for children” highly (85%), their rating of “leading and teaching songs” was slightly lower (75%). These findings may support Gharavi’s assertion (1993) that teachers need more explicit instruction to develop better singing skills. Dennis Siebenaler (2006) found that specific attention to better singing had a positive impact among pre-service classroom teachers: “Through regular group singing … starting pitches and tonal accuracy improved, and some … felt more confident when singing. Their risk taking in attempting and practicing an unfamiliar skill paid off.” In addition, teachers surveyed by Saunders and Baker (1991) offered their highest ratings (95%) to activities such as “providing creative experiences” and “using music to supplement other curricular areas” implying that “using” music to support other curriculum was more in line with their practice. These findings point to two important components of the training
design in this study: (1) attention to improving participants’ singing skills, and (2) specific instructional guidance differentiating “using” and “teaching” musical concepts connected with other academic or social pursuits.

In his six-week case study, researcher Peter DeVries (2004) set out to determine which extramusical outcomes would emerge from a mentorship between himself and one preschool teacher. This brief and intense study was influential in the design and data collection methods of the current study. His conclusions reveal that the mentorship was an effective strategy in guiding the teacher to greater comfort in the delivery of music instruction. Students demonstrated growth important to their social and cognitive development including increased motor skills, improved interpersonal interactions with peers, improved expressive language skills, and greater aural acuity. While no specific “academic” curricular outcomes were identified, the researcher reported, “These effects alone were enough to convince her [the teacher] of the importance of music in the preschool” (p. 11). This is just one example of music’s relationship with myriad human capacities, its value in an interdisciplinary context, and its inextricable link to the important affective, kinesthetic, and cognitive growth preschool attempts to facilitate in young children.

**Philosophy and Practice of the Reggio Emilia Approach**

In northern Italy during the chaotic days after World War II Loris Malaguzzi and the mothers in Reggio Emilia began to rebuild their lives by visioning a future for their children. Inspired by the work of Dewey, Piaget, Bruner, Vygotsky, and others, a social constructivist foundation grounded their philosophy of best practice in early childhood education. Since that
time this progressive movement has become a worldwide model for its highly successful approach to schooling for young children (Page-Smith, 2011).

At the heart of the Reggio philosophy is the child as protagonist: learning is child-centered, focused on the child’s competencies rather than her deficiencies. Driven by the “hundred languages of children,” this approach embraces the rich and varied modes of communication, intelligences, and expressions important in nurturing young children. Collaboration is central to the approach, urging children, teachers, and parents to become co-constructors of knowledge in a setting that nurtures the role of culture and promotes the interdependence of individuals (Hertzog, 2001). In Reggio schools the environment is described as “the third teacher”, underscoring the importance of the aesthetic, practical, emotional, and managerial aspects of the entire school environment (Malaguzzi, 1998). Documentation is held as a highly effective form of communication and offers key evidence into the thinking and learning processes of children in Reggio schools. Teachers and students embrace multiple media like photographs, drawings and other art-based media, as well as text-based evidence of student work (The North American Reggio Emilia Alliance, 2008).

The atelierista – or studio artist – is an important member of the Reggio community. Charged with nurturing the artistic expressions of the children, this teacher also collaborates with the pedagogista – instructional leader – to capture student-initiated research and project work through developmentally appropriate means (Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1998). This work is grounded in the fundamentals of visual art and contributes significantly to the overall school environment. Typically, Reggio schools employ an atelierista, however the engagement of an instructor with musical expertise is not part of the structural paradigm. Classroom teachers look to the atelierista for guidance and expertise in visual art instruction, but the Reggio model does
not include her counterpart in music. This reflects data confirming the lack of teacher musical expertise found in most preschools nationally (Nardo, et al., 2006).

Nancy Hertzog (2001) identifies core attributes in this constructivist approach impacting the teaching practice of educators in a Reggio-inspired environment: (1) the belief that children are already capable learners – not empty vessels; (2) teachers, children, and parents are co-researchers and co-learners; (3) the aesthetics of the environment are important; (4) curriculum emerges with purpose; and (5) communication and collaboration are highly valued. These attitudes influence the teaching approach, lesson planning and curriculum development, relationships between all stakeholders, and the highly reflective nature of all the work at this model (Parnell, 2011).

The engagement of an instructor with musical expertise is significantly missing from the Reggio-Emilia model. This omission offered a noteworthy influence to practitioner attitudes toward the value and purpose of music instruction as well as its place within the curriculum in a Reggio-inspired system (Page-Smith, 2011).

**Key Traits of Effective Professional Development**

Three of the reviewed studies (Levinowitz, 2001; Nardo, et al., 2006; Register, 2004) suggest that music educators must develop collaborative relationships with practicing early childhood educators as a strategy for improving music instruction for preschool children. In addition, Gruenhagen (2012) suggests that “collaborative learning opportunities best support teachers when mentors or facilitators of learning communities and teacher study groups share responsibilities in creating agendas and facilitating group conversations” (p. 14). This ‘new’ model of collaboration (Nardo, et al., 2006) requires attention to and implementation of
longstanding tenets of best practice in professional development as well as an innovative approach designed to serve both constituencies. Her twelve-year tenure at the Southeast Center for Education in the Arts, has prepared the researcher to engage effectively in professional development in arts education. She brings considerable expertise in the design, delivery, and assessment of professional development for teachers in music education and over fifteen years’ classroom experience as a certified specialist in music education.

Professional development in arts education has been the sole focus of The Southeast Center for Education in the Arts since 1988. Nationally recognized for its role in the development and dissemination of Disciplined Based Arts Education (Wilson, 1997) and the vision and development of Arts Integration as a school-wide instructional model (Southeast Center for Education in the Arts, 2001), the organization continues to lead the field in professional development in arts education (www.utc.edu/scea).

Relevancy is a key factor in successful professional development requiring an understanding of the constituency for whom it is created, the needs to be addressed through the engagement, and the outcome expectations of all stakeholders (Burgess, unpublished research). While teachers may recognize music as an important experience for children, they often lack musical training and have little formal education in the tenets of DAP in music even though they may have worked in day care settings for some time (Scott-Kassner, 1999). To envision a relevant, site-specific, and innovative professional development model for this study, a review of significant works on the topic is appropriate.

Thomas Guskey (2000) describes professional development as a “purposeful and intentional process [with] consciously designed effort to bring about positive change and improvement” (pg.17). He has identified four fundamental tenets for successful professional
development that builds organizational capacity: a clear focus on learning with particular
attention to the unique community it serves, an emphasis on individual as well as organizational
change, the critical importance of visionary leadership and the importance of a shared vision
between all stakeholders, and the value of an ongoing and job-embedded model. In addition, he
suggests that the “highly individualized approach of [mentorships] can benefit both individuals
involved” (p. 28). Hargreaves (2007a) adds to this list sustainable education leadership that
preserves and develops learning for all stakeholders. Newman, King, and Youngs (2000) echo
these traits and add technical resources as another important factor.

Theresa Bey describes mentorships as a meaningful model for the professional
development of teachers (1995). She defines the ‘transferrable transaction’ between expert and
novice as a cooperative partnership in which the mentor guides and advises the novice teacher on
any number of educational issues relating to “theory, research, and practice” (p. 12). Bey’s
research suggests that the traits of the mentor are many including self-discipline, patience, and
tact and that to develop as a skilled mentor one must cultivate ingenuity when working
effectively with adults. Lipton and Wellman (2001) suggest that mentors “gain new insights into
themselves as teachers and learners … [through] personal reflection and articulating their own
knowledge base to novices, they deepen and integrate personal knowledge about professional
practice” (p. 71). Additionally, Thomas Guskey suggests that mentorships are most effective
when “mentors and their less experienced colleagues collaborate on developing the goals and
procedures of the mentoring relationship” (2000, p. 28). The interactive, interpersonal, and
classroom-specific environment created in a mentorship offers teachers a relevant environment
in which to apply new skills and strategies. Researchers Albert, Conway, Hibbard and Hourigan
found that “Providing choice for teachers and allowing them to reflect on their own classrooms is
a much more effective way to learn than mandated “stand and deliver” model lectures on topics chosen by administrators” (2005, p. 7).

In his research regarding the diffusion of innovations, Everett Rogers presents four critical elements that influence change in a social system: the relevance of the innovation, the importance of communicating the innovation within the social system for which it is intended, the necessity of time, and the unique capacities and needs of the social system to which the innovation is directed (Rogers, 2003). These criteria can be applied to professional development and offer a significant framework from which to strategize the objectives for this study. According to Rogers, the adoption of the proposed innovations in music education will require that study participants perceive them as advantageous, identify them as compatible with their existing values and norms, find them easily understood and applied, can experiment and adapt them to suit their own particular situation, and find the results of these changes observable and effective.

Steven Kelly’s study of 210 preschool teachers (1998) revealed that the instructional strategies they found most useful in music were those they had learned outside of their pre-service training in workshops or among colleagues. Additionally, they found opportunities in which they were actively engaged with children to be the most relevant and long-lasting learning environments. Both of these factors have informed the design of this study. In her study of 15 early childhood caregivers, Shannon de l’Etoile (2001) concluded that music training seemed to be effective at improving caregivers’ attitudes toward implementing music activities with young children. Key factors in the success of this program were that (1) the training sessions were embedded into ongoing, weekly staff training sessions that caregivers were required to attend as part of their job responsibilities; (2) training sessions included active participation on the part of
attendees; and (3) demonstrations with or videotapes of children were modeled and evaluated. Register (2004) also confirms that workshop experiences without follow up support cannot effect lasting change among early childhood practitioners. These factors have influenced the design of this study beginning with a workshop and providing ongoing support with children in each teacher’s classroom. Each of these studies was positively impacted by the results of needs assessment surveys.

Hilda Borko (2004) suggests that the most effective professional development addresses these five factors: subject matter knowledge to improve instructional practice; guided, active experiences that engage teachers as learners (workshops); ongoing support during the school year; pedagogical foundations relevant to the subject; and the development of professional learning communities. In addition, Bey (1995) and Valerio and Freeman (2009) cite the necessity of teacher reflection as an important component in an effective professional development model.

Zaslow, Tout, Maxwell, and Clifford (2004) and Guskey (2000) add to these criteria that professional development endeavors must include artifacts that document participants’ learning, participants’ use of the new knowledge and skills, as well as the learning outcomes of the students these teachers serve in order to demonstrate the overall impact of a program. Pianta and Hamre (2009) suggest that observational assessments are another important professional development strategy for assessing teacher growth. Because classroom observations are directed specifically at individual teacher performance they can also address specific interventions. This highly individualized approach demonstrated validity in predicting student gains as well as the effective contribution to teacher growth.

The cited research has guided the overall structure of this study. It has also offered key criteria for individual and group interviews, observations, and one-to-one consultations between
researcher and participants that exemplify this mentorship in music education.

Conclusion

This chapter illuminates relevant research to establish a scholarly context to better understand the need for improved practice in music education in preschools and examines key factors in the professional development necessary to accomplish this change. The literature reviewed has described how engagement in content-specific instruction, ongoing professional support, and improved self-efficacy can have a positive impact on the frequency and quality of musical instruction among preschool teachers. The strong link between positive teacher self-efficacy and student achievement offers additional implications toward sustainability and greater teacher capacity. This chapter also describes developmentally appropriate instructional content and teaching strategies best suited to preschool children and the positive extramusical benefits music engagement promotes among youngsters. In addition, the examination of literature has contributed valuable criteria for a site-specific, pedagogically grounded, and collaboratively created professional development training program in music education for early childhood practitioners with little or no musical expertise. The reviewed literature has brought clarity to these issues and contributed to the design and evaluation model created for this study.
CHAPTER III  

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methodology employed to carry out this study. Sections include a summary of the research design, procedures employed to protect human subjects, descriptions of the population studied, the setting for the study, procedures and data collection, instrumentation used to collect data, the role of the researcher in limiting bias, and the analysis of the data.

This collective case study explored the bounded system in four classrooms, one art studio, and one music studio within one local preschool through detailed data collection (Creswell, 1998). The investigation employed typical qualitative methods, and multiple sources of data have informed the study’s outcomes. Surveys, interviews, observations, and artifacts such as lesson plans, photographs, and videotapes were collected and analyzed in an effort to explicate the research findings. The study explored emerging themes describing effective professional development in music education among early childhood practitioners in a Reggio-inspired setting.

Research Design

The research design for this study includes in-depth, within case and cross-case analysis examining emergent themes arising from collaboration between the researcher and twelve early childhood practitioners to address the question, “How might the impact of a site-specific, school-
wide collaboration between a music educator and a preschool staff be described and interpreted?” The case is bound by time, place, and activity (Creswell, 1998).

Research occurred over a four-month period during which time an initial teacher workshop introduced the instructional parameters and goals of the study, and subsequent collaborative planning, model instruction, classroom observation, and reflection took place. The setting of the study included four preschool classrooms, one visual art studio classroom, and one music studio classroom at the same local preschool. Music instruction was the focus activity to be studied.

Participants and the researcher collaborated to design developmentally appropriate music instruction relevant to classroom themes and topics. Two, six-lesson units were designed and delivered in each classroom in two, three-week periods (September 17 – October 05, and October 15 – November 02, 2012). The researcher acted as both participant and observer throughout this phase of the study, providing greater leadership and direct instruction at its beginning and gradually relinquishing instructional leadership to participants as the work progressed. A four-part model was employed: researcher teaches – participant observes; researcher teaches - participant assists; participant teaches – researcher assists; participant teaches – researcher observes. The co-teaching partnership between researcher and participant addressed these additional research questions:

Research Question One: How does the collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms?

Research Question Two: How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners?

Research Question Three: How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?
Procedures to Protect Human Subjects

Prior to implementation, the study’s research procedures were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) (Appendix A). Confidentiality was of utmost concern, and all data collection was guided by the highest proprietary and ethical standards. All written documents such as surveys and questionnaires were submitted under pseudonyms, and the identities of participants in videotape footage, audio recordings, personal interviews and focus groups have been protected (Appendix B). Parents were asked to permit the participation of their children, and signed release forms were required for each child participant (Appendix C). Only one family refused permission to videotape their child, and extra care was taken to exclude any images of him during data collection and analysis.

Population and Sample

The bounded system for this study was drawn from a private, church-based preschool in the Chattanooga area grounded in Reggio Emilia philosophy and practice. The site serves 100 children from middle and upper socioeconomic settings between the ages of 2 and 5. Infant care is not provided at this center. Children attend in varying groupings of two-, three-, and five-day cohorts, in four classrooms. In addition to eight classroom teachers (two co-teachers in each classroom), the school employs two co-atelieriste (art studio teachers) and one music teacher. The study engaged all eleven teachers and the center director.

This highly atypical early childhood community brought a rich background to the study, and the teaching staff collectively represented over 100 years of classroom experience. In addition, the center director brought 32 years’ experience to this environment. The study
benefitted in many ways from engaging in professional development with such an extraordinary clientele because the school already meets many important criteria for impacting change among practicing teachers through professional development (Guskey, 2000). While these teachers brought myriad skills and years of experience with young children, none of them had any training or formal education in music education for young children – not even the music teacher. Although a music teacher was employed at the site for this study, she lacked training specific to the musical needs of young learners. This lack of expertise coupled with the visual art focus of the Reggio model prompted the researcher to pursue the stated research questions. The faculty represented a wide range of educational backgrounds and they brought to this work a shared philosophy and instructional approach considered a critical factor in the quality of care and education provided to young children (McMullen & Alat, 2002). Reggio Emilia practitioners are accustomed to reflective practice, as it is foundational to the approach – another critical component of successful professional development (Borko, 2004). Peer support within a stable faculty is another critical factor in the sustainability of any professional development program (Nardo, et al., 2006), so the co-teaching arrangements already in place provided another important positive influence toward the successful outcomes of the project. Supportive and innovative leadership is another key element in affecting educational change (Hargreaves, 2007a). My initial invitation to this project was met with unreserved enthusiasm from the center director when I asked if she and her staff might consider participating. The inclusion of every teacher at the school in these mentorships allowed for a whole-school change effort to take place, another factor important in building the capacities of practicing teachers (Hargreaves, 2007b).

Time and again the research speaks to a lack of teacher education as a stumbling block toward best practice among early childhood care providers (McMullen & Alat, 2002; Persellin,
2007; Register, 2004). Because these fundamental and important factors were already in place, the research study could focus more completely on the questions posed and expect greater cooperation, participation, and growth from this unique faculty than might come from a more typical one. It was expected that the research outcomes would produce evidence uncluttered with common negative factors like lack of education or commitment and high teacher turn-over and could offer a standard from which more research will benefit.

**Setting for the Study**

The preschool in which this study took place stands unique among others in the region. This is the only local Reggio-inspired preschool and the nearest additional schools practicing this approach are in Atlanta and Nashville. Three significant tenets of the approach contributed to the site selection: the focus on the child as protagonist; the partnership among parents, teachers, and children; and the attention to small group, project-based learning (Edwards, Gandini & Forman, 1998). This social constructivist framework aligns the recommendations in best practice for early childhood education from NAEYC (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997) and NAfME (MENC, 1994b).

As an outsider in this community, it was critical for the researcher to build rapport with all stakeholders. Creswell (1998) asserts that the importance of rapport between researcher and constituents in a qualitative study cannot be overstated. Several opportunities to build camaraderie with the staff at the school have contributed to this endeavor.

Initial contact with the center director was made in March 2012 to introduce the study and solicit participation. The researcher and center director share a lengthy history of interest and organizational participation in the early childhood community in Chattanooga. In an effort to build further rapport with the teaching staff, the researcher participated in the day long Study
Tour hosted by the teaching team at the school in April 2012, and a professional development workshops in math and science education in partnership with the teaching staff in May 2012. Participation in these events allowed the researcher to gain exposure and insights into the behaviors, language, and interactions of this culture-sharing group, and afforded the opportunity to observe these teachers as ‘experts’ in their approach.

Creating a collaborative climate between researcher and stakeholders is another important factor in the success of this study. According to Hargreaves (2007b), effective staff development nurtures the interdependence and critical engagement of all participants. Several opportunities for collaboration between researcher and stakeholders addressed this criterion.

The initial focus group interview took place before the teacher workshop began, setting the stage for the ongoing collaborative nature of the study design. Questions such as “What musical understandings do you hope to gain from this collaboration?” and “What are the most memorable music experiences from your own childhood?” were posed to encourage a collaborative and personally relevant setting.

Immediately following the initial workshop, consultations with the center director and study participants occurred to collaboratively design the curriculum to be implemented. A typical Reggio-inspired lesson begins with a ”provocation”: a problem posed for the children to explore, investigate, or solve. Placing music at the core of the inquiry, additional subjects or contexts also came into play. Some topical considerations to inform musical choices included works of visual art, literature, investigations of nature, and environmental elements. Teachers contributed their expertise in Reggio practice and shared in the development of the music units at the core of the study. Two lesson units were created: one for use with 2- to 3-year-olds, and another for use in classrooms of 4- and 5-year-old children. The collaboration endeavored to align the goals of the
research project with the philosophy and practice already in place. Lessons were modified and adapted throughout the program to meet the needs of each individual classroom through collaborative reflection with each pair of co-teachers and the music teacher. The researcher served as the sole music instructor initially and gradually relinquished all music instruction to participant-teachers.

While the outcome goals were the same for all participants, the mentorship was designed around the diverse needs of four different constituencies: the center director, the co-teachers in four classrooms, the co-atelieriste in the visual art studio, and the music teacher. The recognition of, and adaptation to, individual participant needs were a fundamental consideration of this qualitative study and contributed significantly to the study setting (Hill, et al., 2010). It was expected that differences among participants would emerge as the study progressed.

Another important aspect of the study setting was the innovative and highly affective leadership style of the center director. Her engagement in the study was critical to its success. She modeled reflective practice for her staff and viewed her role as the “… dream catcher, vision holder, and cheerleader” for her students and staff (Laura, personal communication, June 6, 2012). Her relationship with teachers, parents, and students exemplified one of servant leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 361). She engaged in the initial workshop along with the teaching staff and was asked to contribution to data collection through weekly observations of teachers’ music instruction. She was the significant gatekeeper of the project.

**Procedures and Data Collection**

This study took place over a four-month period during the fall of 2012. The following description of study procedures and data collection is presented in three main parts, similar in
form to a Classical sonata composed in three sections: exposition, development, and recapitulation.

Exposition

Four events prepared study participants to engage in music instruction with their students. Each of these events addressed particular research questions. The completion of Participant Surveys (Appendix D) prompted attention toward specific skills typical in the delivery of developmentally appropriate music instruction for preschool children. The Focus Group interview offered opportunity for participants and researcher to build rapport and articulate outcome expectations for the work. The workshop provided explicit training and relevant research in multiple aspects of music instruction for young children (Teacher Workshop Notebook, Appendix E). ‘Participant exploration’ refers to the month-long period between the Workshop and Mentorship during which participants began journaling about the musical behaviors of their children.

Prior to the initial workshop, two activities took place to document baseline data informing the first research questions regarding (1) teachers attitudes about music education, and (2) their expertise in its delivery. First, participants completed individual Participant Surveys. The surveys examined teacher self-perceptions of twenty-two typical skills relevant to developmentally appropriate practice in music education. Next, study participants engaged in a Focus Group interview. The purpose of this endeavor was to build a collaborative climate among participants, build shared outcome expectations of the work, and gain insights into the attitudes and beliefs about music education these teachers brought to the study. Within-case and cross-case analysis of responses informed the pedagogical strategies and materials in the design of the
music curriculum to be implemented. Another set of Participant Surveys and another Focus Group interview took place at the conclusion of the study to inform the second research question investigating teachers’ change in practice.

A workshop exploring the practice and pedagogy of music education for preschool children initiated the instruction required preparing stakeholders for the mentorship to come. This event addressed the second research question: “How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners?” Designed and delivered by the researcher, this initial exposure included an overview of research demonstrating the value and purpose of music education for youngsters, an introduction to the elements and processes of music-making with children, an overview of fundamental skills associated with their implementation, the introduction of music standards for preschool children developed by NAfME, and the presentation of criteria for choosing appropriate music materials for use in the preschool classroom. Workshop participants included the eleven teachers at the school, the center director, and two interested parents. In addition to music instruction, an important part of the workshop content was training in the use of video documentation. All workshop participants completed a Workshop Evaluation (Appendix F) at its completion to gauge the relevance and effectiveness of the workshop content and execution.

At the recommendation of the center director it was decided that the onsite mentorship should not begin during the first month of school. For many children, preschool is their initial experience away from home, and quite a lot of management and routine at school are being established during that time. It was during this period that participant exploration about music for preschool children occurred. Having been alerted to typical musical behaviors of preschool children in the Workshop, participants began collecting baseline data relative to their students’
musical behaviors. Through daily journal entries, teachers were asked to reflect on and summarize (a) pitch accuracy, (b) beat competency, and (c) spontaneous musical expression among the children in their classrooms. No direct musical instruction took place at this time, however general engagement in musical play was encouraged. This baseline data provided an important foundation as teachers were guided to discern developmentally appropriate music instruction from musical play.

As study participants became familiar with the children and their parents, they were asked to identify two child/parent pairs to follow through interviews during this study. A typical classroom of two teachers followed four different child/parent pairs. This represented a sample size of 24 children and their parents – roughly 24% of the total student population. The goal of these interviews was to draw on a purposive sample of children and parents from whom to glean more detailed data regarding the musical development of the children. Teachers were provided with sample questions and criteria through which to collaborate with parents to better understand the musical development of the children in their care (Guilmartin & Levinowitz, 2008; Valerio, Reynolds, Morgan, & McNair, 2012).

The same three-part criteria through which teachers were analyzing the children’s musical behaviors framed the interview questions: (a) pitch accuracy, (b) beat competency, and (c) improvisatory musical expression (Child/Parent Interview Protocol, Appendix G). Teachers identified their interviewees and collected their first interviews before the mentorship began. Thereafter, interviews were to be conducted once weekly. These early journal entries and initial child/parent interviews were sought to lay necessary groundwork to inform all three research questions documenting: (1) teacher attitudes about music instruction, (2) the improvement of musical practice, and (3) the effectiveness of the professional development endeavor.
Development

The central focus of the study occurred through the mentorship between the researcher and each teacher participant. In her study of the Reggio Emilia approach to preschool music instruction, Amanda Page-Smith sets the precedence for the short-term, intensive study that was followed here (Burton & Taggart, 2011). This mentorship took place over an eight-week period: six weeks of intensive, twice weekly, site-specific music instruction in each classroom, with one resting week and one final week of observation.

*Weeks 1, 2, 3*

During the first three weeks – in six lessons, the researcher participated in music instruction as a participant observer. Collaboratively designed music instruction was modeled with participating children and teachers, drawing teachers gradually into the shared delivery of instruction. Post-lesson discussions, deconstructions, and unstructured interviews took place between researcher and teachers to clarify modeled procedures and illuminate next-steps for the instruction. All conversations were audio recorded for reference and review by the researcher (Unstructured Interview Protocol, Appendix H). The researcher kept detailed field notes of each lesson, describing teacher behaviors, student engagement, and researcher impressions. Each participant implemented the modeled strategies on subsequent days prior to the next mentor visit. Teachers were asked to document their work through field notes such as daily journal reflections and at least one videotape recording of their musical engagements with children in the researcher’s absence. Two certified music specialists were engaged to view videotaped footage of participants’ music instruction. These external evaluators assessed video documentation using the Participant Skills Assessment (Appendix I) protocol to address teachers’ developing musical
practice in light of the second research question. These assessments have contributed to evaluations done by the researcher, by the center director, and by the teachers themselves in an effort to triangulate the data.

The center director employed the same instrument to document teachers’ engagement in music instruction. This data informed research question one, as it documents frequency of instruction – an indicator of teacher self-efficacy and values identification (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011). Teachers completed the Participant Self-Report (Appendix J) weekly, to document their changing practice in music education.

The researcher attended regularly scheduled staff meetings to gather data related to teachers’ progress and questions, and to collaborate with all stakeholders in the reflexive nature of the project. Each week, interview topics and/or questions for children and parents were collaboratively constructed around the outcome criteria for student growth to maintain cross-case alignment. Through this collective effort, shared themes have been identified and whole-school goals articulated. Each of the research questions has guided these discussions and the analysis of teacher practice.

**Week 4**

A one-week ‘resting period’ occurred between weeks three and five to allow teachers greater reflection into their personal practice, and to honor the break embedded in the school calendar. No new data were collected at this time, although the researcher continued to analyze collected data during this period.
**Weeks 5, 6, 7**

During weeks five, six, and seven the researcher took on the role of outside observer when participants led music instruction with participating children without researcher guidance. The Participant Skills Assessment was employed by the researcher to document ongoing evidence of teacher growth. Data collection and evaluation took place in like manner to data collected in the first three weeks of the project, including videotape documentation and analysis by external evaluators, daily journal reflections and weekly Participant Self-Reports from participating teachers, and at least one observation by the center director. Participation in regular staff meetings continued for all stakeholders, as did weekly Child/Parent Interviews. Ongoing data collection continued to inform all three research questions, and ongoing thematic coding contributed to cross-case analysis.

**Week 8**

Recapitulation

In the week following the mentorship, unannounced observations by the center director or the researcher occurred for all teacher participants. The Participant Skills Assessment was utilized to gauge the frequency of music instruction being delivered and contributes to aggregate data addressing the first research question regarding teacher values, and the second research question probing teachers’ improving practice in music education. In addition, all participants completed another Participant Survey to compare responses with those gathered before the project began, contributing data toward research question two. Another focus group interview took place between researcher and participants during the final week of the project. The focus of this conversation was to summarize project outcomes and solicit participant responses to all three
of the research questions.

**Instrumentation**

Six evaluation instruments were developed to document teachers’ participation throughout the study: Data Collection Log, Participant Survey, Workshop Evaluation, Participant Self-Report, Participant Skills Assessment, and Child/Parent Interview Protocol. Additional emergent data were evaluated through participant reflections and journals, unstructured interviews, and researcher field notes.

**Data Collection Log (Appendix K) and Binders**

A data collection log was created for each participant, and for the community as a whole, to track all documentation of the project. Binders were created for ease of paper management, and to simplify organization. Along with various reference materials, undesignated pages were plentiful, and multiple copies of Protocols, Self-Reports, and Reflection prompts were provided. Additional folders were made available for participants to include student-created artifacts and photo documentation of their work. The researcher collected binders regularly for data analysis. Electronic portfolios would have been more efficient, however, pencil and paper record keeping was commonly practiced among these teachers and offered the least disruption to their practice.

**Participant Survey (Appendix D)**

To substantiate inferences regarding the lack of familiarity with developmentally appropriate practices in music education among these early childhood practitioners, the researcher created a *Participant Survey* to be administered to all study participants once before
the mentorship began, and again at the end of the project. The needs assessment surveys developed by Steven Kelly (1998) and Shannon de l’Etoile (2001) were influential in its development. Kelly’s questionnaire was adapted to gain insights into participants’ personal comfort level with a variety of musical behaviors relevant to the musical development of young children. The data were analyzed to address the third of the research questions: How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?

In his book, *Assessment for Educational Leaders*, James Popham (2006) suggests that affective assessments are not given the importance they deserve in our current educational environment. This is particularly true in professional development, as the accurate assessment of constituent needs is crucial to the success of any program. He further asserts that Likert inventories are among “the most serviceable affective measurement strategies available” (p. 285).

The five-part descriptors in the Participant Survey were based on Popham’s criteria for Likert Inventories (p. 286-287). They offer participants the opportunity to self-assess within a range of categories from very comfortable to very uncomfortable indicating their comfort level with twenty-two musical behaviors. The selection of categories and tasks is based on fundamental instructional elements of music education appropriate in early childhood settings. Once completed, each item was scored to determine which musical behaviors required the most attention. For example, teachers initially indicated a high level of discomfort with “guiding music composition”. This information prompted the researcher to introduce instrumental strategies and compositional activities through which the goal of musical composition could be made explicit for teachers. Survey results were the basis for the initial Focus Group Interview,
and informed elements of instruction that brought insights into the greatest needs for continued inquiry at the conclusion of the study. The same measure was employed to evaluate teacher change at the conclusion of the study.

**Workshop Evaluation (Appendix F)**

A key element of this program design was the workshop component of the training because it established the initial atmosphere and introduced fundamental skills to be addressed. As referenced earlier, current thinking about quality practice in professional development requires specific training in subject matter knowledge, guided and active experiences for teachers, and pedagogical foundations critical to the content (Borko, 2004). The instructional content of the workshop is addressed in greater detail in subsequent writing, however its evaluation must be mentioned here. Participant responses to workshop events and atmosphere informed the development of further instruction and brought insight to the second research question: How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners?

After the workshop, participants evaluated its usefulness using a three-part Likert inventory. The measurement of participants’ affective responses to the activities and pedagogies of the workshop influenced the development of mentorships and offered context for data collected through the Participant Skills Assessments, Observation Protocols and Reflections and Journals.
Teacher Journals

Dewey’s premise that we learn not from experience, but from reflecting on experience (1933) prompted the collection and analysis of reflections from all stakeholders in the project. The daily reflections and journal entries requested from participants were framed through all three of the research questions, although specific prompts were not provided. Teachers’ attitudes and beliefs emerged in these writings to address the first research question: How does the collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms? The open structure of this data allowed for direct interpretation and the emergence of relevant themes or issues. Participants began making journal entries immediately following the introductory workshop, allowing them to freely explore musical leadership with their students for roughly three weeks before the mentorship began. Reflections were collected, reviewed, and coded weekly. Participant growth emerged over time to address the second and third research questions.

McMullen, et al (2006) indicated that self-reported beliefs and the documentable practices of preschool teachers are not always aligned. In order to uncover these inconsistencies a comparative analysis of observed behaviors and self-reported practices was done. This method of data collection has been useful to the project because it helped to bring context to the observations of the researcher and the perceptions of participants. Additionally, teacher reflection has been cited as a critical component of quality professional development (Borko, 2004). These findings point to the need for journals, reflections, and participant self-reports in order to better understand participant growth as well as participant perceptions of self-efficacy in music instruction.
Participant Self-Reports (Appendix J)

The assessment field has produced a number of instruments used to measure teacher effectiveness. The following summarizes relevant examples that have been considered in the creation of the Participant Self-Report for this study.

*The Teacher Belief Scale* (TBS) and *Instructional Activities Scale* (IAS) developed by Charlesworth, Hart, Burts, and Hernandez (1991) offer examples of prompts and questions soliciting self-evaluation by teachers on topics like their endorsement of developmentally appropriate practices and philosophies (DAP), and frequency of engagement related to them. McMullen, Buldu, Lash, and Afat (2004) created the *Early Childhood Professional Questionnaire* (ECPQ) to address such issues as demographics (age, location, setting, role), structural variables (background qualifications, ratio of adults to children, average group size, level of engagement in professional development), and process variables (quality of professional relationships, job satisfaction). The *Classroom Assessment Scoring System* (CLASS) emphasizes observation methods particularly suitable to early childhood classrooms and focuses on instructional methods and interpersonal interactions between students and their teacher (LaParo, Pianta, & Stuhlman, 2004). The *Early Childhood Classroom Observation Measure* (ECCOM) (Stipek, 2004) takes into consideration multiple aspects of the learning environment like instruction, management, social climate, cultural sensitivity, and the resources of preschool and kindergarten classrooms. The final example used to develop the Participant Self-Report for this study is the *Early Childhood Teacher Behavior Observations Scale* (ECTBO) through which a teacher’s classroom interactions can be quantified through time sampling based on seventeen categories of behavior (McMullen, et al., 2006). Each of these assessment tools related the importance of teachers’ practice and philosophy, teacher-child interactions and the importance of
affect in the learning environment. While none of them address the specific impact of musical endeavors on classroom interactions, each example was helpful in creating relevant categories for measurement in this study.

The prompts created for the Participant Self-Report urge teachers to assess the frequency in which they engage in music instruction with their children. Prompts are constructed as a five-part Likert scale for ease of use. Participants are asked to rate the frequency of their musical practice using the descriptors *daily, often, sometimes, rarely, and never*. Responses are grouped into five categories: singing, moving to music, playing instruments, listening to music, and teaching pedagogy. There are 22 total prompts, ranging from three to five in each category. In each case, the last prompt, “please add any personal insights here”, was constructed as an open response and contributed to the overall narrative data collected in the study.

**Participant Skills Assessment (Appendix I)**

The Participant Skills Assessment is constructed identically to the Participant Self-Report for ease of comparison. The researcher completed weekly assessments for each participating teacher, and selected videotaped recordings were viewed and assessed by external evaluators using the same instrument, providing analysis triangulation to support the trustworthiness of the study. This instrument was also employed for use in the observations done by the center director. Comparative analysis of the findings identified specific areas of teacher growth and the common structure for all observations facilitated thematic analysis (Creswell, 1998).

Fundamental to any qualitative study, observation provided the keystone for the analysis of all other data in this collective case study. In situ observations predominated, although video documentation also offered another lens through which project assessments could be made. Over
the eight-week period of the mentorship, multiple unstructured observations occurred as the researcher engaged in music instruction with participants. Beginning as a participant-observer, the researcher gradually relinquished teaching responsibilities to take on the role of outside observer. This approach offered the researcher plentiful opportunity to allow themes to emerge and report emic as well as etic data through rich description and detailed analysis.

The Participant Skills Assessment is a frequency count created to measure the occurrences of musical activities and instruction guided by participants during their regular encounters with children. To gauge the frequency of music instruction being delivered, the center director was asked to use this instrument in each of the four general classrooms, and the music studio. Data gathered from these observations was compared with data gathered by teachers, external evaluators, and by the researcher in an effort to identify which activities were most often delivered and further triangulate the data.

The Participant Skills Assessment and the Participant Self-Reports are both instruments through which teacher behaviors were analyzed and evaluated to address the second and third research questions: (2) How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners? (3) How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?

Child/Parent Interview Protocol (Appendix G)

Teachers gathered interview data from children and parents at the school in an effort to understand student growth in music. Standards created by NAfME identify three overarching musical goals for children in preschool: (a) pitch accuracy, (b) beat competency, and (c) spontaneous musical expression (MENC, 1994a). Child/parent interviews were intended to bring
awareness to these expectations among teachers and parents and bring insights to the first research question: *How does the collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms?* Issues of parent expectations, student interest, and teacher self-efficacy contributed to these findings.

Questions for weekly interviews were collaboratively created at regular staff meetings to contribute to cross-case comparisons. While this content varied week-to-week, the format for the interviews remained consistent. Largely left blank, each protocol requires managerial information like the date, identities of the interviewer and interviewees, and the general topic questions to be discussed. Because these teachers nurture ongoing relationships with the children and their parents, the interviews took on a very informal, conversational tone. It was important for teachers to code responses anonymously, noting each respondent specifically (child or parent). An important issue that arose in the development of interview questions was attention to user-friendly vocabulary for both children and adults. Accurate documentation was another important factor in keeping interviews relevant and on point (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004). Audio recordings of these interviews were suggested, although because they tended to be somewhat spontaneous in nature teachers’ did not record them. Teachers were urged to use whatever method yielded the most natural responses.

**Unstructured Interview Protocol (Appendix H)**

Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen (2004) offer multiple strategies for the creation and implementation of qualitative interviews and focus groups. Establishing the appropriate climate and rapport for these inquiries is fundamental to their success. Because interactions with participants took place at their school, issues of physical climate were minimal, however,
developing personal rapport was of utmost importance. Care was taken to guard against using overly ‘academic’ language and position the researcher as a co-learner among teachers and students rather than an outside ‘expert’. All interviews were audio recorded to assure accuracy and time was set aside immediately thereafter to make notes, draw conclusions, and note next steps.

Unstructured, personal interviews were conducted with each participant after every music lesson. The purpose of these interviews was to bring context to other data (Participant Surveys, Workshop Evaluations, Participant Skills Assessment and Participant Observation Protocol) and gain insight into the alignment of each data set. Best practice in professional development suggests that participant input is critical to the success of any program and multiple measures offer the most reliable data. In their descriptions of collaborative assessment protocols, McMullen and colleagues (2006) suggest that self-reported beliefs and practices among preschool teachers are not always evident in the observation of their practices. Their premise asserts that it takes the examination of what teachers say about their beliefs, the observation of their actual teaching behaviors, and the evaluation of artifacts and other evidence of their teaching to get a true understanding of their practice.

The intimacy of personal interviews helps strengthen the mentor/mentee relationship, and offers the mentor a depth of understanding that helps to guide the work with greater specificity toward the needs of the mentee. Interviews solicit information that cannot be observed, and shed light on participant attitudes and beliefs (Gay & Airasain, 2003). The broad questions to be posed address the three key elements of this research: (1) attitudes toward music instruction, (2) quality of instruction, and (3) the effectiveness of the professional development model. Unstructured interviews allow participants to elaborate or add pertinent information to the broad
questions posed. Additional questions were developed based on interviewee responses. It was critical to the data collection that interview vocabulary and context were appropriate for the interviewee, and that their responses were accurately recorded. This opportunity for participants to put their understandings in their own words was an important evaluative element of the mentorship. Among the ‘guidelines for interviewing’ Gay and Airasian (2003) state “listening is the most important part of interviewing” (p. 213). Post-study Focus Group interviews offered comparative data through which within-case and cross-case teacher growth could be measured. This data brings insight to research question three: How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?

Teacher-generated Artifacts

McMullen, et al (2006) suggests that the collection of artifacts is essential to building a true picture of teacher practice. To that end, participants were expected to include products such as lesson plans, child-created objects or compositions, child/parent interviews, audiovisual recordings, photographs, and the like in the documentation of their work. These products offered the researcher another avenue for cross-case analysis and provided rich fodder for more naturalistic generalizations. Participants’ self-selection of artifacts offered data supporting research question two: How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners? Each of the measurement tools cited shed light on the development, structure, and administration of the assessments created to support the design and evaluation of this professional development study.
Role of Researcher in Limiting Bias

Attention to bias is particularly important to qualitative researchers who are immersed in the cultures of their participants (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). In this study the researcher interacted with all twelve practitioners as both observer and participant. The dual roles required vigilance toward careful use of music-specific language and resisting the temptation to over-analyze too soon. These roles also heighten the possibility of overlooking negative case analysis (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Additionally, the researcher’s investment in the study outcomes requires that her connection to the field be made explicit.

The researcher has been immersed in professional development in the arts for over ten years, having come to the field from over twenty years as a music educator in elementary and preschools in four states. Additionally, she has taught elementary music methods courses at two Universities. The collection of multiple sources of data such as teacher self-reflection, teacher observations, and the evaluation of videotaped examples of participants’ music instruction by external evaluators will contribute to the triangulation of data to mitigate researcher bias.

Analysis of Data

The study employed a largely qualitative design, although some simple descriptive data were gathered to document teacher change in response to research question two. Qualitative procedures dominated the study analysis and were largely drawn from the ethnographic tradition. Employing surveys, interviews, observations, reflections and artifacts, the data analysis evolved through a spiraled approach to description, analysis, and interpretation (Creswell, 1998). A Project Calendar (Appendix L) and a Data Collection Matrix (Appendix M) were developed to aid the researcher in the collection and tracking of all documentation for the project.
The analysis of data is grounded in the three main themes aligned with the research questions: (1) teachers’ attitudes, (2) teachers’ musical practice, and (3) professional development strategies impacting teachers’ changing practice. In a qualitative study, data analysis is an ongoing process (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Through the inductive analysis of data and repeated examination of field notes, interviews, observations, and collected artifacts, cross-case concepts and themes emerged. Much of the data collection and analysis was done manually, although the researcher relied heavily on her iPhone for audio and video documentation.

Detailed descriptions of all study activities for each participant (n = 12) followed a chronological presentation of collected data. Multiple artifacts representing each participant were analyzed and coded for themes. A data collection log was kept for each participant to summarize study participation. Cross-case analysis was employed to aggregate findings.

Quantitative data is represented in simple descriptive strategies using pre- and post-Participant Surveys, Focus Group Interviews, Participant Skills Assessments, and Observation Protocols to measure teachers’ changing practice, and assess the overall effectiveness of the intervention. Analysis of patterns or shared trends will be presented in the next chapter as generalizations relevant to the community as a whole, and may inform further studies among other populations.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Note pads, pencils, and cameras are always at the ready; teachers are at the tables, on the floor, and inciting their busy broods in a constant state of inquiry. Activity and omnipresent chatter are the norm in this happy laboratory of learning. “What happened, Arlen?” poses one teacher in an effort to provoke the thinking and articulation of a three-year-old whose experiment with gravity has yielded surprising results. “What are you singing about, Katelyn? Can you teach me your song?” another teacher asks as she observes an active two-year-old at play. Response, dialogue, and debate: Where is the line between teacher and learner?

“Things about children and for children are only learned from children.”

Introduction

The purpose of this collective case study was to describe and interpret the impact of a site-specific, school-wide professional development endeavor in music education on the attitudes and practices of twelve early childhood practitioners working together at the same preschool. This chapter will present the research findings beginning with participant demographics. Next, the development of the methodology is presented and research procedures are described. The chronological descriptions of encounters with participants and the analysis of collected artifacts will reveal themes that emerged from the study. The chapter will conclude with a summary of the research findings.
Participant Demographics and Study Participation

Twelve participants were enrolled in and completed the study, although engagement varied among them. Pseudonyms were assigned to protect their identity as well as the children and families named in the study. Participants are all female, except one, and their average age is 44, ranging from 22 to over 65. Teaching experience among participants averages twelve years, ranging from one year to thirty-three. All participants held college degrees, although only five of them (42%) relate to early childhood education. The roles represented are eight classroom co-teachers (67%), two Atelieriste (visual art specialists) (17%), one music specialist (8%), and the center director (8%). Table 4.1 represents a summary of participant characteristics.

Table 4.1 Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years’ Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AA Early Childhood</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher 2 yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3 ECE; 5 HS</td>
<td>BA English/Social Studies</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher 2 yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BS ECE (Masters)</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher 3 yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>BS Marketing</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher 3 yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher 4 yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AA Early Childhood</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher 4 yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>MS Child Development</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher 5 yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>BA Art Studio</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher 5 yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AS Visual Art</td>
<td>Atelierista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>BA Art History; MA Counseling</td>
<td>Atelierista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M.Ed. Special Education</td>
<td>Music Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>BA Psychology</td>
<td>Center Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight classroom teachers and the music teacher contributed the most active participation in the study (75%). Artifacts documenting teachers’ participation included multiple semi-
structured interviews, weekly self-assessments, journals, and records of parent/child interviews (Data Collection Matrix, Appendix, D). The depth and quality of submissions varied greatly, and the return rates ranged from 13% (Henry) to 100% (Karen).

The two atelieriste were not expected to engage in music instruction, although they were generous to make their work transparent and to offer the researcher critical insights and observation opportunities into the process and emergent nature of the Reggio Emilia model. These teachers acknowledged the importance of music for children, and Isabel provoked many fertile conversations with the researcher indicating her interest and rich personal musical background.

The Center Director was most engaged and very generous in her participation through interviews, both in person and those collected by email. Face-to-face semi-structured interviews between the researcher and Center Director represented more than three hours of conversation. Multiple spontaneous conversations and email interviews accounted for lengthy and insightful responses to questions posed by the researcher. She completed only three of the requested evaluative documents (Participant Skills Assessment, Appendix J) and her contributions in journal entries (two weeks) were detailed, although total submissions were limited. She clearly viewed her role as administrative, rather than participatory.

**Data Analysis**

**Overview**

The researcher collected data through the mentorship at the research site for an average of 20 hours per week between September 17 and November 5, 2012. In addition, two four-hour teacher workshops were held: one on August 13 and another on September 10, 2012, before the
onsite mentorship began. Over the eight weeks of the study numerous artifacts were collected and analyzed: 25 semi-structured teacher interviews, six structured interviews with the Center Director, 72 lesson observations, 31 weekly journals, 37 participant self-reports, 29 parent/child interviews, 50 videotaped teaching excerpts, 63 audio recordings representing 11.2 hours, and multiple spontaneous interviews, discussions, emails and photographs. The researcher also accumulated over 50 single-spaced pages in journal entries documenting her daily tasks and reflections in response to the study. Data collection represents roughly 125 hours of onsite engagement and seemingly countless hours of reflection and analysis that contribute to the research findings. External evaluators also contributed assessments of videotaped observations of teachers’ music instruction with their children in an effort to triangulate data. A Data Collection Matrix (Appendix D) summarizes the total data collected for the project.

Since the three research questions guiding this inquiry focus on a community of practitioners, the analysis for this dissertation will focus on aggregated data, drawing on significant individual details as exemplars. All participant-generated data sources were coded separately highlighting words and phrases illustrating any aspect of the research questions as well as any unexpected elements of the study deemed significant. The researcher’s journal was coded in a similar manner. Initially, some data were given multiple codes when multiple meanings could be applied.

Corbin and Strauss (2008) suggest the use of memos as a strategy that helps researchers move from raw data to the concepts represented. This strategy was employed to guide reflection and analysis of all the data. Lists of memos were arranged and rearranged based on shared and contrasting properties. As expected, differences among participants emerged as the study progressed, necessitating the need to consider data through the roles participants played within.
the school community: that of the classroom co-teachers, the atelieriste, the music teacher, and the center director. Memoing was particularly helpful in identifying similarities and differences in cross-case data. Creswell (1998, p. 220) also suggests a process of “layering themes” in which data is filtered from specific to general. In this study, themes were organized in alignment with the research questions.

In qualitative research, data analysis requires a multistage process of organizing, categorizing, and interpreting data in an iterative cycle (Gay & Airasian, 1992). In this study, data were examined many times: daily, during data collection, and multiple times post-collection. With each repeated examination of the data, the process of axial coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) was employed to group concepts with complementary relationships into themes emerging across cases.

The first post-collection examination approached the data chronologically, analyzing interviews, teacher-generated artifacts, and researcher reflections side-by-side in an attempt to identify events and behaviors significant to participants practice. Memos were drawn from observations and insights recorded in the researcher’s journal such as, “Anna is still leading singing too low; when she asks children to start the song she doesn’t sing along in their key (Researcher’s journal, October 19, 2012). The memo referencing this quotation reads: she lacks aural awareness. Memos were additionally applied to text and audio interviews. Through the iterative analysis process, over 450 memos were applied and collapsed into concepts. Initially, many text or audio excerpts were labeled with more than one concept.

A second examination grouped the data conceptually to expose commonalities and differences among participants’ comments, products, and behaviors. The final data analysis scrutinized all products for shared topics, inferences, conceptual similarities, and common
themes. This cyclical process of reading, memoing, classifying, and interpreting led to the development of three themes over the course of the study: *musical Awareness, Identity, and Adoption*. Figure 4.1 represents these themes and their key concepts visually. The narrative that follows describes in detail the process through which the researcher arrived at these representations.

Figure 4.1 Themes and Concepts

Themes and Concepts

The most frequently identified theme to emerge, *Musical Awareness*, became a ubiquitous thread throughout the investigation. This theme was constructed through three major concepts: the heightened awareness of (a) teachers’ own musical behaviors, (b) the behaviors teachers observed in their children, and (c) pedagogical insights teachers reported as they engaged in the work. Findings developed through this theme address the second research
question: How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners?

Initially, some teachers addressed their own lack of musical self-efficacy while others demonstrated comfort with music. As the study progressed there were demonstrations of personal musical growth in teachers’ improved use of musical vocabulary and through their assessments of the musical behaviors of their children. Others continued to struggle with both issues although teachers’ statements in dialogue and in print often began with, “I noticed that …” as they addressed their own or the children’s musical practice.

Another frequently identified concept relating to musical awareness was pedagogical understanding. Most teachers were aware of the affective and kinesthetic benefits of music for preschool children before the study began, however the cognitive benefit of music education was a topic of continuing inquiry (Scott-Kassner, 1999). Weekly visits to the music studio were an established routine and ‘enjoying’ music was a frequent activity in every classroom. Teachers reflected on cherished musical memories from their own childhood and expressed a desire to nurture them among the children in their care. Music was often used to soothe a crying child, to build a shared community, or to facilitate classroom management.

Throughout the study, the researcher posed questions about the instructional purpose of musical activities she observed, coaxing teachers to engage in musical provocations designed to build musical skills and concepts that were developmentally appropriate for the children in their care. Teachers articulated many extramusical and affective purposes for the musical engagements they initially guided and progressed later to using “tuneful, beatful, artful” (Feierabend, personal communication, August 6, 2012) descriptors to identify the musical objectives that grounded their music instruction and observations.
Identity was another prominent theme throughout the study. The issues of personal and community identity were woven throughout the study as practitioners expressed their musical understandings in these contexts. Teachers self-identified as able or unable musicians, and these personal beliefs influenced their engagement in this study. Personal teaching practice became significant as teachers strove to bridge their growing musical understandings with more familiar teaching practices. Guiding teachers to reflect on their own small successes, helping them find relevance in musical engagement, and allowing them multiple and flexible entry points into this work were all strategies the researcher utilized to provoke participants to think of themselves as able music teachers.

The constructivist philosophy in which the Reggio Emilia approach is grounded offered a rich tapestry through which to understand community identity among participants in the study. In particular, the prominence of the ‘language of visual art’ seemed, initially, to leave no room for musical exploration or instruction. Because music education is not addressed in Reggio schools in Italy, there is no precedent for music instruction from which to draw. Study participants demonstrated shared community identity in their comfortable guidance of children in visual art activities, and enjoyed collaborative support from the atelieriste, but there was no corollary design for music. On the contrary, the established music program functioned like a typical elementary school music classroom. The children came to music each week and sang seasonal songs and sometimes played rhythm sticks or shakers. Their classes typically lasted fifteen minutes. When describing her instructional choices for the children, Karen said, “Like anything in show biz, you’ve got to know your audience. You’ve got to know when it’s time to move on. This is fifteen minutes of ta-da” (Karen, personal communication, October 18, 2012)! Music was a scripted, active, presentational endeavor in which teacher-directed activities dominated the
experience. This model was completely contrary to the emergent curriculum approach practiced elsewhere at the school. Classroom teachers participated along with their children and the expertise of the music teacher was honored and isolated. Karen’s personal identity as “entertainer” influenced the community’s expectations for school-wide musical engagement.

The atelieriste held strong identities and expertise in visual art and were also revered as “experts” across their teaching community. The full-time presence of an art specialist was accomplished through the part-time presence of these two teachers. Their full-time presence among the faculty was another indicator of the value placed on their pedagogical and practical contributions to the curriculum. Neither of the atelieriste demonstrated much comfort with music, and while they recognized its value for children, they did not find music instruction relevant to their practice. Isabel and Jenny enjoyed collaborative relationships with one another and with all of the classroom teachers, and were frequently seen in classrooms as well as the atelier guiding children and their teachers to illuminate a particular artistic process or introduce a new artistic medium that would be supported in the children’s classrooms. This strong collaborative relationship between classroom teachers and atelieriste contributed to a community identity more strongly aligned with visual art than with music. This proved a practical model through which to position music education in this setting, suggesting that a similar collaboration could take place between the music specialist and the classroom teachers. This ‘new model’ for music education at the school will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five. These findings have contributed to the first research question, how does the collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms?
The third theme to be revealed was teachers’ Adoption for the strategies and practices introduced in this professional development endeavor. The roles teachers played within their school community influenced their acceptance and adoption of newly introduced music strategies. None of the participants thought of themselves as “music teachers”, and because they had no training in music education it was a common misperception that ‘teaching’ music was beyond them. Teachers’ self-efficacy was fundamental to their acceptance and adoption of newly acquired music strategies. Building skills and confidence in the practice of music instruction proved a critical element toward that end.

Co-teachers had identified teaching strengths and weaknesses in each partnership and developed divisions of duties that reflected them. In partnerships where one teacher was not musically confident, musical engagement was relegated to the other teacher. This was the case for Gail and Henry; because he held negative views about his own musicianship, Henry relied on Gail to lead all musical engagements in that classroom. Callie and Diane had a similar arrangement.

The relevance of music instruction to teachers’ established practices and outcome goals for their children played a significant role in their adoption of new strategies and skills. The emergence of individual needs on the part of each participant arose very quickly to impact the researcher’s responses and recommendations in each classroom setting. Those most successful sought out musical provocations that aligned with children’s interests, seeking to broaden their existing explorations. Callie’s efforts to musically support the scientific thinking of her children resulted in the exploration of contrasting musical timbre in the triangle and cabasa. This instructional inquiry offered the researcher the opportunity to individualize musical support, promoting the teacher’s musical goals in the context of her own teaching practice.
The leadership of the center director was crucial in promoting the school-wide adoption of developmentally appropriate music instruction. The aim of strengthening teachers’ understanding of ‘the language of music’ and its relevance in daily classroom life was an important goal articulated in Laura’s journal:

I hope my teaching staff will become more mindful of ‘tuneful, beatful, artful’ as a way to think about foundational skills in music for early childhood… [and that] they will find the connections between what they already offer the children and how that ties into more intentional content. (Personal communication, September 18, 2012)

As both manager and visionary, Laura positions her leadership through a human resources lens (Bolman & Deal, 2008), supporting and empowering her teachers to grow as a community of Reggio-inspired practitioners. She aligns her approach to leadership with several key traits of the constructivist Reggio approach:

Curtis and Carter [2008] are fond of saying, ‘If it’s good for children, it’s good for teachers’. I take this to heart. I need to have a strong image of my teachers. I need to treat them with respect. I have to be willing to be a co-researcher with them. I need to scaffold their next steps and growth. I have to shape their hypotheses and sometimes confuse their thinking so they can construct their own knowledge. (Personal communication, September 15, 2012)

In the same communication, she credits her dedication to ongoing professional development as “the most important piece of our transformation” when describing the six-year transition to the Reggio approach she continues to negotiate. This emergent model highly influenced the structure and process of this study. Throughout numerous communications, Laura’s insights into Reggio-inspired practices were invaluable to the researcher in her efforts to maintain the relevance and alignment of this professional development endeavor with the shared identity among this group of practitioners. The theme of Adoption, and its supporting concepts of roles and relationships, relevance, and leadership addresses findings relevant to research question three: How does a
collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?

An unexpected additional factor influencing teachers’ participation in the study was time. Teachers frequently mentioned how busy they were, and how overburdened they felt with the documentation process for the study. Time was an expected limitation in the long-term and sustained adoption of the study goals, however, it was surprising to the researcher to find this overall time pressure in a small preschool environment, unburdened by state and federal testing mandates.

A fundamental tenet of the Reggio approach is the importance of time within the emergent curriculum.

One of the most important organizational elements is that of time. In Reggio’s municipal preschools, children are afforded a great deal of time to explore both long-term projects and typical, everyday preschool activities. Children are both expected and encouraged to spend long periods of time concentrating, whether it be on a painting, in the dramatic play corner, or during a conversation. Being able to work at something for a long time is highly valued because it indicates a deeper level of involvement and hopefully of understanding. Teachers are very observant and respectful of children’s time, giving them the time they need to process information, to come to a new level of understanding, and to construct new knowledge. (Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1998, p. 376)

Within this philosophical context, it seemed remarkable to hear the teachers address time as a constraint rather than a benefit. When addressing the issue of time in the context of this study with the center director, she suggested that a once-a-week mentorship stretched over a year’s time might prove more beneficial than this short, intensive model. While the struggle with time was not a direct outcome of our musical endeavors, it had a negative impact on the timeliness and quantity of data collection.
Data Representation

During the open coding process the researcher used the three research questions through which to filter the most salient comments, leaving room to also consider unanticipated concepts that might emerge. Teachers’ musical awareness, their personal and community identity, and their eagerness to adopt new teaching strategies are the major themes that have arisen to inform the research questions guiding this study. Table 4.2 presents an example of how data were condensed from memos through concepts and finally into themes through which aggregated data could be analyzed. More than sixty themes were considered during this process.

The columns are arranged from specific to general in a left-to-right orientation, beginning with reference data such as recording (R), journal (J), or researcher’s journal (RJ) entry number, date recorded, speaker identification and event or context for the data, and specific quotations. The columns that follow: Memo, Concept, and Theme represent the researcher’s responses and analysis.
Table 4.2 Data table – Example of Collapsing Data into Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Quote or Paraphrase</th>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>10-01-12</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>“Music isn’t a language that’s real comfortable for me. If you want a lot of music, go visit the Twinklers!”</td>
<td>Teachers in the Twinklers classroom are viewed as having musical expertise</td>
<td>Teacher’s Self-efficacy Others are better at music than I am</td>
<td>Musical Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ23</td>
<td>10-19-12</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>“Anna is still leading singing too low; when she asks children to start the song she doesn’t sing along in their key.”</td>
<td>She lacks aural awareness</td>
<td>Teacher’s Self-awareness Researcher’s model must make singing higher a priority of instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>10-17-12</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>“[I] added remaining bells to the tone ladder today. Mary and James noticed and commented at different times today. Mary said, “Now you can make real music” – like it was not music if not complete [the entire diatonic scale]. Interesting.”</td>
<td>We began with pentatonic, and she added fa, ti, and do’ as a provocation. [Diatonic] She notices Mary’s tonal awareness</td>
<td>Children’s Self-efficacy Children have preconceived ideas about what music should sound like; they are comfortable expressing musical opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R58</td>
<td>11-01-12</td>
<td>Evie</td>
<td>“We (teachers) started the activity by asking: ‘Are you going to stir the brew fast, or slow, or medium?’ We started watching the children lead the song. A few tried all three tempos… doing fast, slow, and medium – and you could tell the difference between all three. I’m glad you suggested that strategy - I don’t think I would ever have thought to do that.”</td>
<td>Teachers introduced the concept of tempo through a Halloween song introduced in the Music Studio. The researcher urged them to heighten the instructional purpose of the activity with greater musical detail.</td>
<td>Pedagogy The children are able musicians; Teachers are able music teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impromptu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since this dissertation is a descriptive study, the findings are represented largely in narrative form, although some simple numerical data is included. Narratives are used extensively.
in qualitative research to guide the reader in a chronological approach depicting events over time (Creswell, 1998). Each of the above-named themes is illuminated in the narratives that follow. Because there is no ‘standard’ format for reporting case studies (Stake, 1994), these findings have been organized through two categories: the chronology of events leading up to the mentorship (Workshop, Collaborative Planning, Consultation, Staff Meeting), and later described as categorical data (Surveys, Interviews, Artifacts, and Lesson Observations) once the mentorship began. Narratives include multiple data sources to triangulate analysis and impressions, plentiful detail regarding circumstances and setting to contextualize events for the reader, and frequent use of excerpts from face-to-face encounters with participants to offer exemplars that drew the researcher to the themes that emerged.

**Chronological events**

**Workshop**

In the initial workshop, the researcher introduced fundamental music skills and knowledge around Feierabend’s simplified categories “tuneful, beatful, and artful” (1992) and guided participants in the exploration of them (Gharavi, 1993; Saunders & Baker, 1991). One experience focused on singing, one rhythmic experience, and one activity targeting creative music making framed the experiential portion of the workshop. In each case, the researcher presented research-based evidence for the benefits of this engagement and then guided participants in activities exemplifying them. This is a critical first step when introducing innovations into a client system (Rogers, 2003). Participants needed to understand why improved music instruction was important for their children, and they needed to be assured, through experience, that they were capable of delivering it (Guskey, 2000).
Attention was given to teachers’ engagement and demonstrated comfort levels with activities such as singing, moving to music, and playing classroom percussion instruments. All participants engaged willingly and demonstrated positive affect in all aspects of the work. The researcher’s role of participant observer was supported with videotaped footage of the workshop. Analysis of the workshop footage revealed teachers’ accurate pitch-matching skills, with the exception of one atelierista (Jenny), and well-developed basic beat-keeping skills. Teachers managed instruments well and were somewhat familiar with their use.

Creating a positive climate and providing relevant content for adult learners are crucial to effective professional development (Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). Relevant content was presented through repertoire thematically linked to the newly developed outdoor playscape, and the woodland setting it inhabited. A positive climate was nurtured through group activities developed to ensure success in each contribution teachers made, and carefully protecting the anonymity of teachers’ vocal contributions.

To gauge participants’ responses to this initial encounter, Workshop Evaluations (Appendix G) were distributed and completed anonymously. Aggregated data appear in Table 4.3, Workshop Evaluation. Participants indicated an overall positive response and seven surveys contained brief open responses. One significant response read, “Music is scary to me. I am definitely looking for ongoing instruction.” This lack of self-efficacy toward musical engagement provided the researcher with insight into the theme of Self Identity. Although this participant’s reticence wasn’t overtly evident, the written, private, response was a reminder to the researcher that adults bring self-criticism into new and risky endeavors, and that one-time workshops don’t offer novices the depth or confidence required to change teaching practice (de l’Etoile, 2001). This finding was further confirmed in the ratings to question number 10, “After
the workshop, I felt more confident about leading music activities with children”. Participants indicated their highest “somewhat” rating in this category (42%), demonstrating a lack of readiness to apply in their classrooms what they had experienced in the brief workshop. This brief insight into participants’ prior knowledge and musical self-efficacy provided an important foundation toward building rapport between researcher and participants, and contributed to the researcher’s understanding of participants’ self and community identities.

Participants’ responses to the survey assured the researcher that the beginning of a positive relationship had begun through this initial experience. Teachers were prompted to describe their most beloved songs and activities already part of their daily practice in an effort to draw parallels with the newly presented repertoire and validate teachers’ personal musical choices. The researcher’s success as a change agent depended on teachers’ perceptions of her as “credible, competent, and trustworthy” (Rogers, 2003, p. 369), and this practice of informal information exchange was an effective strategy toward that end.

Table 4.3 Workshop Evaluation - Aggregated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The workshop atmosphere was positive.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The music skills addressed were relevant to my practice.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt comfortable trying new musical tasks.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The workshop leader met my contributions with positive acceptance.</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The pace was too fast for me to grasp new strategies and skills.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There were plenty of opportunities to ask questions.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The materials presented were appropriate for the children I teach.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The introduced songs and activities were easy to learn and remember.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I will use some of the new songs and activities I learned today in my classroom.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have gained confidence in leading music activities with children.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please add any personal insights here
Collaborative Planning

To verify participants’ understanding of the study, the initial workshop ended in a collaborative conversation and question/answer period regarding shared outcome expectations and the development of a study calendar/schedule. It was the researcher’s additional intention to solicit ideas from participants that would lead to music lesson plans designed specifically for each group of children with the needs of each teacher in mind (Guskey, 2002). Workshop Notebooks (Appendix F) were provided for each participant containing resources such as song samples with accompanying CDs, workshop activity notes, support documents such as music standards and developmental scales in music, and research documents including journals, parent/child interview protocols and participant self-reports.

Teachers appeared overwhelmed by the detail and scope of the research plan and the newness of the music content. When urged to offer ideas for co-constructed music lessons embedding some of the strategies they had just experienced, participants were noticeably reluctant to participate. Rogers calls this “information overload” when the change agent overwhelms the client with too much technical language or expertise (2003, p. 386). Questions were rephrased, prompts were simplified, and still teachers hesitated. As Guskey aptly points out, “…to try something new means to risk failure” (2002, p. 387). From the teachers’ perspective, it was just too risky to venture a suggestion. In a later interview, Becky confessed that seeing the lesson plan implemented with children was critical to her understanding. “The written lesson plan was really overwhelming until we saw you do it. It makes sense now” (Becky, personal communication, September 19, 2012).

Gail finally suggested that we begin the year with one plan for everyone and adapt activities and skill expectations for each age group. She acknowledged everyone’s reticence to
impose their own choices, as well as the comfort that comes from knowing they were all working from the “same playbook” (personal communication, August 13, 2012). The concept of *Community identity* is evident here. As Gail speaks for the group she captures their discomfort in being asked to design musical tasks for their children. Teachers’ hesitancy reflects their perception of the researcher as “expert” and their own lack of self-efficacy toward musical decision-making.

When the researcher volunteered to create a sample lesson from which to begin, participants expressed relief and agreement. It was suggested that teachers review the documents provided and substitute favorite, more familiar, repertoire in addition to, or instead of, those provided by the researcher before our next meeting. Guskey’s assertion was considered in this request: “Certainly teachers should have in-put in the planning and development of new programs. Their experience and expertise are a valuable resource that should not be ignored” (1986, p. 6).

The researcher gained early insights into the theme of *Adoption* through this event. Teachers’ perceptions of their roles and responsibilities in this professional development endeavor were revealed in their hesitancy to openly engage in shared planning. Gail demonstrates the traits of an early adopter in her recommendation for a community-wide lesson design. According to Rogers (2003), “early adopters help trigger the critical mass when they adopt an innovation” (p. 283). Gail’s high degree of opinion leadership is also evident when her colleagues indicate their approval of her suggestion.
Consultation

Two sample lesson plans were prepared by the researcher to illustrate the subtle differences in outcome expectations for two- and three-year-olds, and those targeting the developmental capacities of four- and five-year-olds. Figure 4.2 offers the reader a sample of these plans, and a completed example is attached (Appendix N). The two plans shared much of the same repertoire although some differences were also apparent. The column marked Repertoire included one example and the phrase ‘your choice’ to prompt teachers to add their own favorites with the same instructional goals in mind. The researcher later learned that this type of traditional lesson planning was not practiced among these teachers. They were more accustomed to open-ended prompts or simply observing children’s interests as a provocation for study.

The researcher met with the center director on August 17th to deliver the sample plans and get her feedback on the process. She agreed to distribute them and reiterate the importance of teachers’ input and participation. Plans were made available to teachers, although no individual consulting occurred between the center director and teachers. This was the researcher’s first glimpse into the busy and hectic role of the center director as this meeting was interrupted with multiple phone calls, teacher requests, and parent inquiries.
Staff meetings

A subsequent meeting occurred on September 10, 2012, to review and refine study elements and consider the sample lessons proposed by the researcher before the mentorship began. It was evident that teachers had not reviewed documents, listened to CDs, or attempted to edit lesson plans. When prompted to suggest alterations, Anna said, “I’m thinking we should try it [the lesson plan] the way it is, and as you get to know how our classrooms work, and the children, we can adapt as we need to. We sing all day long” (personal communication, September 10, 2012). Her skeptical tone communicated the belief that her musical practice was
already sufficient and that the responsibility of the lesson design was clearly the burden of the researcher. Rogers would categorize this client as a ‘laggard’: “Laggards tend to be suspicious of innovations … their decisions are often made in terms of what has been done previously” (2003, p. 284). Anna’s statement alludes to instructional purpose and relevance in its assertion that adaptations to the lesson should be driven by their alignment with her existing practice. Anna makes an additional inference toward understanding musical pedagogy in her assertion that singing ‘all day long’ requires no instructional plan. Pajares (1992) describes this tendency as a reflection of teachers’ values: “…knowledge of a domain differs from feelings about a domain… Teachers often teach the content of a course according to the values held of the content itself. … This combination of affect and evaluation can determine the energy that teachers will expend on an activity and how they will expend it” (p. 309-310). Anna’s inability to differentiate between music activities (“We sing all day long”) and planned music instruction was an indication of her lack of knowledge of the domain.

After a lengthy discussion of the research plan and the required documentation, Anna’s teaching partner, Becky, said “I just want to recap expectations: We’re doing interviews on two children and their parents each week, and a self-evaluation on Fridays. We’re doing daily journals every day, and we’re tracking the [musical] developmental progress of the interviewed children” (personal communication, September 10, 2012). The tone of her comments and closed body language indicated skepticism and resistance. These are traits of the ‘late majority’ of adopters; according to Rogers “[for the late majority] innovations are approached with a skeptical and cautious air” (2003, p. 284).

Others were more positive, including Evie, who asked if she and her partner could substitute ‘Five Little Monkeys’ for ‘Humpty Dumpty’ as suggested in the lesson sample. She had
clearly understood the instructional purpose of presenting rhymes to children, and had applied that understanding through the use of more familiar material. Her suggestion was met with enthusiastic approval by the researcher and the change was made to reflect that teacher’s contribution.

A final staff meeting occurred on November 2, 2012. Participants anonymously completed a Mentorship Evaluation (Appendix P) to summarize their feelings towards the project. The twelve prompts in the survey addressed both philosophical and practical aspect of the study and reflected an overall positive response.

*Roles, relationships, relevance, adoption and identity* are all themes that began to emerge before the mentorship began and continued to deepen as the study progressed. These findings contributed to the researcher’s understanding of this community of learners and provoked the reflection contributing to the study’s flexibility and responsive design. The small size of the client base, the intensely personal mentorship, and the diversity of experience each teacher brought to the work offered the researcher many opportunities to consider this professional development endeavor through the lens of change agent (Rogers, 2003).

Categorical data

*Surveys*

Prior to engagement in musical activities, participants provided responses to twenty-two prompts probing their comfort with musical behaviors in four categories: reading music and playing instruments, singing with children, leading musical activities, and planning music instruction. Responses were analyzed as nominal data on a five-part Likert inventory employing these descriptors: very comfortable; somewhat comfortable; neutral; somewhat uncomfortable;
and very uncomfortable. The researcher gathered baseline data prior to the initial workshop and again when the mentorship ended (Appendix E) in an effort to identify changes in teachers’ awareness of their own musical skills. Responses were then tallied and aggregated into two categories: positive and negative responses. Data were compiled for side-by-side comparison. Categories reflect the instructional focus of this music mentorship. Table 4.4 presents a comparative representation of the data.
Table 4.4 Pre- and Post-Study Surveys: Teachers’ Comfort with Musical Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate Data:</th>
<th>Pre-Study Survey</th>
<th>Post-Study Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 13, 2012</td>
<td>November 05, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Study: 12 reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Study: 11 reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Playing: reading music and playing “traditional” classroom instruments</th>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read music notation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (name it)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm instruments</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sing: vocal comfort and classroom use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singing with own accompaniment</th>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singing with recorded music</th>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowing characteristics of children’s voices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selecting appropriate songs for children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leading and teaching songs to children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leading music activities through multiple modalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08%</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selecting recordings for children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developing and leading listening lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing creative music experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning music experiences for children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using song books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using music curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding music standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leading music improvisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding music composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using music to teach other subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instigating musical provocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Post-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All twelve participants responded to the initial survey ($N = 12$), however the center director did not participate in the summative survey, so that data set was calculated accordingly.
Responses to prompts one through five informed the researcher of participants’ background knowledge and prior musical experience before the study began. Teaching participants to read music and play traditional classroom instruments was not a focus of the study, and therefore these prompts were unsolicited in the summative survey. On the contrary, playing classroom rhythm instruments was an important part of the music instruction fundamental to the project. This prompt solicited a high positive response rate, improving slightly in the summative survey (83% and 91% respectively).

Developing singing skills and strengthening teachers’ vocal practice are other significant components in this study. Prompts seven through 11 address this topic and in every case positive response increased and negative response decreased when comparing the two surveys. Prompt nine, *Knowing characteristics of children’s voices*, demonstrated the strongest improvement with a positive response range from 17% initially to 91% on the summative survey. This data was further confirmed in teachers’ increased use of the MUSIC TOGETHER® OBSERVATION SCALE for Children’s Music Development (Music Together, 2008).

Developing and leading movement activities, focused listening tasks, and creative musical experiences such as composition are topics explored through prompts 12 through 15. Again, positive growth was indicated with the strongest gains noted in prompt 13, *Selecting*
recordings for children (40% gain) and prompt 15, Providing creative music experiences (41% gain).

The final group of prompts (16 through 22) addresses issues of music planning and pedagogy. While gains are demonstrated in this category as well, the lowest positive ratings are reflected in these responses. It is particularly notable that prompt 21, Using music to teach other subjects, enjoyed the highest rate of improvement even though the researcher often demonstrated and identified in participants’ instruction the difference between ‘using’ and ‘teaching’ music.

This survey data asserts that teachers’ self-efficacy improved in every category except one, in which the decline was negligible (see prompt number 12). While this data offers an insight into participants’ self-assessment, it is important to remember that teachers’ stated beliefs and observable practices do not always align (McMullen, et al, 2006), confirming the need to build trustworthiness in the research findings through triangulation. The findings presented here demand extensive and diverse qualitative data through which a more balanced picture can be developed.

**Interviews**

Interviews rendered the richest records among all the requested data. Teachers were much more willing to simply ‘sit and talk’ about their experiences than they were to write about them. By the end of the second week of the mentorship teachers were asking to be excused from journaling for lack of time. “We have a lot to squeeze into the three hours we have them [the children]” (Evie, personal communication, September 18, 2012). Additional interviews served as a solution to this dilemma. Classroom teachers and the music teacher established a 30-minute weekly meeting with the researcher to compensate for the irregular submission of journals.
Interviews with the atelieriste emerged as informal conversations embedded in their work with children. Many face-to-face interview ‘moments’ occurred between the researcher and the center director in addition to three 45-minute scheduled conversations.

Multiple semi-structured and spontaneous interviews occurred between the researcher and teachers, and between the researcher and the center director. These conversations were often prompted with phrases like, “Tell me about …” or “How are things going?” Corbin and Strauss (2008) suggest open prompts such as these as a way to engage the interviewee in guiding the dialogue. Thompson (2007) also suggests establishing ongoing opportunities for the examination, reflection, and refinement of personal beliefs among teachers. These conversations were recorded and reviewed by the researcher shortly after their collection. Researcher reflections were noted through ongoing journaling, and significant questions or follow-up strategies were identified. Participants took a reactive, rather than proactive, stance toward these conversations. Most teachers welcomed the opportunity to respond to questions posed by the researcher without having to prepare for them, and yet fitting in thirty minutes at the end of a busy day was often difficult. Time was a frequent subject of these conversations. “There is a lot of paperwork [required in this study]. It’s time consuming and I’m having trouble meeting the deadlines. The only time I can do this is the weekend” (Fiona, personal communication, September 25, 2012).

Using the three research questions to guide the conversations, participants were prompted to discuss how their teaching practices were being influenced by the mentorship, in what ways their musical self-efficacy might be changing, what – if any – musical behaviors they noticed in their children, and any other issues that appeared relevant to the work. The data table previously
described (Table 4.2) offers the reader a glimpse of these responses as they offer evidence of the concepts and themes to emerge from the study.

Once the project ended, the interviews were revisited and coded, documenting dates and times the discussions occurred, reconsidering notes from each session, and capturing significant quotes from participants. Interview entries were reviewed multiple times and compared with journal entries and other participant-generated artifacts to identify common concepts and themes through triangulation.

Teacher-generated Artifacts

Participants were asked to submit four documents each week as evidence of their engagement in the study: a journal containing weekly reflections, questions, or ideas, a self-assessment of musical practices, and a parent/child interview documenting conversations with two children and their parents. Responses ranged from lengthy narrative accounts to simple one-word answers. Likert-type prompts were provided in the Participant Self Reports in an effort to standardize and simplify responses. Journal entries varied widely and represented a 57% return rate. Participant Self-Reports were the most frequently submitted with a 69% return rate, and Child/Parent Interviews were the least represented in a 27% return rate. Efforts to compensate for low return rates of teacher-generated artifacts were addressed through the researcher’s increased interviews of teachers, and expanded video and audio collection.

Journals.

Teachers were asked to journal in an effort to promote their reflective practice and to provoke self-appraisal and critical thinking about the musical tasks set before them and the
Impact these musical engagements had on their children (Kremenitzer, 2005). The researcher urged teachers to focus their writing with a dual purpose through two recurring questions: “How are your children responding to this musical engagement?” and “How is your musical leadership with the children changing?”

Initially, much of the writing lacked detail and was simply presented as a reported event: “Today we used songs as transitions” (Anna, personal communication, September 18, 2012). As teachers became more fluent with music pedagogy and vocabulary, their writing became richer: “The children are remembering more of our fall songs and starting them themselves. We are definitely listening more closely to the children’s singing, and starting songs in the pitch they choose now” (Becky, personal communication, October 29, 2012). Becky’s journal entry expresses her heightened awareness of the vocal contributions of the children in her class, and addresses her changing instructional pedagogy and that of her teaching partner.

Heightened awareness of their students’ musical engagement became evident in teachers’ descriptions of the musical behaviors they were observing, and in the ways in which they provoked their own thinking: “We are beginning to wonder about the children who are ‘singing under their breath’ – Are they unsure of the words, or do they not know the tune” (Callie, personal communication, September 25, 2012)? These personal insights offered the researcher timely opportunity to demonstrate teaching strategies that specifically address children’s melodic growth apart from their management of text in singing. Later in her writing, Callie is able to separate these skills as she describes the progress her children are making: “I noticed they are beginning to learn the words and the melody…” (October 1, 2012). This understanding was further supported when she said, “I’m having to step back and listen more carefully for the tune
because I always thought the words were more important; but really there’s more to it than just getting the words” (October 3, 2012).

Another example of teachers’ growing musical awareness is seen in Fiona’s frequent use of the T (tonal) and R (rhythmic) codes taken from the MUSIC TOGETHER® OBSERVATION SCALE for Children’s Music Development (Music Together, 2008) when she describes the progress of her students: “The children began keeping the beat with their heads swaying back and forth, and with their hands and feet smacking the floor [as they sang] – (R4)” (October 5, 2012). This beginning step toward musical assessment is an indication of Fiona’s growing understanding of ‘beatfulness’ as well as her improving musical self-efficacy.

Other participants also expressed in their journals a growing self-awareness of their own musical expertise. In her November 2nd journal entry, Becky wrote, “We are really amazed at how much more we are listening closely to the children and how this immersion in music is helping them move past monotone singing to tuneful melodies.” In a similar way, Callie wondered about how her own melodic inaccuracy might influence the way the children were singing: “…I realized my tune was off a tad. I wonder how that affects their singing” (October 3, 2012).

Each of these journal entries offers insight into the teachers’ growing musicianship and their application of new musical understandings into their practice. Teachers exhibit in these statements a willingness to reevaluate former practices, and demonstrate a growing understanding of how to identify and assess the ‘tuneful’ and ‘beatful’ musical growth of their children.
Participant Self-Reports.

Weekly Participant Self Reports were requested from the nine participants who were regularly implementing music instruction in their classrooms to track instructional frequency in music. Thirty-seven reports were submitted, representing a return rate of 69%. These documents were read weekly to inform the researcher’s efforts with individual teachers and to provoke teachers’ recognition of their own practice. Although fewer than requested reports were completed and submitted, those received offered significant insights into the weekly practice of individual teachers and assisted in developing an understanding of their progress. These reports were implemented as part of the data collection to illuminate how teachers viewed their own progress toward improving their practice in music instruction, and to identify the frequency in which teachers’ were engaging in these behaviors. de l’Etoile (2001) suggests “… music training seemed to be effective at improving caregivers' attitude toward implementing music activities with young children. … Improved attitude and comfort level may result in caregivers' providing music activities more frequently and with greater enthusiasm” (p. 18-19).

When the study was complete, the researcher assigned numerical values to each descriptor: Daily = 4; Often = 3; Sometimes = 2; Rarely = 1; Never = 0, and converted findings numerically. First and last submissions from each participant were tallied and compared to identify instructional frequency in each category and calculate change reported by each individual.

One participant, Henry, failed to report after the first week so his initial data was eliminated from the aggregated calculations. In addition, Fiona failed to complete the two categories on the back of the document (Listening to Music and Teaching Pedagogy) in her initial report, so those categories were calculated based on only seven paired responses. The final
exception to the calculation of data is found in Karen’s reporting; she purposefully eliminated instrument playing in her final report due to time constraints, therefore limiting that data set to seven. While quantitative data is not typically drawn from samples this small, overall impressions can be informed from aggregated figures of teachers’ self-reported findings.

Not unexpectedly, participants reported improved frequency of instruction in all categories. Although it represented the least-reported activity at 63% frequency, Playing Instruments reported the highest average increase rate at 37%. The category reporting the least change was Teaching Pedagogy (9% increase) citing the only declining score over time [Anna: First Report = 90%; Last Report = 75%]. This data is represented in the table below.

Table 4.5 Teacher’s Reported Cross-Case Means: Frequency of Music Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>First Report Mean</th>
<th>Last Report Mean</th>
<th>Mean Frequency Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to Music</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Instruments</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Music</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Pedagogy</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child/Parent Interviews.

Participants were asked to collect interviews with parents and their children to provoke their analysis of children’s musical growth, and to draw parents into a greater awareness of it as well. This strategy aligns with the Reggio philosophy recognizing “the critical role of parents as protagonists alongside their children and the teachers” (Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1998, p. 149). The interviews offered participants the opportunity to strengthen their musical thinking and
analysis, and to engage in music-specific dialogue with both children and parents. However, the collection of child/parent interviews proved difficult for participants. Of the nine teachers actively engaging in music instruction with children, only four of them collected and submitted any interview data. Of the 108 interview documents expected, only 26 were submitted, representing only a 24% return rate. Once again, the burden of documentation was a frequent barrier, as exemplified in the statement “Parent interviews are really hard at the end of the day [because there is so much activity and noise in the dismissal process]” (Fiona, personal communication, September 25, 2012).

Karen found that ongoing conversations with the parents of her study-subjects were best facilitated through her personal Facebook™ page (http://www.facebook.com/Karen). Her child/parent interview documents were submitted most frequently, representing an 83% return rate, and contained the most thorough and insightful content including a MUSIC TOGETHER® OBSERVATION SCALE for Children’s Music Development (Music Together, 2008) tracking the rhythmic and melodic growth of each child she followed.

In her last submission, Karen notes the significance of one parent’s growing musical understandings about her children:

The general consensus at the Smith house is that there has been more musical everything since the beginning of school. Mom was confused about why I chose to observe/study her son and not her daughter. This journey seems to have opened her eyes to Sam’s musical abilities and interests. She seems to have admitted to a bit of gender bias, so it’s good to have shattered that. The mom has stated that she has purchased more children’s music because of Sam’s enthusiasm towards it. (Personal communication, November 1, 2012)

This kind of parental awareness is similarly reported in The Hundred Languages of Children when the authors interview parents of children attending La Villetta School in Reggio Emilia. Gianna Fontanesi speaks to the important relationship between teachers and parents when she
says, “it seems they help us to *discover* our children” (Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1998, p. 151). In this interview, Karen identifies the parent’s growing awareness of the musical growth and interests of her son and draws her own conclusions to the issue of gender bias – implying that Mrs. Smith expected music to be a more appropriate expression for her daughter than for her son. These insights contribute to the significance of including child/parent interviews in the data collection, and the importance of ongoing dialogue between parents and teachers in promoting their awareness of the musical development of the children in their care.

**Lesson Observations**

Because teachers’ self-assessments and stated beliefs are often inconsistent with their observable practices, the research plan included observation and evaluation of participants’ music instruction by the researcher and two outside evaluators (McMullen, et al., 2006). Teachers’ music instruction was analyzed using the Participant Skills Assessment (Appendix J). Twenty-five behaviors documented teachers’ practice in five categories: singing, moving, playing instruments, listening to music, and teaching pedagogy. The categorical prompts were identical to those used in the Participant Self Reports (Appendix K). Eight classroom teachers and the music teacher engaged in music instruction most frequently, and of those, six teachers (68%) made the greatest and most consistent contributions. The work of these teachers provides a purposive sample from which the Lesson Observation data is drawn. Two participants (22%) did not lead any music activities during any of the researcher’s classroom visits, preferring to abdicate the task to their teaching partners. One participant seldom led music activities and provided only one, very brief, observable event. These teachers participated alongside the children, often taking charge of behavior management. Although they did not lead instruction,
these participants were active in the lesson analysis and deconstruction conversations that occurred after each lesson.

Researcher Impressions

Teachers’ weekly assessments were reviewed and analyzed by the researcher to inform face-to-face collaborations with each client. The researcher completed weekly teacher assessments, and kept detailed field notes and reflections to support the assessment protocol. Personal emails were sent to teachers, and copied to the Center Director (Appendix O), in response to weekly lesson observations posing questions and offering feedback to encourage participants’ continued efforts. Using the same skills assessment protocol (Appendix I), the researcher collected and tallied frequency data regarding teachers’ music instruction using the same procedures as those reported in Table 4.6 (Teacher’s Reported Cross-Case Means – Frequency of Instruction). The researcher’s quantitative findings are reported here.

Table 4.6 Researcher’s Reported Cross-Case Means - Frequency of Music Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>First Report</th>
<th>Last Report</th>
<th>Mean Frequency Increase %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to Music</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Instruments</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>03%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Music</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Pedagogy</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The detailed descriptions that follow offer exemplars of teachers’ attitudes and practices as they are reflected in the five categories of the Participant Skills Assessment protocol: singing,
moving, playing instruments, listening, and teaching. Some of these narratives are supported with audio examples. Audio links are embedded to take the reader directly to the appropriate sound files. Simply click on the **Audio Link: Song Title** to access the sound files.

**Singing.**

Lesson observations revealed a wide range of comfort with singing among study participants, although all teachers demonstrated melodic accuracy. As suggested in the research of Flowers and Dunne-Sousa (1990), the greatest challenge was setting the tonal centers high enough for the children to accurately reproduce the melodies presented. This was an ongoing challenge illustrated in the theme, *Musical Awareness*. Some teachers took their tonal cues from recordings produced for preschool teachers, often by those with no musical credentials. Specifically, *Dr. Jean Sings Silly Songs* (Feldman, 1997) was a school-wide favorite. “Dr. Feldman inspires teachers across the country with her engaging songs and creative activities that help make teaching and learning FUN!” ([http://www.drjean.org/html/about.html](http://www.drjean.org/html/about.html)). Well-meaning vendors of early childhood products commonly appropriate authentic folk melodies seeking to enliven instruction for any number of extramusical purposes. While this recording, and others like it, offered participants ‘teachable’ content like the sequence of the calendar, and familiar tunes with jaunty accompaniments to support their own singing, they were typically pitched for adult – not child – singers. The researcher afforded every opportunity to suggest alternative recordings, and provided the Center Director with a reference list of more appropriate resources (Appendix Q).

Promoting this fundamental change in teachers’ practice required constant reminders and those who entered the project as comfortable singers were most able to make the adjustments.
Teachers were most successful singing in appropriate ranges when taking starting pitch cues from the children. The following rendition of *Skip to My Lou*, adapted here as *Hello, How are You* ([Audio Link 4.1 Hello Song](#)) calls the Twinklers for Morning Meeting every day. Becky uses Dr. Jean’s recording and sings along, inviting the 2-year-olds to the carpet.

![Figure 4.3 Hello Song](#)

Notice in this example that Becky’s melody lies very low. Nearly the entire melody lies below the singing range (d₄ – a₄) typical of 2-year-olds (Guilmartin & Levinowitz, 2008; Gordon, 1990; Welch, 2006). Notice also that when the children venture “Hello, How are you?” they sing in a much higher key.

![Figure 4.4 Typical singing range of two-year-olds](#)

In a lesson observation, gathered two months later, Becky exhibits two important improvements in her singing practice ([Audio Link 4.2 Hello Song II](#)). First, she is confident enough to sing without the recording so she can sing a major third higher than in the first example, employing only two pitches below the singing range of the children. She also prompts individual children to begin each new verse, listening for their tonal leadership. Even though all
of the children are not yet singing in unison some individuals approximated the melody with
greater accuracy.

It is also notable that by the third verse, Anna, Becky’s teaching partner, can be heard
singing nicely in this higher range even though she holds a limited view of her own ability to
”sing high”. The following excerpt from the researcher’s journal brings to light Anna’s
reluctance to lead the singing in a higher range – even though she can match the higher notes
when Becky leads the singing.

    I reminded her [Anna] of the conversation in the workshop when I talked about singing
in a child-appropriate range. She said, “Oh yes, I remember. Becky can sing higher, but I
can’t. When I was in school and they listened to me sing I was placed in the alto section
because my voice is so low. (Researcher’s journal, September 26, 2012)

Anna’s self-identity as an alto is grounded in the past, another example of her status as a
‘laggard’ in the community of adopters (Rogers, 2003).

In the closing interview, Becky speaks to the way the mentorship has begun to influence
her teaching practice and how she is applying her new vocal and auditory skills:

    I am thinking about using these strategies and activities with the songs we already know.
We saw you use the techniques, then we used them, and now hopefully we are putting
them into what we do. Listening to the children more carefully; listening to their singing;
where they are starting the song and modeling their pitch instead of my own. There are a
lot of things I do now that I didn’t do before. (Personal communication, November 1,
2012)
Another common practice among study participants was singing to the children to evoke non-musical responses or facilitate transitions such as preparing for snack time. Researchers refer to this as extramusical purposes (Kuhlman & Schweinhart, 2012). This was often part of the ‘Morning Meeting’ routine. An early example of this occurred in Evie’s classroom when she sang *One Little Elephant* to call children to a line as they prepared to go outside to the playground (*Audio Link 4.3 One Little Elephant*). Evie placed the tune in an appropriate range for the children, but did not offer an opportunity for them to sing it. As you listen to this audio excerpt, notice that the goal for the children in this activity is listening for their own name, and then counting their peers in the line.

![Image of One Little Elephant sheet music]

**Figure 4.6 One Little Elephant**

Some children try to sing along, although they sing slightly behind the teacher and do not master the melody. The following excerpt from the researcher’s journal illustrates these baseline findings:

The children requested the ‘Elephant Song’, so she [Evie] acknowledged their request by saying, “yes – we will sing that one as we line up to go outside.” She sang well for the children in a clear, simple voice with accurate intonation. Her range was on target for the age group, and though she never explicitly invited children to sing along, she acknowledged through body language when she heard children singing. There was no attempt to evaluate the children’s contribution. This is a clear example of ‘using music
for extramusical purposes’. Children are prompted to count their peers (elephants) in line at the end of every repetition. This supports learning outcomes in math like sequence and addition. Affective goals are turn-taking and personal/shared space. (Researcher’s journal, August 30, 2012)

In a lesson observation viewed by the researcher two months later Evie employs a cloze strategy (Chatel, 2001) as she starts the melody for *Open Shut Them* and prompts the children to complete the song without her help (*Audio Link 4.4 Open Shut Them*). While this repertoire represents another example of using music to teach extramusical concepts – in this case, behavior, the teacher is moving toward improved instructional practice as she turns the melody over to the children, rather than singing it for them. Additionally, she demonstrates enough confidence to apply new teaching strategies to repertoire that she knows, and has taught for years. In addition, she supports the children by mouthing the words without singing – an example of audiation (Gordon, 1990), and that midway through the song the melody falls apart. You’ll hear the researcher sing the familiar opening motive in the closing phrase to help the children get back on track and model for the teacher how to support the children’s singing without dominating it.

![Figure 4.7 Open Shut Them](image)

Figure 4.7 *Open Shut Them*
During the deconstruction interview with Evie the researcher presented video documentation of her work as an entry point into the analysis of the lesson. The teacher noticed that the children couldn’t sing the entire song on their own, but recognized that it was a valid challenge for them in her response to the researcher’s question, “Why do you think I jumped in at the end?” Evie replied, “They did kind of fade out … I’m glad you helped them a little bit. When you’re [the teacher] singing with them, they kind of rely on you – but what we want them to do is listen to each other and sing together” (Evie, personal communication, October 30, 2012). This recognition offered the researcher the opportunity to clarify the teaching strategy: “Sometimes that little bit of a cue like, [singing the first word, and mouthing the last two] ‘Open ____ ____ , Open ____ ____ ,’ is enough of a short coaching example to help them remember to sing” (Personal communication, October 30, 2012). Later in this same conversation, the researcher was able to point out the comparison between the cloze reading strategy and the musical skill of audiation, praising the teacher’s guidance in modeling melodic thinking for the children.

In response to this video example, one of the external evaluators suggested, “the children did not receive enough of a tonal center to carry the rest of the song” (Evaluator 1, personal communication, November 6, 2012). In the same communication, she also pointed out that “many of the children did not seem engaged in her [Evie’s] lesson and she made few corrections, either verbally or with body language, to involve them back into the lesson.” These observations address the theme of Awareness, implying that the teacher’s awareness of the musical behaviors of her children required greater attention.

Moving.
Teachers appeared comfortable moving, and promoted kinesthetic engagement with musical activities in their classrooms and on the playground. The greatest challenge was positioning movement activities within a musical context and helping teachers identify appropriate musical outcomes through kinesthetic engagement. Clarifying instructional purpose was another ongoing exploration throughout the study.

Initially, movement activities lacked instructional purpose throughout the teaching community. A typical movement activity for Twinklers was “tap dancing” to recorded music. Anna and Becky provided up-beat recorded music and tap shoes for the children to explore “dancing” simply for the sake of kinesthetic exploration. As the study progressed, engagement in more purposeful movement to support musical learning began to emerge. Musical objectives such as melodic direction and tempo can be seen through the following excerpts from Becky’s journal: “We sang *Autumn Leaves* outside today, using movement as well as pitch [to depict] the leaves falling “down, down, down”. I think movement is such an important part of music, and it also simulates more parts of the brain – more than just singing.” (October 3, 2012). “Aaron asked for ‘songs on’ today – for me to turn on some music. I asked him if he wanted ‘fast or slow?’ – he said ‘fast’” (October 5, 2012). These simple instructional adjustments indicate heightened awareness for small teaching opportunities and an increased frequency in the correct use of music vocabulary.

Beat competency is a musical goal often accessed through movement for young children (Guilmartin & Levinowitz, 2003). Karen, the music teacher at the preschool, often met her classes at the door to lead them into the room stepping to the steady beat of the drum. She was unaware of the complexity of this task and it’s inappropriateness for young children (Weikert, 1982). During the observation on September 27th, the researcher noted that none of the 3-year-
olds were able to match the steady beat consistently. Because the teacher walked in front of the children she was unable to monitor their success. In addition, her constant verbage over the drum beat is an additional distraction for the children: “Steady beat! Steady beat! March your feet to the steady beat!”.

After observing the researcher lead developmentally appropriate steady beat movement activities and discussing their purpose, Karen adapted her instruction to more age appropriate expectations. In a lesson observation occurring two weeks later (October 19, 2012), the instructional focus had shifted from matching the steady beat of the drum while marching, to keeping the macro- and micro-beat in response to recorded music. Children were seated and moving hands bilaterally, and the teacher sat facing the children to monitor their success. These developmentally appropriate instructional adjustments resulted in greater beat-keeping success for the children. Karen continued to struggle with too much talking over the music – an ongoing issue of the mentorship, but the children demonstrated some success keeping the faster microbeat (Levinowitz, 2011).

Both external evaluators and the researcher found evidence of teachers conflating the concepts ‘beat’ and ‘rhythm’. In multiple examples, their physical demonstrations of beat often reflected the rhythm of the words. Many teachers additionally used the word ‘beat’ to describe the rhythmic work of their children at instruments: “I’m not comfortable with the beat. I can’t even keep the beat. I felt like they did better when I came around and listened to them individually. Some of them did a really good job keeping the rhythm [beat]” (Fiona, personal communication, October 23, 2012). “Several friends spent time making up beats [rhythms] and tunes at the bells. They tried to duplicate each other’s music” (Gail, journal entry October 3, 2012).
Playing instruments.

Study participants indicated a high comfort level in leading instrumental activities with their children, although the researcher and the external evaluators saw little evidence of it. Instrumental instruction was frequently guided by the researcher during model instruction with the children. Teachers talked about how much more interested children were becoming in playing instruments as a result of this specific engagement. Callie noticed that the children in her classroom more frequently engaged in instrumental free play as evidenced in this interview:

I really feel that the interest [in playing musical instruments] is there. We [researcher and teacher] are introducing them to instruments this year, and we didn’t do that last year. Before, we just made them available and invited the children to play with them whenever they wanted to. There was never an introduction. I really see how much that matters - because we’ve taught them the right way to play; they’re respecting the instruments more than they would have; and they’re using them! We really didn’t get them using them last year. They are really working hard to play these correctly. (Personal communication, October 17, 2012)

The following photographs represent children exploring musical instruments during ‘exploration time’. These opportunities were exclusive to the children’s classroom experiences and their outside play.

Figure 4.8 David experiments with sounds at the triangle
Another common hurdle for teachers experimenting with new skills is the tendency to try too much, too soon. Fiona discovered that too many instructions could result in diminished
outcomes for all tasks when she challenged the children to keep the beat on their instruments as they sang a familiar song (Audio Link 4.5 Skidamarink). She prompted one of the children to begin the singing, and then cued the others to join in. The reader will hear the researcher joining in as the song begins, and then dropping out of the singing to encourage the teacher to do the same. While Fiona’s singing and steady beat examples were very clear, she quickly realized that these tasks were too complex, as the children could not execute either undertaking accurately when prompted to execute them simultaneously.

This was another opportunity to make developmentally appropriate practices in music relevant and to identify the importance of instructional focus. In the deconstruction conversation after this lesson the researcher was able to remind the teacher to limit and clarify the tasks she challenges children to undertake, adapting her instruction in the future to ask children to either sing or play – not both.

Listening.

Overall, lesson observations revealed a need to help teachers listen more carefully to the musical efforts of their children. Singing and speaking rhymes “for” the children was a common practice and extramusical outcomes were often the goal. Musical activities were often used to build vocabulary and linguistic understanding as evidenced in the following rendition of Old MacDonald (Audio Link 4.6 Old MacDonald). The song serves simply as a vehicle to prompt these 2-year-olds to identify farm animals and the sounds they make. The children were asked to select an animal from the toy barn to provide vocabulary for the song. The reader hears Becky prompt the children to name the animal they’re holding and suggest a sound for it. There is no attempt to engage the children in singing the verses, although they are asked to provide animal
voices at the proper time. Listen for Katelyn’s offering for her kitty cat; while she cannot match
the low pitches sung by the teachers she approximates the contour of the melody a perfect fourth
above it when she sings, “meow, meow here and a meow, meow there…”

Figure 4.12 Old MacDonald in two tonal centers

Building understanding for rhyming sets was another frequent extramusical goal in
Karen’s instruction. Rather than focus on the acquisition of steady beat so prominent in nursery
rhymes, she places emphasis on the rhyming ending in this example of Ride a Little Pony (Audio
Link 4.7 Ride a Little Pony). Using a cloze technique, she recites the rhyme in tempo, bouncing
the baby doll on her knee until the ending requires the words “fall down” – which she waits for
the children to provide, disrupting the steady beat foundation of the text. This was a frequently
used strategy for Karen, based on her efforts to validate the musical experiences she was guiding
and to connect them with other curricular goals.

Ride a little pony,
Go to town.
Ride a little pony,
Don’t ____ ____.

Figure 4.13 Ride a Little Pony

A common misconception shared among the staff is articulated in Callie’s recognition
that quality music instruction requires close listening for students’ musical contributions beyond
their simple reproduction of the words: “I’m having to step back and listen more carefully for the tune because I always thought the words were more important; but really there’s more to it than just getting the words” (Callie, personal communication, October 3, 2012). Additionally she notes the importance of making wise instructional choices related to the careful auditory screening of recordings for instructional use: “Some of our songs are on CDs, so I don’t have control of changing the melody [to place the pitch higher]. So maybe when we listen to songs they can’t sing, I should be going for ‘beatful’ instead of ‘tuneful’” (Callie, personal communication, October 17, 2012).

Inhibiting her own singing in order to listen to the children sing was difficult for Evie in the beginning, as she was accustomed to singing “for” the children. The reader has followed Evie’s progress through examples of One Little Elephant (Audio Link 4.3) and Open Shut Them (Audio Link 4.4) as illustrations of her singing practice. These examples also serve to illustrate her growth as a more focused listener.

Teaching.

Not surprisingly, the most common finding in this category of the lesson observations was teachers’ use of music as a transition or management technique (Nardo, et al., 2006). The teachers themselves identified this as a beneficial strategy. “We use music a lot with transitions. Guided music activities are more typical during transition time. I wish people knew how effective music is as a management technique instead of negative discipline” (Anna, personal communication, October 1 and November 1, 2012). Anna recounted many improvised musical moments as examples of this practice, and the researcher observed many instances as well.

I heard Anna organizing a group of children to head outside for lunch: the kids were squirrely and talking to each other; the moment she started singing “I wiggle my fingers
…” the talking stopped and all eyes were on her. Irrefutable evidence that using music to facilitate transitions really works. (Researcher’s journal, September 19, 2012)

Several teachers use a familiar melody with substituted words to call their children together for specified events during the day. Evie sings a version of The More We Get Together using the words, “It’s time for morning meeting” (Audio Link 4.8 It’s Time for Morning Meeting).

Figure 4.14 It’s Time for Morning Meeting

Callie’s approach to musical transitions uses the familiar tune Bingo to call her children to the carpet provoking their phonemic awareness to identify “S-T-ORY”. She later adapted her version to see if the children could recognize the change in the upcoming activity through the spelling of the word, “M-U-SIC” (Figure 4.16).

Figure 4.15 It’s Time to Have a Story
This activity highlighted Callie’s inquiry about the difference between attending to text and musical content when leading music activities. The following excerpt from the researcher’s journal details the exchange:

Callie asked me about the appropriateness of her use of the transition song. She wanted to know if it was OK to use the same tune (BINGO) to draw attention to multiple activities (e.g. story time, music time, and snack time). I told her that it’s really all about purpose: if your goal is to have them attend to the spelling, then this is a phonemic awareness exercise. If you want them to sing the song independently of your leadership, then you’ve got to attend to the melody – not just the words. (Researcher’s journal, September 19, 2012)

Callie’s teaching practice demonstrated further insight in the adaptations she made to Sally Go Round the Sun (Audio Link 4.9 Sally Go Round the Sun). The researcher introduced the original game in the style of Ring Around the Rosie: all the children turn until the fall at the end of the song. Callie’s adaptation places one child into the center of the ring, and all the surrounding children sit in a circle and adapt the text to insert the name of the child in the middle. This text-based change (substituting the child’s name for ‘Sally’) addresses linguistic goals and the adaptation of the game reflects extramusical outcomes such as turn taking and community building. Notice in the recording that Callie does all of the singing. It is typical behavior for children of this age to stop singing when movement becomes the focus. Callie continued to urge the children to sing with her, and during the deconstruction of the lesson it was
suggested that she invite the children to sing the song without her help occasionally, through a prompt like “It’s your turn to sing this time, while I listen.”

External Evaluators’ Assessments

Two external evaluators were tasked with viewing videotaped lesson excerpts from the six most active participants. Teachers were asked to videotape their teaching partners twice during the research period as part of the data collection process; however, by the end of the second week of the study it became evident that this was not being done even though participants were engaging in music instruction. In response, the researcher took on this additional responsibility. She captured forty-two short excerpts of teachers’ musical instruction on her iPhone in two periods during the study: in, or around, week three, and at the conclusion of the mentorship in week seven. Over ninety minutes of total footage was collected. Six teachers were represented in thirty-nine lesson excerpts that were labeled and converted into .MOV files and uploaded into Dropbox™ for ease of access. The external evaluators enjoyed flexible and solitary access to the files ensuring that her contributions were untainted by shared viewing or collaborative assessment.

Videos were evaluated in two groupings. The initial evaluations were completed and submitted to the researcher in mid-October, and the second group was submitted at the end of December. The quantity of footage for each teacher varied, but the collected average totaled sixteen minutes per teacher. All recordings were maintained for comparison.

In viewing these small portions of teachers’ work, external evaluators were asked to respond only in categories reflecting observed teacher behaviors. They were instructed to mark “never” in any categories not addressed in the excerpts viewed. Not all categories were
represented in every lesson excerpt, so it was not unexpected that some evaluations rendered scores of zero in certain categories. Often, evaluators’ most salient contributions came in the form of narrative comments. A table depicting cross-case mean frequencies reported by the external evaluators (Table 4.7) has been created in like process to those representing teachers’ (Table 4.5) and researcher’s (Table 4.6) findings. A comparison of this data will be made in chapter five.

Table 4.7 External Evaluators’ Reported Cross-Case Means - Frequency of Music Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>First Report</th>
<th>Last Report</th>
<th>Mean Frequency Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to Music</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>- 01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Instruments</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>+ 08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Music</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>+ 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Pedagogy</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>+ 21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External evaluators reported average frequency ratings of forty-one to forty-seven percent in all categories except Playing Instruments, where a 14% rating was reported. One evaluator noted in her comments, “Anna does not seem to consider the role of the instrument when she is playing. I would like to see her move away from playing with recordings. I heard more ‘noise’ than instrumental music” (Evaluator 2, Participant Skills Assessment, November 6, 2012). While the overall frequency rating in this category was low, evaluators reported an 8% gain in the frequency of teachers’ instrumental music instruction.

The highest increased rating was reported in the category of Teaching where a 20% improvement was noted. Item number 23, Maintains positive affect during musical encounters
with children, was frequently assigned the highest possible rating, however, the following narrative addresses item number 22, *Offers instructional feedback when children engage in musical behavior*, as well. “I loved to see the smile and excitement on Becky’s face as she participated in musical activities with her kids. She looked like she was enjoying herself, and after each experience, she would try to offer feedback and encouragement to the children” (Evaluator 1, Participant Skills Assessment, December 30, 2012).

External evaluators included brief narrative comments in a number of categories. Their assessments were often similar and brought attention to issues the researcher might have otherwise overlooked. These insights were highly valued by the researcher, and brought critical context to the numerical ratings of the protocol.

**Summary of Findings**

Findings revealed that the mentorship heightened the musical awareness of participants, allowing them to examine their own musicianship more closely as well as the musical behaviors of the children in their care. Participants overcame initial reticence and began to use musical vocabulary more often, and plan musical encounters for children with greater intention. Teachers continued to struggle with some musical concepts; however, the simple presentation of musical objectives for children through Feierabend’s vocabulary “tuneful, beatful, artful” (1996) was effective in building teachers’ self-efficacy toward music instruction. Teachers reported improved frequency in their delivery of music instruction, citing engagement with musical instruments as their most often employed musical strategy, although the researcher and external evaluators made contrasting assessments. Refined listening skills were acknowledged in
teachers’ responses to the musical offerings of their children and in their attention to vocal range as they learned to take tonal cues from the children, and sing higher.

Community and individual identity were factors affecting teachers’ acquisition of new musical practices. Teachers’ personal views of their own musicianship changed little in this brief encounter; however, they exhibited an improved willingness to engage their children in musical experiences more often in spite of their own perceived weaknesses. The prominence of visual art present in the Reggio approach afforded teachers a strong cultural identity, and practices of the atelieriste became a practical model for increasing the presence of music at the school. The brief, once a week, teacher-directed, music class began to give way to more collaborative and emergent musical encounters embedded into the daily classroom experiences of the children. As a result of this study, the center director recognized the need for more instructional time, more time for collaboration, and greater alignment with an emergent pedagogical approach in order to bring the musical practices of teachers on her staff more in line with the school’s Reggio-inspired philosophy and practice.

The roles and relationships of practitioners in this study impacted their adoption of the newly introduced music strategies presented. The personalized partnership between the researcher and study participants promoted the individualized support that teachers needed to strengthen their self-efficacy, refine their musical skills and knowledge, and contextualize music instruction into their existing practices. Teachers were hesitant to call themselves “music teachers” and were initially more comfortable using music for extramusical purposes unaware of the specific musical outcomes embedded in the music activities they guided. As the study progressed, teachers became more comfortable in musical explorations as ‘co-researchers’ with their children. They expressed less tension in the need to “copy the expert” and a greater
willingness to adapt modeled strategies into their own practice. The center director’s leadership significantly impacted the design of the mentorship and the school-wide acceptance and adoption of music instruction throughout the study. Her role as both manager and visionary was crucial to the implementation of the project, and will continue to impact its sustainability.

In such a brief encounter, it is difficult to evaluate the rate of adoption among this clientele; however, initial observations indicated a rather typical range (Rogers, 2003). Age, education, and expertise appeared to be indicators of adoption in this clientele. Callie, a 26-year-old teacher with only three years’ teaching experience, represents an ‘early adopter’ among her peers. She was pursuing a Master’s Degree in early childhood education during the course of the study, and she was the only teacher on the staff with first-hand experience at the Loris Malaguzzi International Center in Reggio-Emilia, Italy. Callie was a comfortable singer at the start of the study and continued to demonstrate a high degree of comfort with music. She brought openness to new ideas, and an eagerness to risk as she often suggested adaptations or additions to the modeled instruction.

On the contrary, Anna’s participation in the study represented the ‘laggard’ in Rogers’ description of adopter categories. She was the oldest among study participants, citing over 30 years’ experience working with young children and her educational background included an Associate Arts Degree in early childhood education. Anna’s comfort with the past made adoption of new strategies and ideas irrelevant for her. She was most comfortable with her own well-known repertoire of songs and rhymes, demonstrating reluctance to try new ones. Her low self-efficacy in music was often evident in interviews and conversations with the researcher.
In these two examples we see implications of a typical adoption pattern. The brevity of the study and the small sample size may indicate a less than typical result, and necessitate further investigation from which to draw more detailed conclusions.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Change comes in moments - when we least expect it, hiding behind 'the way we’ve always done it'.
If we listen and watch, the children will lead us.

Overview of the Study

As revealed in the first chapter, the purpose of this collective case study was to describe and interpret the impact of a site-specific, school-wide collaboration in music education on the attitudes and practices of twelve early childhood practitioners working together at the same preschool. The questions this study sought to answer were: (1) How does the collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms? (2) How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners? (3) How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants? To answer these questions a mentorship was established between a music educator (the researcher) and twelve early childhood practitioners. The second chapter reviewed pertinent literature to establish a context for the study. Relevant topics included an historic overview of music education in American public schools, the importance of teachers’ attitudes and values regarding teacher engagement in music, the development of teacher practice in music education, the philosophy and practice of the Reggio Emilia approach to early childhood education, and key traits of effective professional development. Chapter three presented qualitative methods used to
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answer the research questions and chapter four revealed findings through analysis of data collected during the study. In this final chapter, discussion will develop around key research findings and how the research findings relate to current literature. The chapter begins by drawing conclusions from the themes and concepts revealed in chapter four to address the research questions. Study exemplars are contextualized through current literature to reveal results in this study. The chapter closes with the researcher’s recommendations for future practice and research at the study site, for music education, in professional development for educators, and for music education within a Reggio-inspired setting.

**Discussion**

When creating the structure for this dissertation, the focus of improving music education in a preschool setting was framed through the strategies for effective professional development and the contextual setting particular to the Reggio-Emilia approach practiced at the research site. Those key factors were focused through three research questions to reveal themes and concepts through which improved practice could be supported. Once data were analyzed and thematic structures were developed, themes were aligned with corresponding research questions and considered through cited literature to make observations and recommendations illuminating new or unexpected findings.

Research Question One: How does the collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms?

This line of inquiry brought into focus teachers’ personal and community identities as they demonstrated through their comments and practices the value and purpose they held for music education. The following conclusions relevant to research question one can be drawn:
• Teachers’ attitudes about the value and purpose of music instruction shifted from exclusively affective goals toward content-specific musical outcomes as the study progressed (Bey, 1995; Guskey, 2000).

• Personal musicianship and musical self-efficacy were the most influential identity traits to impact teachers’ attitudes about musical engagement during the study, requiring a personalized and differentiated approach to their training (Bainger, 2010; Gruenhagen, 2012).

• The philosophical grounding and influence of visual art in the Reggio model provided a strong foundation for teachers’ practice, through which they strove to find relevance and alignment as they embedded musical activities into their existing practices (Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1998; Page-Smith, 2011).

• The leadership of the Center Director and her partnership with the researcher established an emergent framework for this professional development endeavor in which teachers’ self-discovery and application of new strategies took on personal relevance to their teaching practice (Oreck, 2004; Persellin, 2007; Zaslow, Tout, Maxwell, & Clifford, 2004).

Guskey (2002) asserts that teachers’ attitudes and beliefs are most impacted when they experience success in the implementation of newly introduced strategies: “The crucial point is that it is not the professional development per se, but the experience of successful implementation that changes teachers’ attitudes and beliefs. They believe it works because they have seen it work, and that experience shapes their attitudes and beliefs” (p. 383). With the goal of the successful implementation of more focused and developmentally appropriate musical engagement, the researcher continually provoked teachers to articulate the instructional purpose behind the musical activities they guided. It was her belief that teachers would be unable to recognize their success if they had not first articulated their intentions. In the beginning, teachers’ responses to question about instructional purpose were as simple as “because the children enjoy it” – a typical example of the affective value teachers’ held regarding music for young children and one easily assessed through observing the children’s behaviors. Another commonly cited purpose at the beginning of the study was the frequent use of music as a
classroom management technique, cited often in chapter four, through multiple examples. These extramusical outcomes support the findings cited by Barrett (2001) and Wiggins (2001) identifying the need to strengthen the integrity of music instruction among teachers seeking to embed music into their broader curriculum. When prompted for musical objectives supporting these activities, teachers were initially unable to articulate musical goals, but nearly always described positive mood or affect as a behavioral outcome among the children. These trends began to change as teachers observed and analyzed the researcher’s instruction, and began to implement modeled strategies. Over time, they gained self-efficacy building musical skills and knowledge in the delivery of music instruction (Hill, et al., 2010).

Children’s engagement and success were among the strongest motivations that kept teachers trying, and practicing, new musical strategies and open to new attitudes during this study. They often recounted surprising musical responses from children that had previously gone unnoticed and expressed delight in the heightened musical engagement they observed in their children during free playtime.

We are hearing a lot more independent singing - *Ring Around the Rosie* seems to be their favorite; there is a lot of humming as they play and a lot of singing to the stuffed animals that they play with. I think they’re intertwining music into their play more because we [teachers] are intertwining music into our day more. (Becky, personal communication, November 1, 2012)

Whether the children’s engagement had actually increased or not, it was significant that teachers’ had begun to notice and predict causes for these changes.

Karen’s instructional adjustments also reflect Guskey’s (2002) assertion that teachers’ experiences shape their attitudes. In chapter four, Karen’s changing practice is described in the way she delivers steady beat instruction. She reflects on her observation of the children when she says, “The kids seemed to really enjoy the spirited beat and were intensely watching when I
would change [from macro to micro] beats. I will definitely be doing it again this week and note improvement (or not) in their beat accuracy” (Karen, personal communication, October 16, 2012). Karen’s comments exemplify a change in her attitude toward instructional purpose. She had begun to look beyond the simple goal of nurturing a positive affect among the children, and began to develop an eye for their skill improvement and the assessment of her students’ musical behaviors. She was inspired to keep trying this new strategy because she observed its positive impact on her students. Her comments also bring insight to the theme of musical Awareness as she has articulated specific musical outcomes and assessments for the activity she describes as well as her understanding and execution of improved music pedagogy.

Teachers’ musical behaviors did not always accurately demonstrate their attitudes towards music. Those participants who entered the study with low musical self-efficacy rarely guided music in their classrooms. Henry, although a pleasant and tuneful singer, was never self-assured enough to lead the children in a song or a rhyme. Likewise, Diane felt much safer letting her able colleague, Callie, lead the musical activities in their classroom. Both of these adults were rather reserved individuals, and excelled in the one-to-one co-researcher role of the pedagogista so important in the Reggio approach. Each of them participated in group music making under the leadership of others, and found instrumental work the most successful. It is notable that both of these teachers participated actively in the discussions about the musical activities of the children, and they both articulated thoughtful insights about what they observed. These findings align with the cited literature by McMullen et al (2006) indicating teachers’ personal teaching beliefs and self-efficacy have significant influence on their actual teaching practice and classroom behaviors. Additionally, Raths (2001) suggests that teachers’ beliefs might be better understood as ‘dispositions’ such as knowledge, colleagueship, and advocacy in
order to better appreciate the motivations behind the practices they demonstrate in the classroom. In other words, it’s not always as simple as just watching teachers work when assessing their teaching practice is the goal; evaluating their understanding and willingness to adopt new teaching practices requires contextual insight and time to build a multidimensional understanding of teacher behaviors.

This finding highlights the need for differentiated instruction among teachers if professional development is to be effective. “… typically … greater variation exists between classrooms within a school than between schools or between districts” (Guskey, 2003, p. 750). Each participant brought individual expectations and needs to the study, and each expressed unique attitudes toward music instruction. Because Henry and Diane did not demonstrate group leadership in music, their apparent disinterest might have been misconstrued as lack of engagement had classroom observations been the only assessment tool employed. That notion was dispelled through the teachers’ thoughtful insights in conversation and their discerning observations about their children. This idea aligns with Guskey’s description of the complexities associated with professional development when he says, “Nearly all professional development takes place in real-world contexts. The complexities of these varied contexts introduce a web of factors that influence whether or not a particular characteristic or practice will produce the desired results” (2003, p. 750). This finding adds credence to the collection and analysis of multiple types of data, repeated personal interactions with each participant, and the need for ongoing reflection and analysis of all teachers’ contributions. These two teachers may need more time to digest and apply the new musical practices being introduced; they may be what Rogers (2003) calls ‘late majority’ in their need to see others accept and implement the innovations being suggested before they will take them on in their own practice.
Designing and delivering professional development that meets the needs of all participants requires flexibility, personal reflection and thoughtful decision making that respond to the unique needs of individuals (Guskey, 2000). Nardo (2006) and her colleagues suggest that diversity between early childhood centers must be considered when planning professional development, but this study suggests that diversity within teaching communities requires individualized attention as well.

... it is important to note the diversity that exists between centers, negating the use of "cookie-cutter" solutions. Each center comes with a unique array of issues involving resources, space, and staffing, and each will need to be a context-specific solution grounded in guiding principles and grown from site-specific collaboration. (Nardo, et al., 2006, p. 289)

The diverse needs represented in this teaching community confirm that “cookie cutter” solutions are no more appropriate for individuals than they are for community wide implementation.

The influence of the Reggio-Emilia philosophy and structural organization of the school had a significant impact on the values teachers demonstrated for music. Teachers’ *community identity* was most apparent in their implementation of emergent curriculum through visual art. The universal presence of visual art in children’s daily experiences spoke volumes about its value and priority as a ‘language of learning’ among this teaching community. The overshadowing presence of visual art in this school subjugated music to the role of entertainment and classroom management. This attitude was reflected in Anna’s comments about how she and the children in her care “sing all day long” (see chapter four), and in Karen’s reference to her tasks as music teacher in the context of “show biz” (see chapter four). Teachers at this school came to this study with a shared understanding of the importance of visual art in their practices, however, they lacked the same value message in music due to a lack of training and awareness.
Laura was an influential and visionary leader among the participants in this study, bringing a fierce advocacy for depth and richness in all that the children experienced at the school. She provided significant influence over the community values afforded music education at this preschool, yet her practical application of this message of support was often mixed. Laura brought a personal lack of musical self-efficacy to this work that emerged as a barrier to her engagement as an evaluator of teachers’ musical progress. Her managerial role kept her very busy, and often prevented her engagement in classrooms with the children and their teachers. She viewed herself as an administrator of this work rather than a practitioner of it.

Having asked early in the study to be excused from drop-in teacher observations for lack of time, her role as evaluator of teachers’ musical progress took on the form of advocate in dialogue and written responses to teachers’ weekly lesson plans, and in many conversations with the researcher. She was clearly not comfortable assessing teachers’ musical effort. In a later interview with the researcher, Laura confessed a lengthy story about growing up “the only one in the family who just couldn’t get music” (Laura, personal conversation, October 24, 2012). This declaration of personal attitude, lack of musical self-efficacy, and belief sheds light on the lack of her teacher observations reported in chapter four and her administrative, rather than participatory, engagement in the study.

Laura was a keen observer of teachers and children alike. Her passion for children was palpable and infectious. It was common for her to drop in and out of classrooms during her busy day, usually to speak with teachers about an administrative need, but she always acknowledged the children in some way. In the following excerpt from the researcher’s journal, Laura alludes to her changing values about music through her observation of a child. This recognition is another
example of Guskey’s suggestion that change happens as a consequence of student outcomes rather than teachers’ professional development experiences (2002).

Laura came to ask me about the added tone bars in the RK [Rainbow Kids] room. She stepped in there to speak to Gail, and noticed that Tim was experimenting with melodies. She noticed that more pitches had been added to the tone ladder, and asked me about the particular tone set because she observed Tim’s calm demeanor and focus. She said, “We’ve known him since he was born, and he is always going 90 miles an hour. Suddenly he was calm, and quiet. I was amazed. I noticed him because the music was having that same effect on me.” I explained the pentatonic tone set, and why I had selected it, expanding the palette from the initial three tone set of do-re-mi. She was awe-struck by the affective impact she felt it had on her and on Tim. She tells me that she and a few teachers are planning to visit another Reggio site in a nearby city in November, and as a result of our work together she plans to inquire more specifically about how this school engages their children musically. The idea that PD ‘is all about relationships’ comes to mind here. If she has access to other programs, teachers, directors, and parents how will this idea of music as another language spread? I am hopeful that we will have a rich story to tell. (Researcher’s journal, October 3, 2012)

The researcher identifies the importance of relationships in this journal entry, identifying leadership as an important component of professional development. Rogers (2003) suggests that change agents must cultivate opinion leaders if the innovation being introduced is to take hold. This insight notes the potential role of the center director in the adoption and dissemination of these research findings.

In spite of her self-identified personal inadequacies in music, Laura demonstrates a new curiosity regarding the musical engagement of children at her school, and suggests that she is developing a greater value for more intentional musical provocations. She employs her leadership position among the faculty to bring this new topic into greater focus, take charge of its sustainability, and to strengthen its alignment within the ongoing Reggio practice at the school.

In order for this to really take root and change over time, I have to have more of an overview of what’s going on. I have to extend my support over time, and keep reminding them – keep bringing these ideas back. I really want the teachers to think about the musical knowledge that’s growing in the classroom; thinking about this in context with what we’re already doing. (Laura, personal communication, October 5, 2012)
The cited literature confirms the need for music educators to strengthen the presence of quality music experiences for children in early childhood education through professional development among early childhood practitioners. As quoted in chapter one of this paper, music educator and researcher Donna Brink-Fox poses a question prompting experts in the field to address this very issue: “How do we make music as integral and embedded in early childhood education as blocks and the sand table (Boston, 2000, p. 1)?” In response to this study, the researcher poses an adapted question: How do we make music as integral and embedded in a Reggio-inspired preschool as paintbrushes and the atelier?

This question was posed to participants as the study came to a close, and many teachers spoke of how their practices in visual art could offer a viable model for a similar structure in music.

The atelierista introduces an art medium to the children and then we follow up with that medium in the classroom. She does what we can’t do because she sees only a few children at a time. I think the music studio could function in a similar way. A musical concept could be introduced to the children through a song, and then we can follow up in the classroom. (Becky, personal communication, November 1, 2012)

The power of these ideas lies in their discovery on the part of the teachers themselves, and while the center director identified budgetary constraints as a barrier to this approach, a bigger philosophical shift was beginning to take place. Becky’s comments reflect a values shift paraphrased by the researcher as: “Music is another viable language of learning that requires greater attention and deserves thoughtful collaborative planning”. Also significant in these recommendations is the inference that heightened musical engagement could become standard teaching practice at this preschool. Guskey (2002) suggests, “If a new program or innovation is to be implemented well, it must become a natural part of teachers’ repertoire of teaching skills” (p. 388). Becky’s vision for an aligned practice between music and visual art suggests that her
newly acquired musical skills are becoming an embedded and relevant part of her teaching repertoire.

Research Question Two: How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners?

The theme of Awareness was articulated as teachers expressed understanding of their own musicianship, the musicianship of the children in their care, and their growing understanding of music-specific objectives and goals in their teaching. These findings align with the second research question, addressing the content specific skills and knowledge required to deliver developmentally appropriate music education within this setting (Scott-Kassner, 1999). This aspect of study findings aligns with much of the literature cited in chapter two of this dissertation. The following study conclusions relevant to research question two can be drawn:

• The conceptual simplicity in “tuneful, beatful, artful” (Feierabend, 1996) offered participants content-specific instruction in ‘user-friendly’ language that helped to remove the barrier of perceived out-of-reach expertise in music.

• Teachers overestimated their own skills in the delivery of music instruction when compared with researcher’s and external evaluators’ reports (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011).

• Teachers’ practice in music improved as they acquired greater knowledge of music pedagogy and enjoyed reflective analysis of their work with the guidance of the mentor (Bey, 1995; Valerio & Freeman, 2009).

• Vocal placement began to improve as teachers’ listened more carefully to the singing ranges of their children, and adapted their vocal models to more appropriate ranges (Flowers & Dunne-Sousa, 1990; Rutkowski, 1996).

• Assessments of children’s musical behaviors became more precise as teachers’ musical skills and knowledge improved and their listening skills grew more acute, evidenced in their use of the MUSIC OBSERVATION SKILLS ASSESSMENT® to guide and scaffold student assessment. (Music Together, 2008)

• Instructional purpose and music pedagogy gained focus as teachers’ adapted and embedded musical engagements relevant to their broader curriculum (Barrett, 2001).
• Teachers sometimes mistakenly perceived the researcher’s work as ‘for the children’ rather than for them, demanding the researcher’s vigilance toward making teaching practice and pedagogy explicit (Register, 2004).

Teachers in this study confirmed through their practice, and through writing and dialogue with the researcher, earlier findings aligning stronger self-efficacy and increased content knowledge with increased frequency and quality of instruction (de l’Etoile 2001; Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Raths, 2001). The simple presentation of primary goals for children in music at this age offered teachers ‘user-friendly’ language through which to build musical content knowledge and understand developmentally appropriate practices in music education. Rogers (2003) suggests that the perceived complexity of an innovation can be a barrier to its adoption. Likewise, the expertise of the change agent can be intimidating. It was, therefore, important to the success of the study that the researcher introduced and used simple vocabulary meaningfully in order to promote its understanding and application among participants.

Chapter two of this dissertation introduced John Feierabend’s vocabulary, “tuneful – beatful – artful” as succinct and descriptive language for goals in music education for our youngest students (1996). These teachers embraced that language, and found those simple three goals very accessible in describing their own musicianship as well as that of the children. “Other than the ‘artful’ piece, I think for myself I’d like to focus on ‘tuneful’ because I think that’s where I struggle the most” (Callie, personal communication, October 3, 2012).

Improved attitudes and comfort levels toward music led teachers to report increased frequency of instruction, and greater enthusiasm for music as the study progressed, even though the same assessments were not confirmed by the researcher or the external evaluators (de l’Etoile, 2001). Garvis and Pendergast (2011) go so far as to say that it is fruitful for teachers to slightly over-estimate their teaching skills as it tends to support motivation and efforts to persist
as they develop new teaching habits. A comparison of teachers’ reported frequency of music instruction illuminates this very finding, as teachers’ self-ratings were consistently higher in all categories than those of the researcher or external evaluators. This finding is also supported in the research of McMullen, et al (2006) and brings validity to data triangulation.

Particularly notable are the comparisons in the category of instrument playing. Teachers reported an overall increased frequency of 37% when asked how often they engaged in this avenue of instruction with their children. On the contrary, external evaluators found only an 8% increase, and the researcher found a 21% increase in the same category (See Tables 4.5, p. 100; 4.6, p. 103; 4.7, p. 121). Teachers’ high ratings can be attributed to the influence of the Hawthorne effect (Gay & Airasian, 2003) evidenced in participants’ possible intentions to please the researcher. The exceptionally low rating of the external evaluators in this category may reflect the brevity of data presented to them. The researcher’s evaluations were a reflection of many observations, interviews, and repeated analysis of teachers’ work providing her with an overall greater data set than those made available to the external evaluators. It is the researcher’s opinion that teachers conflated their estimates of instructional frequency with their overall self-efficacy with classroom instruments. Teachers described the children’s growing enthusiasm for musical instruments during the course of the study, attributing their gains to strengthened instructional purpose. Diane noticed that children were sharing instruments and demonstrating their kinesthetic comfort with them during free playtime. “They are playing instruments every day. I see children helping one another play them” (Diane, personal communication, October 24, 2012).

In the Moonbeams classroom, the researcher modeled an instrumental activity that prompted children to discern contrasting instrumental timbre and play them to represent
characters in a story, creating a sound track for a favorite picture book. The children were very successful assigning the sound of the shakers to represent the buzzing bees in the story, and choosing the contrasting sound of the guiro to represent the croaking frogs. This was a new strategy to Callie and Diane, and they enthusiastically recognized its relevance among many instructional goals suitable for their children (self-regulation, acute listening skills, literacy) as well as the musical objectives relating to ‘artful’ as children made creative choices with musical understanding. Janet Barrett (2001) suggests that these meaningful curricular partnerships are critical when teachers strive to integrate curriculum with integrity. The teachers were immediately comfortable with this strategy, and continued to adapt it using other books, different instruments, and building on the children’s personal story telling with instrumental accompaniment.

The described instrumental activity illuminates a timely answer to this question posed by researcher Scott-Kassner (1999): “How do we train caring adults to create child-centered programs that offer music experiences of high quality” (p. 20)? In this example, the answer came in the individualized mentorship and partnered collaboration between a music educator and two preschool teachers working together to embed authentic musical experiences in the day-to-day practices in their classroom.

Reflection is another important factor in changing teachers’ practices (Bey, 1995; Valerio & Freeman, 2009). In this study, teachers had many opportunities to reflect and analyze their own as well as the mentor’s instruction. The mentor modeled a variety of teaching strategies specifically linked to musical outcomes. For example, speaking a nursery rhyme while bouncing a child on one’s knee offers children whole-body kinesthetic engagement in steady beat – a developmentally appropriate practice for children of this age. The Mother Goose rhyme, Ride a
**Little Horsey**, is a clear example (see chapter four). Beyond simply leading music activities with children in the presence of their teachers, the researcher insisted on reflective conversations after each lesson (Thompson, 2007). These exchanges were most fruitful when they could occur immediately following the event, although there were times when they had to wait until the end of the day.

Reflective analyses provided the opportunity for teachers to clarify their thinking, ask questions, and get feedback on their musical ideas. Initially, teachers’ comments were about student engagement, “Their attention that they gave to you – they were just spellbound. I think they related to the puppets” (Anna, personal communication, September 19, 2012). As the mentorship progressed, and teachers’ awareness improved, the lesson deconstruction became much more focused on purposeful instructional planning. In this excerpt from an interview, Callie suggests a continued instrumental exploration based on her observations of the children: “I think we should keep working on our *Owl* song. They [the children] are very interested in adding new animals and sounds to our song” (Callie, personal communication, October 24, 2012). Her suggestion indicates that the children may want more time to explore instrumental timbre and musical orchestration, and also contextualizes her instructional focus in the emergent approach of the Reggio model. This supports, once again, the earlier findings attributing teacher change to student success (Guskey, 2002) and confirms as well Andress’ findings that children demonstrate understanding and application of specific music concepts when teachers’ instruction became more specific (1998).

Although most teachers participating in the study were ‘tuneful’ singers, all of them needed ongoing reminders to model singing in a child-appropriate range. During the first music making experience in the study workshop, the researcher was explicit about the need for teachers
to set high vocal models for the children. Shifting her speech from chest to head voice offered participants an audible example of the difference between lower and higher vocal placements. Additionally, the researcher presented songs in a light, high voice (head voice) unconcerned about musical details like exact pitch names or key signatures. The purpose of these examples was simply to offer an aural model, not to overwhelm participants with musical detail. While teachers understood the concept and could sing along, they struggled to remember this strategy when leading singing in their classrooms. Often, the researcher could remind teachers to sing higher with a subtle raise of her eyebrows or an understated ‘thumbs up’ from the back of the room as she observed. Occasionally, the researcher sang along an octave higher than the teachers to offer the children a more suitable model. The need for these prompts was ongoing throughout the study. According to the study by Flowers and Dunne-Sousa, when teachers began singing in a suitable range for children’s voices, the children’s intonation improved (1990). This finding was illustrated in chapter four in the comparison between Becky’s two versions of her Hello Song (Audio Links 4.1 and 4.2).

Another strategy teachers used successfully to keep their singing high enough was to coax a soloist among the children to begin songs for the group. Once the children began the melodies, teachers could take their vocal cues from them. Rutkowski suggests that this individualized and small group singing is the best way to improve vocal development among young children (1996). As teachers’ understanding for developmentally appropriate practice in music improved, they were more able to give the music making over to the children instead of dominating their singing experiences. Teachers transitioned from singing “for” and “to” the children, and became more adept at providing starting models from which the children could take ownership of the melodies and songs they enjoyed. It was also significant that teachers
began to recognize the children’s vocal improvisations as musical events: “Today I noticed Jenna singing. She made up her own song about the pillows. She was just singing about what she was doing. I notice more of them singing during the day” (Fiona, personal communication, October 23, 2012). This teacher’s recognition of the child’s song-narrative is an example of heightened awareness of developmentally appropriate musical behaviors for children in this age group.

“It’s so interesting to me [to notice the musical growth of the children]. Last year I never would have put two and two together or noticed it. It’s amazing to me” (Callie, personal communication, October 24, 2012). Callie recognizes her developing musical awareness as she describes the change in her practice. She was one of three teachers who found the MUSIC OBSERVATION SKILLS ASSESSMENT® (Music Together, 2008) a useful tool in discerning children’s developmental level of rhythmic and tonal musicianship. Participants’ use of these scales was not always accurate, but they found the descriptors useful and simple to understand. It is the prediction of the researcher that these teachers will continue to improve the accuracy of their student assessments with repeated use of the tool.

Strengthening teachers’ music pedagogy and bringing awareness to instructional purpose were critical elements in the pursuit of research question two. Coaxing teachers beyond ‘activities’ toward the purposeful delivery of content rich instruction emerged as a significant component early in the study. The need to build teachers’ content knowledge in order to strengthen their practice was repeatedly emphasized in the literature cited (Bainger, 2010; Guskey, 1986; Ponick, 1999; Register, 2004; Scott-Kassner, 1999; Valerio & Freeman, 2009).

The side-by-side mentorship model of the study had great impact on influencing teachers’ understanding of developmentally appropriate practice in music. Study participants repeatedly remarked about the value of observing quality practice when their own students participated:
I really liked the way you let the kids suggest verses for the song. Allowing us [the teachers] to watch you in the music studio really helps me see how I could implement your strategies in the classroom. We can take more away when we’re in there. (Fiona, personal communication, October 17, 2012)

When researcher-modeled instruction took place in the classroom, the temptation to manage behavior and attend to peripheral concerns was an ongoing distraction for all the teachers in this study. Callie and Diane adjusted well to researcher-guided musical engagement to their ‘morning meeting’ routine at the carpet. For Evie and Fiona, observations worked best in the music studio rather than in their own classroom. It was a concern of the researcher that this sequestered presentation might inhibit the daily, more embedded, inclusion of music as an integrated part of the curriculum – further isolating music to its traditional “special” status under the auspices of an “expert”. However, Fiona’s comment suggests that her focus and analysis was better in the dedicated space.

The active presentation of quality musical practice was a worthwhile model because teachers saw first-hand how strategies worked with their children. Teachers were able to draw comparisons between their own emerging efforts and those presented by the researcher. “I like that you were the only one with the scarf. Yesterday, I passed out all the scarves – but we pretended to be the wind. It was clear that they were just playing with them” (Callie, personal communication, September 19, 2012). At times, simple management strategies had the most powerful impact on teachers’ practice, and the deconstruction conversations afterward allowed the researcher to make explicit instructional choices clear. Guskey’s (2000) assertion that quality professional development must be embedded in the teachers’ workplace and practice is illustrated here.

Active examples of best practice are also valuable in strengthening teachers’ understanding of sequential instruction. To transition one’s practice from ‘activities’ to
‘instruction’ multiple models, offered over time, present valuable examples for teachers as articulated in Karen’s following description:

My first impression of the lesson plan was that it was going to be overkill on these songs. But children like repetition. I see how you don’t do every song every time, and that sequentially you are layering complexity as you go. I pretty much approached it from a seasonal point of view, and I never thought of it like this. I didn’t make the skills the focus – they just happened to be a byproduct of the activity. Instead of doing little snippets of lots of things, I think I’ve switched to fewer things with more focus. (Karen, Personal communication, October 4, 2012)

The ”in-class” model of mentorship is not without risk. Initially, it was common for teachers to think of the researcher’s work as “for the children” rather than for them. It was important in discussions and interviews to keep the focus on teaching practice and pedagogy. Often those discussions began with teachers recounting their observations of the children during music. It was the researcher’s responsibility to pose probing questions that guided participants’ analysis of music-specific goals.

Another common pitfall in the highly individualized nature of this model is acquiescence to the expert. Because teachers know the researcher’s expertise, it is easy for them to feign lack of readiness when provoked to do the teaching themselves. Researcher awareness of these tendencies is important to the weaning process. In this study, the issue was especially apparent in Gail and Henry’s classroom. On the contrary, Anna and Becky took on the delivery of musical content very early in the mentorship. Model instruction on the part of the researcher-musician is an important foundation in building teachers’ self-efficacy and content knowledge in music, however, the gradual transfer of instructional leadership must occur if teachers are to gain the guided practice they need to embed new strategies into their work (Bey, 1995). To honor teachers’ efforts, to probe with focused questions, and to position musical engagement within the community context were important strategies that undergirded the researcher’s mentorship.
Research Question Three: How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?

The theme of Adoption was illuminated as study participants struggled to contribute to the emergent and reiterative construction of the professional development endeavor. The roles and relationships governing teachers’ interactions produced a reactive – rather than proactive – engagement. Teachers had difficulty sharing the responsibility of designing the collaboration with the researcher, as their attitudes and beliefs about professional development were limited to very traditional, ‘stand and deliver’ examples (Albert, Conway, Hibbard & Hourigan, 2005). The intensity of the side-by-side, daily presence of the researcher appeared both comforting and stressful as teachers and researcher built collegial relationships. Leader – follower interactions emerged as a significant factor in the evolving design of the endeavor. These characteristics of Adoption are supported in much of the reviewed literature in chapter two of this dissertation and have contributed to the following study conclusions relevant to research question three:

- The shared roles of expert and novice allowed a ‘partnership of expertise’ to develop through the Reggio-inspired practices among study participants and the practices in music education modeled by the researcher (Bey, 1995; Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 2003; Lipton & Wellman, 2001). The benefit of this shared expertise was the improved alignment of music within the emergent curricular philosophy of Reggio Emilia practiced at this school.

- Effective professional development that meets the needs of both music educators and early childhood practitioners requires a collegial relationship bound by collaboration, adaptation and flexibility (Guskey, 2000; Nardo, et al., 2006; Rogers, 2003).

- Leadership impacts the adoption of new practices, and requires attitude and actions if professional development endeavors are to become embedded in daily practice and sustained over time (Rogers, 2003).

The researcher entered the partnership with the openness of her inexperience in Reggio-inspired teaching and learning, with the intention of establishing a ‘partnership of expertise’ in which study participants and the music educator could enjoy the reciprocity of one another’s proficiencies. This was a new and somewhat difficult concept for teachers unaccustomed to
having ownership of their own professional growth and it required ongoing attention throughout the study.

When the project was first proposed to the Center Director, her response to the researcher was one of enthusiasm although she also insisted on presenting the idea to her faculty for their consideration before she accepted the proposal. The manner in which the decision to participate was made was not made clear to the researcher, although once the study began it became clear that not all participants shared the center director’s enthusiasm. The importance of a shared vision between all stakeholders participating in a professional development endeavor has been repeatedly cited (Borko, 2004; Guskey, 2000; Hargreaves, 2007; Lipton & Wellman, 2001).

In recognition of this disparity, the researcher engaged in numerous and repeated strategies to build the bridge between hers and participants’ expertise in an effort to co-construct a shared vision for project outcomes. One such example occurred in the presentation of music lesson examples at the conclusion of the initial participant workshop. It was the researcher’s intention to draw repertoire choices from the teachers themselves in a beginning step toward collaboration. Participants’ reticence as co-constructors of music curriculum (as described in chapter four) exemplified the researcher’s lack of understanding of this community and the instructional climate in which the professional development was situated. Because strategies for designing lesson content were not aligned, researcher and participants were not ”speaking a shared language”. The following reflection from the researcher’s journal identifies her realization that new information requires greater context for novice learners:

I was disappointed with the teachers’ responses to my lesson plan ideas because I truly wanted them to feel ownership of the choices we were making together. They were reluctant to suggest any changes or offer any alternatives to my original plans. I initially wondered if this was due to their lack of interest, lack of knowledge, or intimidation of my “expertise”. In getting some of their feedback this first week, I realized that the documents I gave them had no context. They were unable to ‘read’ them without first
seeing me actually deliver the instruction. After having seen the first lesson both Anna and Becky responded with much greater understanding. (Researcher’s journal, September 19, 2012)

As the study progressed, teachers revealed that their lesson planning process typically involved collaborative conversations between partner teachers about daily observations and developmental progress of individual children in their classrooms. The lesson planning process was very fluid and child-centered. In conversation with the center director, the researcher realized that the review and analysis of teachers’ planning process and documentation would have been valuable to her preparation for this stage of the partnership.

The atelieriste were instrumental in guiding the researcher in her understanding of the Reggio approach. Their practice included occasional support of children’s artistic endeavors in classrooms alongside the classroom teacher, as well as weekly engagement with small groups of children in the atelier. The atelier was revered as “the place for art”, and although plenty of art materials were available in each classroom it was understood by the children that focused engagement with art-making materials was the expectation in this space. The small-group engagement – usually no more than four children at a time - was very experiential. Teachers offered very minimal direct instruction, but instead, responded to the engagement of each individual child. Teachers attended to preparing the space with materials, and refreshing each workstation after the children returned to their classrooms. It was in this environment that the researcher began to see the strongest alignment between the Reggio-inspired approach to visual art and developmentally appropriate practice in music.

The need for both guided, group experiences in music as well as exploratory and improvisational ones has been cited in the literature review (Custodero, 2010; Guilmartin & Levinowitz, 2009; Page-Smith, 2011; Persellin, 2001), and yet exploratory experiences for
children in the music studio were generally missing. It was suggested by the researcher that a stronger partnership between classroom teachers and the music teacher be developed to collaboratively design musical provocations that address appropriate musical outcome goals for their children. Additionally, teachers in this study were guided to reevaluate the presence of music in their curriculum, and throughout their school, to find its place within the structure of a Reggio-inspired climate.

Each classroom was supplied with a variety of appropriate musical instruments for the children’s exploration; however, there were few opportunities for classroom teachers to attend to the individual musical needs of children within a busy, noisy classroom. Every class went together to the music studio weekly to experience group music making through Karen’s leadership, even though this practice was not demonstrated anywhere else in the school curriculum. Visual art was continually valued for its representational voice as one of the important “hundred languages of children” and yet there was no parallel consideration for music when teachers documented children’s growth. These realizations prompted the researcher to follow three avenues of inquiry in an effort to promote a stronger presence for music education within this Reggio-inspired setting:

1. Why couldn’t the music teacher visit classrooms regularly to support individuals in their musical investigations, or invite a few children into the music studio to explore materials in a similar model to the atelier?

The music teacher could, of course, spend more time with the children and their teachers if the budget allowed it. However, a budget-neutral solution would suggest that both classroom teachers and the music teacher attend to more specific purpose and developmentally appropriate practices regarding the musical engagement they envision and promote for the children.
The researcher modeled this technique in every classroom to prompt the classroom teachers to include musical investigations in their provocations for the children. In the Moonbeams classroom, the children developed an interest in musical instruments and we explored tempo, timbre, and dynamics to give voice to puppets, dramatizations, and characters in familiar stories. For the Rainbow Kids, constructing melodies at the step bells was a challenge that prompted several children to investigate melodic sequence, pattern repetition, and the representation of text through invented melodies.

2. Why couldn’t ‘Morning Meeting’ begin in a shared space, gathering all the children and their teachers to begin their day singing together?

Community music making is an important facet of musical expression. In this way, it diverges from artistic expression in visual art and should be honored and implemented in its own right. The power of school-wide singing at the beginning of each day would elevate its place in the curriculum and free the music teacher of the “music class” model allowing more time for individualized, developmentally appropriate musical engagement. The researcher suggested this to the center director who addressed space limitations for such an event. Several alternatives were discussed, but this strategy was never implemented.

3. Why can’t music be introduced as another language of expression through which children can articulate and document their ideas and inquiries?

The researcher introduced strategies to promote musical improvisation and composition among the children. These goals were new to this teaching staff as their experiences in the music studio were teacher-directed, and the musical explorations left to the children in their classrooms had been completely undirected. As Callie said, in years past the instrument box was always available for the children to ‘play with’ but there had never been any purpose for instruments, or guidance in their use as an expressive tool. It is this kind of musical ‘free play’ that often drives
music out of the classroom because through lack of purpose, it becomes noise making rather than an outlet for meaningful creative expression.

Musical composition is often left out of an otherwise rich curriculum for children of any age, usually because teachers are more focused on musical production than guiding the musical thinking of their children. This comes from the common practice of promoting musical performances that promote parental involvement and offer photo opportunities. Music composition is, however, very possible for these young children (Andress, 1998; Page-Smith, 2011; Ponick, 1999) and one simple way to promote it is to sing conversations with them. The researcher modeled this strategy in lieu of simply taking roll in the Twinklers classroom, and the children responded in kind. To improvise a short melody to the words, “Good morning, Andrea. How are you today?” instead of appropriating a familiar melody for this text sets a vocal and harmonic example for the children, giving them permission to just ‘make it up’. It establishes the antecedent and consequent phrase structure within music and provides opportunity for the children to experience the difference between their speaking and singing voices. These song inventions are not uncommon, and they are developmentally appropriate for young children (Custodero, 2010). Fiona’s example of Jenna’s Pillow Song, described earlier in this chapter, is an explicit example of this.

Musical development for children of this age has been associated through several studies with their linguistic understanding, speech development, and pre-reading skills (Kuhlman & Schweinhart, 2012). As teachers promote their linguistic understandings and development, children are urged to build their vocabulary and explore many ways to express themselves through language. The Reggio philosophy urges educators to expand the notion of ‘languages’ beyond words. If in visual art, we ask children to explore various media to document their
imaginings and ideas, why then, would we not make the same expectation in the language of music?

Through ongoing support and daily shared encounters with teachers and children, the researcher provided opportunities for participants to question, experiment, and adapt modeled strategies to their own practice and circumstances – allowing them to ‘construct their own meaning’ and broaden their repertoire of musical practices. The researcher enjoyed the same relationship with practitioners in the study, as she continued to clarify examples of Reggio practice through questioning and to apply them in her model music instruction (Lipton & Wellman, 2001). An example of this is evident in the following excerpt from the researcher’s journal as she describes a musical provocation in the Rainbow Kids classroom:

When I got to the room I found that the step bells had replaced the keyboard, and the entire diatonic scale was there – having supplemented my placement of the pentatonic tone set. When I asked Gail what prompted the move she told me that Henry had suggested it to prompt the children to play the bells more appropriately. [Henry’s participation!] I moved the bells off the ladder, and took them to the carpet to see who was interested to join me.

A small group of children came over, and I began with some simple prompting questions: How shall we arrange the bells? (Children demonstrated no sense of length order or letter order). What shall we make a song about? (The children articulated no plans, just noise; mostly practicing aim and articulation as well as force to experiment with sound quality). Madeline came over first. She played randomly until I suggested that we make a song. She suggested we write about the beach because she was inspired by the image of her family at the beach hanging behind us.

Michael and Ruth joined us and the children passed the bells around so everyone could take a turn. Beth added to the group last. Someone noticed the sticks, so we added everyone to the ensemble. I provoked some ensemble questions: Shall we play loud or quiet? Fast or slow? Who starts us off? How do we know it’s time to stop? The children made collaborative decisions and enjoyed their musical improvisations. (Researcher’s journal, October 15, 2012)

Gail observed this encounter and captured some video documentation of it. In conversation afterward, discussion between the researcher and teacher centered on the emergence of musical
interest articulated by the children and the necessity, through questioning, of the subtle guidance of their musical thinking. The model in the atelier offered the researcher a valuable example of open questioning and reiterated the importance of allowing the children to guide the exploration.

Repeated conversations around teachers’ and researcher’s observations and analysis played a large part in participants’ adoption of the strategies being introduced. The ‘partnership of expertise’ introduced by the researcher was a fruitful strategy in gaining the acceptance and adoption of musical practices among participants. Rogers (2003) refers to this as an “information exchange relationship” (p. 369), and Guskey (2000) insists that individual change among teachers is first necessary when organizational change is the desired outcome. In addition, Bainger (2010) suggests that effective professional development among early childhood educators is most successful in a collaborative context in which “the establishment of a supportive relationship between ‘expert’ and teacher, where the expert works as a mentor with each teacher in their own practice and work place” (p. 25).

Collaboration, adaptation, and flexibility were ongoing traits of the study as researcher and participants experienced the “complex, situation-specific, and dilemma-ridden” environment of daily life in the preschool (Bradley & Reinking, 2011, p. 368). Collaborative decisions between teachers and researcher occurred often when planning and reflecting on instructional strategies in music. The adaptation of the structure of the study was required as participants’ reluctance to produce reflective writing necessitated an increase in verbal exchanges such as interviews. Flexibility was another requirement of the study as the researcher responded to teachers’ sluggish documentation of their work. Increased video and audio recordings, additional email communication, and many additional ‘friendly reminders’ were required of the researcher in gathering evidence of teachers’ engagement in the study.
The leadership of the center director has been important to the acceptance and adoption of the introduced musical practices fundamental to this study. Laura’s visionary leadership has been described earlier in this writing, in light of her values and beliefs. Further discussion is warranted here regarding her servant leadership style in relation to study outcomes (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Laura was a caring and sensitive facilitator, whose emotional intelligence motivated and empowered teachers to work hard and keep striving to improve their teaching practices. She was a deep and reflective thinker. While positive attitude, energy, and enthusiasm were trademarks of Laura’s demeanor, her practical participation in this work was seldom evident. Laura’s supervisory role precluded her full participation in the musical activities teachers were practicing. Her busy schedule, including managerial and budgetary responsibilities, prevented her regular observations of teachers engaging in this work. Laura’s ambivalence toward music impacted her commitment as well. She saw her role as supervisory and freely admitted a personal lack of musical interest. “I just don’t appreciate music much. I value it for the children and I think it’s important, but I don’t know what happened to me. It’s not that I don’t like it, I just never think about it. I don’t turn the radio on in my car or listen to music much at home” (Laura, personal communication, October 24, 2012).

All of these factors allude to the unique needs of this school administrator as a participant in the study. Her needs emerged as quite distinct from her teachers’, and because music was not a ‘comfortable language’ for her, she found the administrative distance from daily musical encounters acceptable.

In light of these findings, the role of the administrator in a professional development endeavor for teachers bears reconsideration. How could Laura’s positive and enthusiastic attitude
toward this musical endeavor have been operationalized into more visible actions? Would an increased involvement on her part have influenced greater adoption of music instruction among her teaching staff? These questions provoke the researcher to wonder about how she might have better met the needs of the center director to impact the long-term growth and sustainability of this endeavor. Knowing that strong and visionary leadership is a key factor in successful professional development, clarifying role expectations for the center director that embraced both attitudes and actions might have had a positive influence on study outcomes (Guskey, 2000).

**Recommendations for Practice and Research**

**Site Specific Recommendations**

The research study illuminated several site-specific findings worthy of consideration for these participants. Interpretations of these findings may offer readers insight into their own circumstances, or provide understandings into elements of generalizability for future studies.

- The need for a full-time music teacher has arisen as a result of teachers’ increased awareness of the musical development of their children and their need for continued musical support from someone with expertise in music (MENC, 1994b).

- Increased collaborative planning between classroom teachers and the music teacher could lead to more focused instructional purpose in music and strengthen the integrity of extramusical outcomes (Barrett, 2001; Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1998).

- 15-minute music ‘lessons’ in the music studio are not long enough to reap musical outcomes. Longer, more focused music experiences would benefit children’s development, and strengthen teachers’ practice in music education as classroom teachers participate in group music making guided by a trained music teacher (Andress, 1998).

- An instructional shift needs to occur in the delivery of music that reflects the emergent model of the atelier. A more balanced approach between pre-planned musical engagements, and spontaneous, exploratory music making would reflect developmentally appropriate practice in music education and offer classroom teachers more specific models for musical leadership (Guilmartin & Levinowitz, 2009).
• The documentation of children’s discoveries so prominent in the Reggio model can, through technology, include audio and video examples. Strengthening the presence of children’s voices and instrumental music making would keep the importance and value of music education present among all stakeholders, contributing to the sustainability of teachers’ newly acquired musical skills (de l’Etoile, 2001; Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1998).

• Future research at this study site could include a follow-up investigation of teachers’ musical practices, and a biographical study of the center director to further investigate the impact of leadership on the changing musical practices of these early childhood educators (Nardo, et al., 2006).

Music Education

This study brought to light issues relevant to the preparation of music specialists as well as some overall issues pertinent to the field in general. Music educators and policy makers would benefit from the following:

• A stronger voice must be cultivated among music educators clarifying the unique musical needs and abilities of young children, particularly in regard to musical composition (Page-Smith, 2011).

• A greater understanding of child development among music educators would facilitate the collaboration with the early childhood community to bring developmentally appropriate music instruction to a wider audience of educators (Levinowitz, 2001; Nardo, et al., 2006).

• Clarifying instructional purpose in music education continues to be an important message for early childhood music educators. A play-filled, spontaneous musical atmosphere must be grounded in developmentally appropriate practice and pedagogical understanding if quality instruction is the goal (Ables & Custodero, 2010; Valerio, et al., 1998).

• Future studies in music education might investigate collaborative practice as a means of promoting shared expertise between the music education community and those focused on early childhood education.

Professional Development

This study examined the practice of professional development within a very specific setting, and under unique circumstances. The conclusions that follow offer the reader an
opportunity to consider how these study findings might inform professional development practices in other circumstances or in diverse populations.

- Case study research is highly contextual, and relationship driven. Researchers would be well served to invest in a substantial period of observation before beginning a mentorship to get a sense of each participant’s established practice and the values apparent toward the study topic – in this case, music education (Creswell, 1998).

- Cultivate a ‘partnership of expertise’ that promotes participants’ proficiencies and helps them see alignment between their own skills and those being introduced (Guskey, 2003).

- New strategies and practices should be introduced through child-centered demonstrations among participants’ own children. Documents like lesson plans describing new strategies should be presented and discussed only after teachers have seen the instruction in action (Register, 2004).

- A longer, less intense model might result in stronger sustainability – for instance, a once-a-week onsite mentorship with teachers stretching over a school year might contribute to the development of a more embedded practice among teachers (Guskey, 2000).

- Designers of professional development would benefit from the consideration of an emergent model that demonstrates flexibility, adaptability, and collaboration among all stakeholders (Bey, 1995).

- Future studies in professional development might investigate Vgotskian learning theory and its application to adult learning.

Music Education within a Reggio-inspired Setting

The tenets of Reggio practice are suitable for music instruction and can be effectively aligned in a Reggio-inspired setting. Strategies for such an endeavor include:

- Child and adult as co-researchers: Small group engagement with materials such as the melodic and percussive instruments found in an Orff Instrumentarium can offer a project-based environment through which children make meaningful musical discoveries.

- Provocations inciting children’s curiosity can be framed through developmentally appropriate musical tasks like improvisation and composition.

- Environment as the third teacher: Both the music studio, and the classroom can offer appropriate musical environments for the children, providing opportunity for ongoing discourse among and between children and adults.
• Collaborative work: The collaborative partnership between classroom teacher and atelierista sets a clear precedent for the same relationship between classroom and music teachers.

• The one hundred expressive languages of children: The balance between ‘special’ and ‘embedded’ musical experiences can contribute to the overall music curriculum in much the same way that visits to the atelier and daily art-making in the classroom function in visual art.

Amanda Page-Smith (2011) suggests, “The implementation of a music curriculum that incorporates elements of the Reggio Emilia approach could require a time commitment far greater than that required for a traditional preschool music program” (p. 90). She articulates clearly the time and effort required to adapt the responsibilities of the atelierista to a parallel position in music. Outcomes evident in this study suggest that a guided and focused professional development endeavor in music education can begin to bridge the gap between what is missing in music, and the abundant presence of visual art in a Reggio-inspired climate. Through a community-wide effort, the musical needs of young children can be brought into focus among the entire teaching staff, and promoted in alignment with the emergent curriculum already in place.

Conclusion

“We [music educators] must listen to the voices of those who are charged with the music education of the youngest students, and provide what they need to deliver meaningful educational experiences” (Nardo et al., 2006, p. 290).

This brief and intense study endeavored to meet the challenges described above through a collaborative mentorship between a music educator and twelve early childhood practitioners. The study took place among 100 preschool children at a school grounded in Reggio-Emilia
philosophy and practice. The goal of the study was to strengthen the music instruction being
delivered at this preschool.

Participants’ self and community identity impacted their adoption of new instructional
strategies in music education and their musical awareness improved over time. Teachers’
assessments of their own and their children’s musical skills and knowledge contributed to their
improved practice in music education.

The researcher enjoyed a rich introduction to the Reggio-Emilia philosophy and practice
through this partnership. Emergent curriculum, a vision of children as strong and capable, and
the universal presence of visual art were key components of this community of practice.

An emergent, co-constructed mentorship model was employed to align developmentally
appropriate practice in music with teachers’ existing curriculum and to support the needs and
practices of individual participants in the study. The model holds promise for future
collaborations between music and early childhood professionals and asserts the value of site-
specific, individualized engagements. Future research might investigate similar studies in
alternative settings.
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IRB #12-135 APPROVAL MEMORANDUM
MEMORANDUM

TO: Susanne Burgess
   Dr. Valerie Rutledge

FROM: Lindsay Pardue, Director of Research Integrity
      Dr. Bart Weathington, IRB Committee Chair

DATE: August 9, 2012

SUBJECT: IRB # 12-135: MUSIC MATTERS: IMPROVING PRACTICE IN MUSIC EDUCATION AMONG EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS IN A REGGIO-INSPIRED CLIMATE

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved your application and assigned you the IRB number listed above. You must include the following approval statement on research materials seen by participants and used in research reports:

The Institutional Review Board of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (FWA00004149) has approved this research project #12-135.

Please remember that you must complete a Certification for Changes, Annual Review, or Project Termination/Completion Form when the project is completed or provide an annual report if the project takes over one year to complete. The IRB Committee will make every effort to remind you prior to your anniversary date; however, it is your responsibility to ensure that this additional step is satisfied.

Please remember to contact the IRB Committee immediately and submit a new project proposal for review if significant changes occur in your research design or in any instruments used in conducting the study. You should also contact the IRB Committee immediately if you encounter any adverse effects during your project that pose a risk to your subjects.

For any additional information, please consult our web page http://www.utc.edu/irb or email instrb@utc.edu

Best wishes for a successful research project.
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TEACHER CONSENT
B. TEACHER CONSENT

PROTOCOL TITLE: MUSIC MATTERS: DEVELOPING EXPERTISE IN MUSIC AMONG EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS IN A REGGIO-INSPIRED CLIMATE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA

You are being asked to take part in a research study that examines professional development in music education. Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study. The University Institutional Review Board has approved this research.

Purpose of the research study:
The purpose of this study is to learn how professional development in music education impacts teacher practice among early childhood educators with no formal music training. Please read this form carefully.

What you will be asked to do in the study:
You will be asked to collaborate with the researcher and other faculty to build your understanding of developmentally appropriate practice in music education for young children, and to deliver music instruction to the children in your care. Multiple interviews and observations with the researcher will occur. Multiple artifacts of your work product such as journal entries, audiotaped interviews, videotaped lesson delivery, questionnaires and surveys will be collected and examined by the researcher and two outside evaluators. These documents will represent research findings, contributing answers to the research questions.

Time required:
Your participation in this project will occur between August 13 and November 05, 2012.

Risks and benefits:
I do not anticipate any risks to you participating in this study other than those encountered in day-to-day life. You may benefit through your participation as a collaborative partner with the researcher. Your privacy will be protected through the use of pseudonyms in all written documents.

Compensation:
You will not be paid for your participation, although you may benefit from a professional development experience at no cost. The results of this study will contribute to both music education and early childhood education in an effort to design and execute professional development as a collaborative endeavor between both communities of practitioners.

Confidentiality:
Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a pseudonym. The list connecting your name to this name will be kept in a locked file in my faculty supervisor's office. When the study is completed and the data have been analyzed, the list will be destroyed. Your name will not be used in any report.
Voluntary participation:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study:
You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:
The researcher conducting this study is Susanne F. Burgess. Please ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact me at Susanne-Burgess@utc.edu or (423) 425-5397; (423) 580-2659.

Dr. Valerie C. Rutledge is the faculty advisor supervising this study. She can be reached at Valerie-Rutledge@utc.edu, or (423) 425-5374.

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact Dr. Bart Weathington, Chair of the Institutional Review Board, at (423) 425-4289. Additional contact information is available at www.utc.edu/irb

Agreement:

I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description. I understand that I will be audio- and videotaped by the researcher. The researcher will keep these tapes in a locked filing cabinet. I understand that only the researcher and two designated colleagues will have access to these tapes and that they will destroyed once they have been transcribed, which I anticipate will be within two months of their acquisition.

Participant: __________________________ Date: ________________
C. PARENT CONSENT

Dear Parent:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Valerie C. Rutledge in the School of Education at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. I am conducting a research study to learn how professional development in music education impacts teacher practice among early childhood educators.

Your child's participation will involve taking part in music activities and instruction guided by myself, and his/her teachers, during the regular school day. This project will begin on September 17th and conclude on November 9th, 2012.

Audio- and videotaped documentation of some classroom experiences will be collected. The researcher will keep these tapes in a locked filing cabinet. Only the researcher and two designated colleagues will have access to these tapes. They will be used for research purposes only to document teacher practice, and will be destroyed once they have been transcribed, which I anticipate will be within two months of their acquisition.

Your participation, as well as that of your child, in this study is voluntary. If you, or your child, choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. It will not affect your child's grade, treatment, or care, whichever applies. The results of the research study may be published, but your child's name will not be used. All print, audio, and video documentation will be guarded with utmost confidentiality. The University Institutional Review Board has approved this research.

Although there may be no direct benefit to your child, the possible benefit of your child's participation could include his/her increased musical growth.

If you have any questions concerning this research study or your child's participation in the study, please call me at (423) 425-5397 or email me at Susanne-Burgess@utc.edu.

Sincerely,

Susanne F. Burgess, M.M.
Director of Music Education
Southeast Center for Education in the Arts

The Institutional Review Board of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (FWA00004149) has approved this research project #12-135.

I give consent for my child _________________________ to participate in the above study.

Parent's Name (print): _____________________________

Parent's Signature ______________________________ (Date) ________________

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you or your child have been placed at risk, you can contact Dr. Bart Weathington, Chair of the Institutional Review Board, at 423-425-4289. Additional contact information is available at www.utc.edu/irb.
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PARTICIPANT SURVEY
D. PARTICIPANT SURVEY (Pretest/Posttest)

Please mark the box that best indicates your comfort with these musical behaviors. If none of the responses apply, please leave that item blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat Comfortable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Read music notation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other (name it)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Singing with own accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Singing with recorded music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Knowing characteristics of children’s voices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Selecting appropriate songs for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Leading and teaching songs to children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Using rhythm instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Developing movement activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Selecting recordings for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Developing listening lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Providing creative music experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Using song books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Using music curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Understanding music standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Leading music improvisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Guiding music composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Using music to teach other subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Instigating musical provocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Music Matters
Improving Practice in Music Education
Among Early Childhood Educators in a Reggio-inspired Climate
Highland Plaza United Methodist Preschool
Hixson, TN

“How might the impact of a site-specific, school-wide collaboration between a music educator and a preschool staff be described and interpreted?”

I. How does collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms?

II. How does the collaboration strengthen teacher practice in music education among these practitioners?

III. How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

- 8:45 – Coffee and snacks
  - Thank you! and Initial Survey
  - Research based music education
  - Key characteristics of musical behaviors in children 2-5
  - Orff-Schulwerk approach and emergent curriculum
  - Goals on one hand: “tuneful, beatful, artful” (Feierabend, 2012)

- 9:30 – Singing, moving, playing

- 10:30 – Break

- 10:45 – Movement and music ‘typical’ lesson structure
  - Embodying the emergent curriculum
  - Concept vs. theme

- 11:00 – Research plan
  - Initial survey
  - Timeline and Schedule
  - Outcome expectations
ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS
• Why is music education important for young children?
• What are developmentally appropriate musical expectations for 2 – 5 year old children?
• How does music ‘instruction’ fit into an emergent curriculum?

ESSENTIAL MUSICAL ELEMENTS and PROCESSES
“TUNEFUL – BEATFUL – ARTFUL”  
(Feierabend, 2012)

Tuneful: Exploring melody and form through singing

Repertoire: There’s a Little Wheel A-Turnin’ (African American Spiritual)  
Concept: Same / Different  
Musical Goals: Building vocal range and accurate intonation; Introduce musical phrase; Introduce harmony

Instructional Process

1. Teacher sings entire song without words, showing each phrase with fingers.  
   - Listeners are prompted to listen for the melodic phrase that is the most different (3).  
   - Listeners share answers after the song is complete.
2. Teacher sings entire song again – with text.  
   - Listeners are prompted to confirm their answers. (“Which text is the most different?”)  
   - Song text may need to be clarified.
3. Teacher introduces scarves to approximate turning wheels  
   - Teacher sings again as listeners demonstrate wheels with scarves.  
   - Listeners are prompted to change directions each time the musical phrase changes as the teacher sings the song again.
4. Teacher invites dialog about the text of the song; about turning scarves into wheels; about alternate ways to demonstrate turning through improvised recitative  
   - Teacher sings again as listeners demonstrate phrases through alternatives  
   - Listeners are encouraged to sing along; to sing an introduction; to sing a coda  
   - Group can be divided into two: movers and singers
5. Adult extension  
   - Participants are invited to sing phrases 2 and 4: those that are identical  
   - Melody is taught through echo  
   - Add two ostinati  
   - Group reflection: Why is it important for us to make music together?

Stages of Melodic Development

- Personal pitch center; speaking vs. singing  
- Sings in a narrow range; around the resting tone  
- Sings with musical stimulus first; develops independence  
- Sings alone  
- Creates spontaneous songs  
- Sings unique versions of known repertoire  
- Melodies are most accurate at ending or beginning phrases  
- Approximates entire melodies
• Sings songs without words most accurately
• Sings both familiar and unfamiliar songs in tune

Assessing Melodic Development
Goal: Children conserve tonal accuracy

At any point in the demonstrated singing, children may join in. Teachers listen for tonal and rhythmic accuracy, giving the melody over to the children as soon as they are able to carry on without adult guidance.

• Vocal play is an accessible way to engage children in the exploration of vocal range.
• Taking on characters in a story, or providing sound effects for story events can provoke children into high or low sounds they don’t otherwise explore.
• Invented melodies in recitative style help children explore their own singing voices without the constraint of ‘getting the melody right’.
• Encouraging children to ‘sing along’ with recorded music can offer them a ‘safety net’ for practicing pitch matching.
• Accurately reproducing melodies is first approximated – then refined.
• Songs without words are more accurately reproduced than those with text.
• Recognizable song fragments – often those that are repeated – come first.
• Text is usually accurate before melody.

Beatful: Exploring pulse through singing, moving, and playing

Repertoire: Obiswana (Game Song from Ghana)
Concept: Long / Short
Musical Goals: Introduce pulse; Practice tuneful singing; instruments; bean bags

Instructional Process
1. Teacher places various beat-keeping instruments in the center of the circle (shakers, drums, sticks)
2. Participants stand in a circle; Teacher sings entire song using Ghanan text as she walks the circumference (CCW) tapping shoulders to the macrobeat pulse.
   • At the end of the song, player touched last chooses a beat-keeping instrument.
   • Teacher changes direction (CW) and begins again.
3. Listeners are prompted to join the singing, and keep the beat with bilateral hand motions.
   • Listeners/singers are invited to keep the beat with the instrument of their choice as they are tapped at the end of each phrase.
   • Teacher changes direction (CW) with each phrase of the song.
4. Teacher introduces microbeat through the same game; listeners may shift without prompting – if not, at the repetition of the song teacher offers instruction.
   • Listeners/singers may wish to trade instruments.
• Listeners/singers can review musical phrase by taking turns singing each phrase in turn: leader, group.

5. Participants sit in the circle; Teacher prompts them to trade instruments for bean bags, modeling the passing game by tossing the bag back and forth between the left and right hand.
• Listeners/singers join the passing game, passing only to themselves – first at the macrobeat, then microbeat pulse.

6. Adult Extension
• By now adults are singing; pass the bean bag between hands (R-L-R) then pass to the neighbor at the right
• Group collaborates to create a new passing pattern and choose between macro and micro beat
• Group Reflection: Why is it important for us to make music together?

Stages of Rhythmic Development
• Personal tempo related to body size and speech
• Demonstrate pulse through personal gesture
• Respond to musical stimulus first; then develop independence
• Bilateral to alternating; no left-right preference
• Demonstrates pulse while singing, although the two may not correspond
• Demonstrate growing independence
• Develops consistent tempo
• Most accurate with upper body and quick tempi
• Words may prompt rhythm instead of beat
• Movement consistently coincides with the beat

Assessing Rhythmic Development
Goal: Children internalize beat

Non-locomotor movement to demonstrate beat
• Self-space
• Bilateral upper body
• Alternating upper body
• Seated Bilateral lower body
• Seated Alternating lower body

Locomotor movement
• Shared space
• Alternating even (walk) “Walk and Stop”
• Alternating uneven (skip) “The Farmer in the Dell”
Artful: Exploring musical expression through voices and instruments

Repertoire: *One Little Owl* (MT Family Favorites, pg. 40)
Concepts: Loud/Quiet (Dynamics); Timbre
Musical Goals: Introduce dynamics and timbre; Practice tuneful singing; Introduce orchestration

1. Teacher places various puppets in the center of the circle (owl, squirrel, raven, opossum).
2. Teacher sings verse 1 to introduce the melody and prompt children’s thinking about the sounds animals make as their ‘songs’.
   - Listeners are prompted to listen for the sound the owl makes.
   - Listeners share answers after the song is complete.
3. Teacher sings the song again, inviting listeners to make the sound of the owl at the appropriate moment.
   - Listeners/singers join in.
   - Verse one is sung again as teacher accompanies the owls ‘song’ on the recorder.
   - Older children may wish to designate individuals to portray 1 – 2 – 3 owls as the song progresses.
4. Teacher poses the question, “What other animals might live up ‘in the old oak tree’?”
   - Listeners/singers may be provoked to answers by the remaining puppets or they may suggest new animals altogether.
   - Discussion develops around these animals’ characteristics and the sounds that they make. Particular attention should be paid to issues of contrast (loud/quiet, high/low, fast/slow, smooth/choppy).
5. New verses are collaboratively constructed and sung.
6. Teacher replaces puppets with instruments* and poses the question, “I wonder what it would sound like if we made our animals sing with instruments instead of voices?”
   - Children collaborate to explore instrument sounds appropriate to the animals we have sung about (owl, squirrel, raven, possum) and the song is sung again with instrumental accompaniment.
   - Listeners/singers may wish to trade instruments.
   - Group reflection should occur around timbre choices.

Instruments*
Three of each instrument can be made available so that children can add one for each phrase of the song. Those with contrastive timbre will offer the greatest opportunity for musical decision-making. Some suggestions are:
- Owl – triangle or recorder
- Squirrel – shakers or guiro
- Raven – bells or sticks
- Opossum – drums or cabasa

Stages of Expressive Development
- Exploring with sound-makers
- Building sound vocabulary
• Building starting and stopping skills
• Developing aesthetic choice-making through multiple media
• Exploring with song lyrics – making it personal
• Sound imitation (animals, vehicles, etc.)
• Invent movements to accompany singing or listening
• Songs narrate play (recitative)
• Self-directed musical play
• Align gestures and/or sounds with text cues
• Create musical accompaniments for poems and stories
• Suggest adaptations or variations for known music
• Creates and executes own musical compositions

Assessing Expressive Development
Goal: Children make aesthetically grounded musical decisions for voices and instruments

Sound accompaniment often supports a variety of playful activities for children. The added sound of a zooming car, or the addition of a “character” voice during imaginative play is typical. Teachers listen and watch for sound choices to become increasingly purposeful and involve a widening repertoire of sound sources.
• Vocal play often comes first, and can be encouraged through vivid story-telling and the agile use of the spoken voice.
• Initially, sound play won’t be associated with anything particular. Once children begin using sound to ‘make meaning’ they have begun to think musically.
• The use of onomatopoeia may indicate a readiness to encode sound.
• Instruments can be introduced through open-ended play. Children need ample experiences to explore the sound-making potential of instruments before they can compose purposefully.
• When children make comments like, “hey, that sounds like …” they present great opportunities to coax their explanation of musical thinking. An effective prompting response can provoke children to reflect on and refine their thinking and contribute to their growing vocabulary: “What is it about that sound that makes you think of ...?”

MUSIC and MOVEMENT LESSON STRUCTURE

Experiences include
• Focused listening
• Singing and speaking
• Moving
• Playing instruments
• Improvising or composing

Student outcomes include
• Differentiation between singing and speaking voice
- Pitch-matching opportunities for voices
- Physical embodiment of the beat
- Expressive use of bodies, voices and/or instruments
- Musical decision-making (loud/soft; fast/slow; smooth/choppy)
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Building Musicianship
Music Fundamentals for Teachers

“It is better to make a piece of music than to perform one; Better to perform one, than to listen to one; Better to listen to one, than to misuse it as a means of distraction, entertainment, or the acquisition of “culture”.”
John Cage, American composer (1912-1992)

The Pedagogy of Orff-Schulwerk

It has long been accepted that musical learning is most authentic if it is presented in a sound-to-symbol sequence and experienced in an active way. In other words, students learn best when the music is experienced first (through listening, singing, moving and playing instruments), as a preparation for reading and writing it. Students learn music by making music rather than studying about it. This developmentally appropriate process can be compared to language acquisition: hear it; play with it; imitate it; use it to communicate. This experiential approach to musical learning may be a new process for you – especially if you endured piano lessons as a child! Our work is modeled after the Orff-Schulwerk approach to music and movement education: an active and all-inclusive approach to sequential instruction, and focused on the process of making music rather than reproducing refined performances, or studying about music.

The Elements of Music

Rhythm

Rhythm is the musical element placing sound in time. It can be described as a linear – or horizontal – aspect of music. We often use comparative phrases like ‘long and short’ or ‘even and uneven’ to describe rhythmic elements in music.

The concept of ratio is fundamental in developing rhythmic understanding. Rhythms are constructed and understood within a metrical context: fitting sounds (and parts of sounds) in time. The given pulse – or steady beat – of a piece dictates rhythmic values and orders the metrical flow of the music. That’s why we used to think that music was a mathematical operation. Howard Gardner’s Theory of Multiple Intelligence (1986) has dispelled that myth, and helped us understand that musical learning is constructed through several unique and specific cognitive operations.
Form is the musical element through which we organize its parts. It can be described as the structural aspect of music – or – the way its sections are put together. When we examine the overall design in a work of music we are learning about musical form. We often use phrases like ‘same – similar - different’ or ‘repetition and contrast’ to describe form in music. Many times, letters identify distinct sections within a work. The first section to be heard is usually called “A”, and subsequent sections are likewise given letters to indicate their relationship to the first. For example, a work in ABA form has a unique and contrastive section in the middle, sandwiched between two identical sections of music.

The understanding of form in a musical context requires auditory memory and discernment. It leads to an understanding of the whole through its component parts. The brain, in its effort to seek order and understanding, is always trying to answer the questions, “Have I heard this music before?” and “How is this music like or different from something I have already heard?” It is within this framework that we will explore musical form.

Melody is the musical element through which we identify its highness and lowness. It occurs both vertically and horizontally, and is often described as the ‘tune’ in a musical work. When we remember a favorite piece of music, it is often the melody that comes to mind. In describing melodic shape, sometimes phrases like ‘higher or lower’ and ‘rising and falling’ are used. Melodies are generally thought to move in three distinct ways: by step – moving up or down the scale by neighboring note; by skip – moving up or down the scale with more than one interval between notes; by repeat – neither moving up nor down, but repeating the same pitch.

Expressive qualities refer to the subtle and not-so-subtle performance choices that can vary the impact of a given work. These are the descriptors we use to interpret works of music. Generally, these terms fall into three categories: dynamics (degrees of loud and soft), tempo (degrees of speed), and articulation (approaches to tone production). Interpretive choices are made by the composer and the performers to influence an audience’s response to a musical work. Can you think of a piece that is absolutely exquisite when performed in the quietest and most delicate way? (Barber’s Adagio for Strings comes to mind.) How would your response change if that piece were played too fast, or too loud? These are examples of the expressive qualities in music, and one of the important ways that music touches us.

Most musical terminology has retained its Italian origins, and it is an accepted convention of the art form to use these terms untranslated. This is particularly true when using the vocabulary
describing the expressive qualities in music. This vocabulary serves as a powerful tool for students when describing music and composing it.

Timbre (tám-bur)

Timbre is the unique sound – or tone color – of an instrument or voice. It is the composer’s color palette – providing an unlimited range of possibilities with which to create. We often use color words to describe timbre in music: the rich chocolate brown portrayed by the cellos – or – the soprano sang as brightly as the vermillion of a cardinal. These descriptions attempt to depict the character of the sound, apart from its melody.

Timbre is determined by three criteria: energy source (like tapping, shaking, or blowing), vibrating surface (like a drum head, lips, or strings), resonator (like the body of the cello or the bell of a horn). It is this list of variables that make the French horn sound different from a clarinet – even when they play the same piece. Most traditional instruments fall into four categories, based on these factors:

- **Chordophones** – instruments that sound through vibrating strings
- **Aerophones** – instruments requiring breath to make sound
- **Idiophones** – instruments sounded through shaking, hitting or scraping
- **Membranophones** – instruments with vibrating heads (drums)

Voices are categorized by timbre as well as range. Even though individual singers can work to expand their singing range, there is little they can do to change the timbre they were born with. Each of us has a unique vocal timbre within our speaking and singing voices. This is determined by the size of the vocal chords and structure of the throat and head. It’s the timbre of your friend’s voice that lets you identify him when he calls on the phone – even before he tells you his name! Voice types are identified through four main categories:

- **Soprano** – the highest and most agile female voice; birdlike
- **Contralto** – the medium to low female voice; generally thicker and warmer than a soprano; catlike
- **Tenor** – the highest and most agile male voice often bright, powerful and robust like the howl of a coyote
- **Bass** – the lowest and strongest male voice often dark, intense and warm like the resonant roar of a lion

Harmony

Harmony is represented through multiple layers of sound. It refers to the simultaneous sounding of tones and their relationship in time. We often think of harmony as a pleasant or sweet-sounding tonal expression, but musically speaking harmony can be expressed through dissonance as well as consonance. Harmony can be created through the singing of simple rounds, by the strummed accompaniment of a guitar, or simple percussive patterns. Musical harmony provides
the listener with multiple layers of sound, blending together to create the entire fabric of a piece of music.

**Texture**

Musical texture can be compared to kinesthetic texture: it reveals the auditory layers in music and describes the interwoven nature of a complete musical work.

**NAfME Music Standards**

Musical learning for preschool students has been categorized into four broad strands. The National Association for Music Education has published descriptions of student outcomes, assessment strategies, and descriptions of typical student responses at basic, proficient, and advanced levels of understanding. See “Performance Standards for Music: Prekindergarten (ages 2-5)” included in this document, beginning on page 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Standard 1: Singing and playing instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Standard 2: Creating music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Standard 3: Responding to music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Standard 4: Understanding music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Musical Foundations for Prekindergarten Children

Listening
- Respond to music of various times, cultures and types
- Discuss and describe music, both verbally and nonverbally

Singing
- Explore and differentiate various uses of the voice (speak, whisper, shout, sing)
- Develop vocal control (match pitch)
- Develop a personal, and group, repertoire of songs

Playing
- Find ways to produce sound with classroom instruments and found sounds
- Explore the environment to discover and use sounds
- Experiment with body and vocal sounds as musical accompaniment
- Make appropriate sound choices to accompany songs, stories and dramatic play

Moving
- Use a developing repertoire of movement in response to music
- Begin to keep an individual and group beat
- Respond appropriately to movement cues in story and song

Reading/Writing Music
- Develop iconic representations for sounds
- Encode personal music making

Musical Concepts for Prekindergarten Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparatives</th>
<th>Musical Vocabulary</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louder / Softer</td>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td>Explore dynamic contrast while singing, speaking or playing instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster / Slower</td>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>Explore tempo changes through movement, singing or playing instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher / Lower</td>
<td>Pitch</td>
<td>Explore a wide range of sounds through listening, singing and speaking expressively; Differentiate between louder/softer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse / Rhythm</td>
<td>Beat – steady, even underlying pulse; Rhythm – patterns of short and long sounds</td>
<td>Keep the beat with both hands; stationary first – then moving through space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choppy / Smooth</td>
<td>Staccato / Legato</td>
<td>Explore various ways to make sounds on traditional and non-traditional instruments; with speaking and singing voices. How does the way you play it change the sound of an instrument?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tonal Development

T1 Child sounds or briefly intones around a one-pitch center, usually the dominant or the resting tone.

T2 Child purposefully intones more than one pitch, representing the song’s correct melodic contour. The pitches she sings may not be the exact pitches of the song.

T3 Child sings some parts of the song correctly. Those parts may begin the song or progress to a resting pitch at the end of a song.

T4 Child sings those parts of the song below “the break,” usually around Bb, correctly and/or in tune.

T5 Child sings an entire song correctly and in tune.

Rhythm Development

R1 Child moves with a characteristic gesture and/or sings with a characteristic pattern of rhythm that is short in duration. The gesture or pattern usually does not synchronize with the beat of the music he is hearing or creating.

R2 Child beats or sings an accurate pattern of rhythm (usually over two or three macrobeats) that is aligned with the ends of phrases.

R3 Child moves or sings with a consistent tempo that may be different than the tempo of the music he is hearing or creating. When it is aligned, it usually reflects the microbeat rather than the macrobeat.

R4 Child’s movements may coincide to the macrobeat of the music he is hearing or creating. He moves or sings in the correct tempo and meter only when there is prominent visual, kinesthetic, or auditory stimulus.

R5 Child’s movements coincide to the macrobeat of the music he is hearing or creating. He moves or sings to an entire song in the correct tempo and meter without relying on external stimulus.
Content Standard 1: Singing and playing instruments

1a. Children use their voices expressively as they speak, chant, and sing

Assessment strategy:
The teacher and the child chant a short, familiar poem together. The teacher then asks the child to try using different kinds of voices (e.g., high, low, funny, scary, whispery) in reciting the poem. The teacher invites the child to suggest other kinds of voices, and the child again chants the poem, using other kinds of voices.

Description of response:
Basic Level:
1. The child can offer a few suggestions, but the suggestions tend to be derived from the teacher’s examples and reflect little originality.
2. The child is willing to try using the various kinds of voices, but the distinctions are minimal and unconvincing.

Proficient Level:
1. The child can demonstrate several kinds of voices that have not previously been suggested by the teacher. Some of the suggestions may be derived from the teacher’s examples, but others are clearly original.
2. The child can offer a convincing demonstration of each kind of voice suggested.

Advanced Level:
1. The child can demonstrate a wide variety of voices that cover most of the possible categories. Many are clearly original.
2. The child shows flexibility and imagination in demonstrating a wide variety of voices.

1b. Children sing a variety of simple songs in various keys, meters, and genres, alone and with a group, becoming increasingly accurate in rhythm and pitch

Assessment strategy:
The teacher asks the child to sing a favorite song. The singing is unaccompanied, and the child chooses the starting pitch. The teacher then asks for another and another, as long as the child can think of different songs. If the songs are lacking in variety, the teacher asks, “Do you know this one?” and sings the first line. The child finishes the song if he or she knows it. In this way the teacher seeks to determine to what extent the child’s repertoire includes folk songs from around the world, ethnic songs, patriotic songs, game or nonsense songs, and seasonal or other topical songs.

Description of response:
Basic Level:
1. The child can sing a half dozen rote songs, representing at least three of the following categories: folk songs, ethnic songs, patriotic songs, game or nonsense songs, seasonal or other topical songs.
2. The child’s rhythm is generally satisfactory, though there are some errors.
3. The child’s pitch follows the contour of the melody, though there are frequent errors in actual pitches sung.

Proficient Level:
1. The child can sing a dozen rote songs, representing at least four of the following categories: folk songs, ethnic songs, patriotic songs, game or nonsense songs, seasonal or other topical songs.
2. The child’s rhythm and pitch are generally good, though there are occasional errors.

Advanced Level:
1. The child can sing two dozen rote songs, representing all five of the following categories: folk songs, ethnic songs, patriotic songs, game or nonsense songs, seasonal or other topical songs.
2. The child’s rhythm and pitch are very good. There are almost no errors.
1c. Children experiment with a variety of instruments and other sound sources

Assessment strategy:
The child is placed in an environment with many classroom instruments and other sound sources, including electronic sources, and is instructed to see how many different sounds he or she can make with the instruments. The teacher makes an occasional suggestion, such as, “Can you think of a different way to play that instrument?” Vocal sounds and body sounds are also suggested. Uses of the various sounds are discussed: “What does that sound remind you of?” “Can you make a sound like a thunderstorm?” “A gentle rain?” “A squeaky door?” The child is encouraged to produce a variety of sounds from a variety of sources, to make at least one valid and relevant comment concerning each sound, and to describe imagined sounds.

Description of response:

Basic Level:
1. The child hesitates frequently, but eventually is able to produce an appropriate sound or response to each suggestion from the teacher. Some of the sounds are similar to sounds produced earlier. Many suggestions from the teacher are required. The child takes no initiatives.
2. The child can make at least one accurate and relevant comment concerning some of the sounds produced and some of the imagined sounds, but in other cases the comments are inaccurate, irrelevant, or repetitious.

Proficient Level:
1. The child is able to produce an appropriate sound or response to each suggestion from the teacher and to take one or two initiatives.
2. The child can make at least one accurate and relevant comment concerning most of the sounds produced and most of the imagined sounds.

Advanced Level:
1. The child not only responds promptly and effectively to every suggestion from the teacher but also takes the initiative to produce three or more other sounds. The child demonstrates imagination in producing new sounds and in discussing the possible uses of the various sounds.
2. The child has no difficulty in making at least one accurate and relevant comment concerning every sound produced and every imagined sound and can make several comments about many of them.

1d. Children play simple melodies and accompaniments on instruments

Assessment strategy (both tasks are required):

TASK A: The child is asked to use a keyboard or mallet percussion instrument to play a “song” (i.e., a melody) for the teacher. TASK B: The child is asked to strum an accompaniment to a familiar melody on a chorded zither (e.g., Autoharp or ChromAharp) while the teacher presses the chord buttons, to accompany a song by strumming the strings of a guitar or ukulele while the teacher holds the instrument and fingers the chords, or to play a very simple ostinato pattern on a mallet percussion instrument. The child is encouraged to sing along with the teacher and other children, who sing the melody.

Description of response, TASK A:

Basic Level:
The child plays a series of pitches approximating a “song” (i.e., a melody), though the playing is disjointed or hesitant and is not song-like in structure.

Proficient Level:
The child plays a series of pitches approximating a “song.” The playing is smooth, with only a few hesitations, and is song-like in structure.

Advanced Level:
The child plays a series of pitches approximating a “song” or, perhaps, plays a recognizable children’s song. The playing is smooth and confident, with no hesitations, and is song-like in structure.

Description of response, TASK B:

Basic Level:
1. The child strums the song or sustains the ostinato, but the playing is hesitant and the beat is disrupted at several points.
2. The child attempts to sing along but can sing only a few of the words while strumming or playing.

Proficient Level:
1. The child strums the song or plays the ostinato without hesitation, and the beat is generally steady.
2. The child sings along with many of the words while strumming or playing.

Advanced Level:
1. The child strums the song or plays the ostinato confidently and with a steady beat throughout.
2. The child sings along throughout the song while strumming or playing.
2a. Children improvise songs to accompany their play activities

Assessment strategy:
The child is given a set of blocks and a set of animal figures. The teacher suggests building a zoo and engages the child in a singing dialogue in which the teacher encourages the child to make up a song about the various animals in the zoo. While building the zoo, the child is asked to improvise a song in which each “verse” is about a different animal. The teacher helps out when the child hesitates or stops.

Description of response:
Basic Level:
The child requires much encouragement from the teacher but can improvise briefly about an animal.
Proficient Level:
The teacher has to encourage the child occasionally, but the child continues the song and improvises three additional “verses”—each about a different animal—with little help.
Advanced Level:
The child improvises five additional “verses”—each about a different animal—with almost no help from the teacher.

2b. Children improvise instrumental accompaniments to songs, recorded selections, stories, and poems

Assessment strategy:
The teacher reads a story or poem to the child and asks him or her to identify some of the objects and actions in the story that can be represented in sound, to devise appropriate sounds for those objects and actions, using a variety of sound sources, and to produce the sounds at the appropriate times while the teacher reads the story again. For example, walking can be represented by evenly spaced sounds on a woodblock; sleeping can be represented by an excerpt from a lullaby; a clock striking the hour can be indicated by a chime; and counting can be represented by strokes on a drum.

Description of response:
Basic Level:
1. The child identifies only a few of the most obvious objects and actions that lend themselves to representation in sound.
2. The sounds used by the child include only the most obvious. They are limited in variety. Some of the sounds are inappropriate.
Proficient Level:
1. The child suggests several objects and actions that lend themselves to representation in sound but may omit certain obvious possibilities.
2. The sounds used by the child are appropriate to the object or action they represent. The sounds are selected from a variety of sources.
Advanced Level:
1. The child identifies virtually all of the appropriate objects and actions that lend themselves to representation in sound.
2. The sounds used by the child are all appropriate to the object or action they represent. In some cases the connection between the object and the sound is subtle but logical. The sounds are selected from a wide variety of sources and some show imagination.

2c. Children create short pieces of music, using voices, instruments, and other sound sources

Assessment strategy:
The teacher reads a story in which one of the characters sings a particular song several times. The words to the song (but not the melody) may be provided in the story, or the teacher may create words to fit the story where none are provided. After learning the words, the child is asked to use them to make up a song to be sung in the story, and to sing it the same way each time the character sings it in the story.

Description of response:
Basic Level:
1. The child needs assistance but can create a song.
2. The child is able to maintain some of the rhythm and pitch characteristics of the song during the repetitions.
Proficient Level:
1. The child can create a song without assistance.
2. The child is able to maintain most of the rhythm and pitch characteristics of the song during the repetitions.
Advanced Level:
1. The child can create a song without assistance. The song is appropriate and appealing.
2. The child is able to maintain all of the rhythm and pitch characteristics of the song during the repetitions.

2d. Children invent and use original graphic or symbolic systems to represent vocal and instrumental sounds and musical ideas

Assessment strategy:
The child is asked to make up a piece of music, to write it down on paper or on a chalkboard, using symbols to represent the various sounds, and to perform it. The child is also asked to explain the symbols.

Description of response:

Basic Level:
1. Several different sounds are used, each represented by a different symbol. There is no consistent one-to-one correspondence between most of the symbols and the sounds they represent.
2. The child can perform the piece represented by the symbols but cannot explain or demonstrate the sound that each symbol represents.

Proficient Level:
1. The child uses several different sounds, each represented by a different symbol. There is a consistent one-to-one correspondence between most of the symbols and the sounds they represent.
2. The child can perform the piece represented by the symbols and can explain or demonstrate the sound that each symbol represents.

Advanced Level:
1. The child uses several different sounds, each represented by a different symbol. There is a consistent one-to-one correspondence between the symbols and the sounds they represent. The representation includes distinctions in one or more elements of music (e.g., pitch, rhythm, dynamic level).
2. The child can perform the piece represented by the symbols. The child can explain and demonstrate the sound each symbol represents and can describe how the specific sound is represented by the symbol.

Content Standard 3: Responding to music

3a. Children identify the sources of a wide variety of sounds

Assessment strategy:
Pictures are displayed of instruments or other sound sources with which the child has had direct experience (i.e., he or she has observed the instrument or sound source while the sound was being produced, live or on videotape). These may include pictures of a piano, a guitar, a saxophone, a clarinet, a trumpet, a trombone, a tuba, a violin, a double bass, a drum, a man singing, a woman singing, a balloon bursting, a baby crying, children laughing, a door closing, a package being torn open, a bird singing, a cow mooing, a dog barking, a cat meowing, an automobile (representing a car horn), lightning and storm clouds (representing thunder), a siren, or other common sound sources. Recorded examples of sounds from the various sources are played, and the child is asked to identify the picture representing the source of each sound.

Description of response:

Basic Level:
1. The child is able to identify the source of five nonmusical sounds (e.g., car horn honking, balloon bursting, baby crying).
2. The child is able to identify the source of five musical sounds (e.g., piano, guitar, violin, drum, female singer).

Proficient Level:
1. The child is able to identify the source of nine nonmusical sounds.
2. The child is able to identify the source of nine musical sounds.

Advanced Level:
1. The child is able to identify the source of a dozen nonmusical sounds.
2. The child is able to identify the source of a dozen musical sounds.

3b. Children respond through movement to music of various tempos, meters, dynamics, modes, genres, and styles to express what they hear and feel in works of music

Assessment strategy:
The child is given a prop such as a scarf, a streamer, or a wand and is asked to move to two pieces of music, one slow and one fast, using the prop. The child is not told the title of the music nor how to move but is merely asked to move as the music suggests and to reflect the beat in his or her movements.

**Description of response:**

*Basic Level:*
The child’s movement reflects the character of the music in a general way. The movement to the slow piece is slow. The movement to the fast piece is fast.

*Proficient Level:*
The child’s movement reflects the character of the music. The beat is evident through the movement. Some effort is made to represent the melodic, rhythmic, or dynamic features of the music in the movement.

*Advanced Level:*
Not only does the child’s movement reflect the character of the music, but also the various movement patterns suggest repetition and contrast to reflect the formal structure of the music. The child is able to represent clearly at least one of the melodic, rhythmic, or dynamic features of the music in the movement.

3c. **Children participate freely in music activities**

**Assessment strategy:**
The child is encouraged to follow the example of the teacher in improvising songs or sounds to accompany the activities of daily life. The child has access to song books, picture books depicting folk tales and musicians, and a bin with various music instruments. There is enough space for movement, and there is a collection of props for movement improvisations. An electronic keyboard with headphones and a listening station with a cassette player and headphones are available for the child to use when desired.

**Description of response:**

*Basic Level:*
The child occasionally takes the initiative to participate in music activities but often seems to prefer other types of activities.

*Proficient Level:*
The child often takes the initiative to participate in music activities.

*Advanced Level:*
The child regularly takes the initiative to participate in music activities and frequently becomes engaged in them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Standard 4: Understanding music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4a. **Children use their own vocabulary and standard music vocabulary to describe voices, instruments, music notation, and music of various genres, styles, and periods from diverse cultures**

**Assessment strategy:**
The teacher plays several pairs of short examples of music selected to show clear contrasts in one of the following: tempo, dynamic level, pitch level (i.e., register), style (e.g., smooth or bouncy, calm or excited), instruments/voices, solo/large ensemble. After each pair is played, the child is asked to explain how the two pieces differed.

**Description of response:**

*Basic Level:*
1. The child needs prompting or a second hearing to respond, and cannot respond to every pair of examples.
2. For some of the examples, the child can describe the differences in vague, nonmusic terminology.

*Proficient Level:*
1. The child can respond to every pair of examples.
2. For many of the examples, the child can describe the differences, using appropriate music terminology.

*Advanced Level:*
1. The child can respond quickly and easily to every pair of examples.
2. For all of the examples, the child can describe the differences, using appropriate music terminology.

4b. **Children sing, play instruments, move, or verbalize to demonstrate awareness of the elements of music and changes in their usage**
**Assessment strategy:**
The teacher plays several excerpts of music featuring sudden and gradual changes in loudness, tempo, or pitch level (i.e., register). The child is asked to indicate by movement or gesture the changes he or she hears. For example, to indicate changes in loudness the child may move the hands apart or bring them together; to indicate changes in tempo, the child may move the feet, arms, or head in time to the music; or to indicate changes in pitch level, the child may stand up straight or crouch down. (If administering this assessment strategy in a group, the children may be asked to close their eyes to reduce the tendency to copy one another.) [Note: In this strategy the child responds by moving; parallel strategies should be created to provide opportunities for the child to respond by singing, playing instruments, or verbalizing.]

**Description of response:**

*Basic Level:* The child responds by appropriate movements to some of the sudden changes in loudness, tempo, or pitch level, but for other changes, the response is slow, uncertain, or missing.

*Proficient Level:* The child responds by appropriate movements to most of the sudden changes in loudness, tempo, or pitch level, but does not always recognize a change when it is gradual.

*Advanced Level:* The child responds promptly by appropriate movements to both sudden and gradual changes in loudness, tempo, or pitch level.

4c. **Children demonstrate an awareness of music as a part of daily life**

**Assessment strategy:**
The teacher engages the child in conversation about “where we hear music”: “Where have you heard music today?” “Yesterday?” “Last week?” The teacher does not directly suggest where the child might have heard music, but does inquire about what the child did and where the child went. When the child recalls having heard music in a particular setting, the teacher asks why music was used in that setting.

**Description of response:**

*Basic Level:*
1. The child can identify two or three settings in which music was present in his or her life.
2. For a few examples, the child can give a reasonably satisfactory explanation of why music was used in that setting, but for other examples, he or she tends to miss the point.

*Proficient Level:*
1. The child can identify four or five settings in which music was present in his or her life.
2. For many examples, the child can give a good explanation of why music was used in that setting.

*Advanced Level:*
1. The child can identify six settings in which music was present in his or her life.
2. For most examples, the child’s explanation of why music was used in that setting reflects knowledge and insight.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>Introductory Workshop</td>
<td>Participant Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13 - 17</td>
<td>Collaborative Planning</td>
<td>Music ‘lesson plans’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct parent/child interview question #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20 – September 14</td>
<td>Participant Exploration</td>
<td>Identify child/parent pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collect student data</td>
<td>Collect parent/child interview #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct parent/child interview question #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17 - 21</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 1</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Self Report (Friday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect parent/child interview #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct parent/child interview question #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24 - 28</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 2</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Self Report (Friday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect parent/child interview #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct parent/child interview question #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1 - 5</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 3</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Self Report (Friday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video documentation #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect parent/child interview #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct parent/child interview question #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8 – 12</td>
<td>Fall Break Week 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15 – 19</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 5</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Self Report (Friday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect parent/child interview #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct parent/child interview question #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22 – 26</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 6</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Self Report (Friday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect parent/child interview #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct parent/child interview question #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 29 – November 2</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 7</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Self Report (Friday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video documentation #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect parent/child interview #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct parent/child interview question #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5 - 9</td>
<td>Observation Week 8</td>
<td>Participant Observation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect parent/child interview #8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LESSON SCHEDULE

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:00</td>
<td>Twinklers</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Twinklers</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deconstruct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>Sunshine G</td>
<td>Moonbeams</td>
<td>Sunshine G</td>
<td>Moonbeams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deconstruct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 12:00</td>
<td>Rainbow K</td>
<td>Rainbow K</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deconstruct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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F. WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Please mark the box that most clearly expresses your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The workshop atmosphere was positive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The music skills addressed were relevant to my practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt comfortable trying new musical tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My efforts were positively received by the workshop leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The pace was too fast for me to grasp new strategies and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There were plenty of opportunities to ask questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The materials presented were appropriate for the children I teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The introduced songs and activities were easy to learn and remember.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I will use some of the new songs and activities I learned today in my classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have gained confidence in leading music activities with children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please add any personal insights here
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G. CHILD/PARENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Use the headings below to gather data regarding students’ musical growth (a. pitch accuracy; b. beat competency; c. improvisatory musical expression).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s classroom affiliation:</th>
<th>Date of Interview:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewed by:</th>
<th>Interviewee:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Child ☐ Parent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opening question

Notes

Reflections and/or Next Steps
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H. UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom affiliation:</th>
<th>Date of Interview:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed by:</td>
<td>Interviewee:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opening question

Notes

Reflections and/or Next Steps
# 1. PARTICIPANT SKILLS ASSESSMENT

**Date:** 

**Teacher:** 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singing</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sings melodies accurately (in-tune)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sings in an appropriate range for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uses a variety of ‘voices’ when speaking and singing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sings conversations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Makes aesthetic choices when singing (tempo, dynamics, articulation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Please add any personal insights here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Demonstrates macro/micro steady beat through varied physical responses to music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Models simple rhythmic patterns through voice, body percussion, or instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Moves freely in response to musical stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Makes aesthetic choices when moving (tempo, dynamics, articulation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Please add any personal insights here –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Playing Instruments</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Plays classroom instruments to accompany musical engagements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Responds to the instrumental contributions of children during music-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Makes aesthetic choices when modeling with instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Please add any personal insights here –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Demonstrates ‘turn taking’ through listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Models active listening through prompts and behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Listens actively to the musical contributions of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Please add any personal insights here –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Uses music as transition or management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Offers direct music instruction for the whole group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Offers instructional feedback when children engage in musical behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Maintains positive affect (verbally, physically, emotionally) during musical encounters with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Responds appropriately to the musical questions, ideas, or suggestions of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Please add any personal insights here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### J. PARTICIPANT SELF-REPORT

Use the descriptors below to identify your musical leadership in your classroom this week.

Date:    Classroom Affiliation:    Teacher:    

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I sang melodies accurately (in-tune)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I sang in an appropriate range for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I use a variety of ‘voices’ when speaking and singing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I had singing conversations with some children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I made aesthetic choices when singing (tempo, dynamics, articulation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Please add any personal insights here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I demonstrated macro/micro steady beat through varied physical responses to music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I modeled simple rhythmic patterns through voice, body percussion, or instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I moved (danced) in response to musical stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I made aesthetic choices when moving (tempo, dynamics, articulation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Please add any personal insights here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playing Instruments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I modeled instrument playing to accompany musical engagements (singing or listening)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I responded to the instrumental contributions of children during music making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Makes aesthetic choices when playing instruments (tempo, dynamics, articulation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Please add any personal insights here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Listening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I modeled ‘turn taking’ through listening and singing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I modeled active listening through prompts and behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I listened actively to the musical contributions of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Please add any personal insights here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. I used music to facilitate classroom transitions and / or management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I guided direct music instruction for the whole group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I offered instructional feedback when children engaged in musical behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I maintained a positive affect (verbally, physically, emotionally) during musical encounters with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I responded appropriately to the musical questions, ideas, or suggestions when children offered them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Please add any personal insights here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Please add any additional comments regarding your musical growth or your musical engagement with your students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# K. DATA COLLECTION LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Rec’d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/13/12</td>
<td><strong>Introductory Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/12</td>
<td><strong>Focus Group Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/21/12</td>
<td><strong>Week 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Self-Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/28/12</td>
<td><strong>Week 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Self-Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/05/12</td>
<td><strong>Week 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Self-Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/12</td>
<td><strong>Week 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/12</td>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Participant Self-Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/12</td>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Participant Self-Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/12</td>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Participant Self-Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child/Parent Interview #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/12</td>
<td>Focus Group Interview</td>
<td>Questions 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closing Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/12</td>
<td>Email Interview Questions – Center Director</td>
<td>1. Can you describe the ‘tipping point’ that catapulted you into the world of Reggio Emilia? 05/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How has your journey from ‘administrator to innovator’ influenced the way you collaborate with your community? 06/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. How have you and your staff developed a shared ‘Image of the Child’ through the Reggio lens? 07/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. What steps have you and your staff taken to embrace the idea that the “environment is the third teacher”? 07/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. What are the core values at HPUMPS, and how do they influence and frame the relationships between all stakeholders? 09/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Educator Exchange Days: How has visiting other Reggio inspired schools contributed to your growth as a teacher/leader? 09/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. What else would you like to share regarding the HPUMPS journey into the Reggio world? 09/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## L. PROJECT CALENDAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>Introductory Workshop</td>
<td>Participant Survey&lt;br&gt;Focus group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13 - 17</td>
<td>Collaborative Planning</td>
<td>Music ‘lesson plans’&lt;br&gt;Construct parent/child interview question #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20 – September 14</td>
<td>Participant Exploration&lt;br&gt;• Collect student data</td>
<td>Identify child/parent pairs&lt;br&gt;Collect parent/child interview #1&lt;br&gt;Daily journal entries&lt;br&gt;Collect parent/child interview question #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17 - 21</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 1</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction&lt;br&gt;Daily journal entries&lt;br&gt;Participant Self Report (Friday)&lt;br&gt;Participant Observation Protocol&lt;br&gt;Collect parent/child interview #2&lt;br&gt;Construct parent/child interview question #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24 - 28</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 2</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction&lt;br&gt;Daily journal entries&lt;br&gt;Participant Self Report (Friday)&lt;br&gt;Participant Observation Protocol&lt;br&gt;Collect parent/child interview #3&lt;br&gt;Construct parent/child interview question #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1 - 5</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 3</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction&lt;br&gt;Daily journal entries&lt;br&gt;Participant Self Report (Friday)&lt;br&gt;Participant Observation Protocol&lt;br&gt;Video documentation #2&lt;br&gt;Collect parent/child interview #4&lt;br&gt;Construct parent/child interview question #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8 – 12</td>
<td>Fall Break Week 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15 – 19</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 5</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction&lt;br&gt;Daily journal entries&lt;br&gt;Participant Self Report (Friday)&lt;br&gt;Participant Observation Protocol&lt;br&gt;Collect parent/child interview #5&lt;br&gt;Construct parent/child interview question #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22 – 26</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 6</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction&lt;br&gt;Daily journal entries&lt;br&gt;Participant Self Report (Friday)&lt;br&gt;Participant Observation Protocol&lt;br&gt;Collect parent/child interview #6&lt;br&gt;Construct parent/child interview question #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 29 – November 2</td>
<td>Mentorship Week 7</td>
<td>Lesson notes and deconstruction&lt;br&gt;Daily journal entries&lt;br&gt;Participant Self Report (Friday)&lt;br&gt;Participant Observation Protocol&lt;br&gt;Video documentation #2&lt;br&gt;Collect parent/child interview #7&lt;br&gt;Construct parent/child interview question #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5 - 9</td>
<td>Observation Week 8</td>
<td>Participant Observation Protocol&lt;br&gt;Participant Survey and Focus group interview&lt;br&gt;Collect parent/child interview #8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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M. DATA COLLECTION MATRIX

Data Collection Matrix

1. “How might the impact of a site-specific, school-wide collaboration between a music educator and a preschool staff be described and interpreted?”
   i. How does the collaboration impact the attitudes practitioners have regarding the value and purpose of the implementation of music instruction in their classrooms?
   ii. How does the collaboration strengthen expertise in music education among these practitioners?
   iii. How does a collaborative, emergent professional development model influence change in the practice of music education among study participants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Outcomes/Research Q’s</th>
<th>Data Evidence</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Target Date 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reggio Study Tour hosted by teachers at the research site; Meet with Center Director</td>
<td>Build researcher-participant rapport</td>
<td>iii Researcher reflection/field notes</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>04/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in ‘Ramps and Pathways’ workshop presented by Dr. Rosemary Geiken, ETSU (research site)</td>
<td>Build researcher-participant rapport</td>
<td>iii Researcher reflection/field notes</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>05/21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit research proposal, Acquire IRB approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapters 1–3 All assessment instruments</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>08/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Data Portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project notebooks: Journals, Surveys, Observation Protocol, Skills Assessment, Parent Interview Themes</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>08/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Workshop</td>
<td>• Collect participant baseline data</td>
<td>ii Participant Survey (12)</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>08/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe research commitment</td>
<td>i Focus Group Interview (1)</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct item analysis on survey</td>
<td>iii Workshop Evaluations (12)</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboratively plan curriculum</td>
<td>ii, iii Review teachers’ lesson planning process/habits</td>
<td>All Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>08/13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboratively construct lesson models</td>
<td>ii, iii Music lesson plans</td>
<td>All Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>08/13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meeting</td>
<td>i Field notes</td>
<td>All Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>08/13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect baseline data on children</td>
<td>i Teacher reflections Student artifacts</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>08/20–09/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship – weeks 1, 2, 3 (36 lessons; 6 lessons in 6 classrooms)</td>
<td>Lesson plans and field notes, Video documentation, Unstructured observations, Structured Interviews, Unstructured Observations and Interviews, Staff Meeting field notes, Frequency Report and Reflections, Child/Parent Interview, Participant Skills Assessment</td>
<td>Researcher Participants Center Director Researcher Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td>09/17–10/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resting week – No on-site visits (Week 4)</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Initial data description and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship – weeks 5, 6, 7 (36 lessons; 6 lessons in 6 classrooms)</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Lesson plans and field notes (36) Video documentation (11) Unstructured observations (11) Structured Interviews (11) Structured Observations and Interviews (66) Staff Meeting Field notes (3) Frequency Report and Reflections (+/- 150) Child/Parent Interview Observation Protocol (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-mentorship Observation – week 8</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Observation Protocol (11) Participant Survey (12)</td>
<td>Center Director Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LESSON PLAN EXAMPLE (Music Time with Twinklers)
### Music time with Twinklers

**Fall 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Song Titles</th>
<th>Outcomes for Children</th>
<th>Goals for Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuneful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td><em>John the Rabbit</em></td>
<td>• Attends to teacher’s songs</td>
<td>• Sings in appropriate range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Down by the Station</em></td>
<td>• Takes turns; sings “what comes next” or “starts our song”</td>
<td>• Models aesthetic choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Twinkle, Twinkle</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loud/quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hello, How are you?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Fast/slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tonal Patterns</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>- High/low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Makes purposeful aesthetic choices</td>
<td>- Smooth/choppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sings known repertoire independently</td>
<td>• Prompts engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvises personal songs</td>
<td>• Prompts and responds to child’s improvisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stops singing as soon as children can carry the song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement Games</td>
<td><em>Allee Galloo</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sally Go Round the Sun</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ring Around the Rosie</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td><em>Here is the Beehive</em></td>
<td>• Attends to teacher’s text and motions</td>
<td>• Speaks expressively; varies ‘voices’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ride a Little Horsey</em></td>
<td>• Takes turns; speaks “what comes next” or “starts our rhyme”</td>
<td>• Makes explicit various voices (speak, sing, whisper, shout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Humpty Dumpty</em></td>
<td>• Makes purposeful aesthetic choices</td>
<td>• Models aesthetic choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Speaks known repertoire independently</td>
<td>- Loud/quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvises variations to text</td>
<td>- Fast/slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- High/low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Smooth/choppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Model micro and macro bilateral beat keeping with varied repertoire</td>
<td>• Prompts engagement (puppets, props)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prompts and responds to child’s improvisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers model rhythmic imitation</td>
<td>• Drops out as soon as children can carry the poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rhythm Patterns</em></td>
<td>• Attends to teacher’s vocal play</td>
<td>• Teachers play ‘echo’ with individual children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Imitates rhythmic fragments</td>
<td>• Teachers vary tempo and rhythmic patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to music</td>
<td><em>Crawfish Song</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Junior Ragtime</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nyandolo</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Listen to the Horses</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Shakers</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Copies teacher’s bilateral beat keeping</td>
<td>• Model micro and macro bilateral beat keeping with varied repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Holds shakers to keep the beat</td>
<td>• Explore body parts for beat keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finds the beat in the whole body (swaying, walking, bending)</td>
<td>• Model ‘free’ movement in response to music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tuneful singing</td>
<td>• Attends to teacher’s songs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turn-taking</td>
<td>• Takes turns; sings “what comes next” or “starts our song”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dynamic contrast</td>
<td>• Makes purposeful aesthetic choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Articulation contrast</td>
<td>• Sings known repertoire independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvises new songs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocal Improvisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timbre</td>
<td>• Sings in appropriate range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Texture</td>
<td>• Models aesthetic choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High/Low</td>
<td>• Loud/quiet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loud/Soft</td>
<td>• Fast/slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High/low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smooth/choppy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prompts engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prompts and responds to child’s improvisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stops singing as soon as children can carry the song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrument Playing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stop and Start</td>
<td>• Makes purposeful choices in producing varied vocal timbre of animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dynamic contrast</td>
<td>• Explores instruments as representation of animal voices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Articulation contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timbre contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sings in appropriate range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Models aesthetic vocal and instrumental choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loud/quiet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fast/slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High/low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smooth/choppy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prompts engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prompts and responds to child’s improvisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stops singing / playing as soon as children can carry the song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening and Dancing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Macro beat</td>
<td>• Children respond physically to auditory stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Phrase</td>
<td>• Teachers model free movement in response to music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Start and Stop</td>
<td>• Teachers notice and imitate children’s movement choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• World We Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New World Comin’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Garden Song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Junior Ragtime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alligator Song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lullaby</strong></td>
<td>• Children listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focused listening</td>
<td>• Children respond physically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dynamics</td>
<td>• Teachers model beautiful singing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Start and Stop</td>
<td>• Teachers model beatful rocking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers rock individual children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hush, Little Baby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy Connection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focused listening</td>
<td>• Over in the Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dynamics</td>
<td>• Wheels on the Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timbre</td>
<td>• Makes purposeful choices in producing varied vocal timbre of animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explores instruments as representation of animal voices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE, MUSIC FOR SUNSHINE GANG
Hi, Ladies

Since our time at school is so full, I thought I'd try a weekly email to share my thoughts and provoke your thinking for next week.

• It was another great week for me with the Sunshine Gang! You've got a lot of tuneful singers and many beatful musicians, too. I think your children have a good grasp on the repertoire I've presented. My goal for next week is to shift our focus more toward 'artful' as we promote musical choice-making, and to draw on your leadership in music. I'm looking forward to reading your music journal entries.

NEXT WEEK:
• Please remember to collect video documentation for your teaching partner guiding musical activities that focus on "tuneful, beatful, and artful" engagements with your children. This video can be collected all at once, or in short segments [15-20 minutes total].
• When I am with you and your children next week, I would like you to lead two activities. You may choose from any of the materials I've presented, or add something new.
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MENTORSHIP EVALUATION
P. MENTORSHIP EVALUATION

DEMOGRAPHIC SUMMARY

Name: ____________________  Age: ____________  Role at the school: _________________
Years of teaching experience:
Highest degree earned / subjects studied:

MENTORSHIP EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark the box that most clearly expresses your feelings.</th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The mentorship has influenced the way I approach music instruction for the children in my care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I prompt musical engagement with my children more often now, as a result of this collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have a new understanding of the purpose of musical engagement for children and it has influenced my instructional choices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There were plenty of opportunities to ask questions and get specific guidance that met my needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I observe and analyze the musical behaviors of my children with greater awareness as a result of this collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have gained musical understanding and improved instructional skills in music through this collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The materials and activities presented were appropriate for my class and reflected their interests and abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The mentor positively received my efforts and her feedback was specific and useful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I felt able to “make the work my own” through adaptation to, addition to, or substitution of repertoire and materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The pace of the mentorship allowed me to grasp new strategies and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have gained confidence in leading music activities with children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I have a better understanding of why music is a valuable endeavor for children as a result of this collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please add any personal insights here
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MUSIC MATTERS – RESOURCE LIST
Q. MUSIC MATTERS – RESOURCE LIST

Music Matters:
Improving Practice in Music Education
Among Early Childhood Educators in a Reggio-inspired Climate

RESOURCE LIST

West Music - www.westmusic.com
Vendor of musical instruments and resources for children

Organization dedicated to music for families

International organization dedicated to music and movement for children 0 – 8 years old

CDs from the following pedagogues and performers will offer high quality repertoire and child-friendly – developmentally appropriate – songs and activities.

Early Childhood Focus
John Feierabend – First Steps in Music Series
Lynn Kleiner – Kids Make Music Series
Music Together – Song Collections (CDs and songbooks)

American Folk Songs
Pete Seeger
Raffi
Woody Guthrie
Peter and Mary Alice Amadon

Quality Recordings for Children
Smithsonian Folkways Recordings
Sesame Street
Putamayo Kids
VITA

Susanne Finch Burgess was raised with her brother by two loving parents in Santa Barbara, California. She began studying music and dance at an early age, and entered Santa Barbara City College to study music and theatre in 1972. Upon completing an Associates Degree in vocal music she married and entered California State University, Fullerton where she completed a Bachelor’s Degree in music education with a minor in theatre in 1978.

Upon graduation she moved to San Antonio, Texas where she entered the University of Texas to complete teaching certification. She was fortunate to apprentice with two master teachers accomplished in the Kodály method. In 1981 she relocated to Tucson, Arizona where she began her teaching career in vocal music and theatre for the Tucson Unified School District, at Secrist Middle School.

In 1983 she moved to Memphis, Tennessee, where she taught elementary music for Memphis City Schools. It was there that she was introduced to the Orff-Schulwerk approach, and completed a Master’s Degree in Orff Schulwerk at the University of Memphis in 1988.

Susanne began teaching preschool music on a part-time basis when her girls were born in the 1980’s. She continued to practice Orff-Schulwerk and became a regional and national workshop presenter promoting its practice and writing curriculum for Orff teachers. In 1997 she returned to California with the family to design and implement a K-8 Orff-based music curriculum at College School in Santa Ynez, California.
In 2000, she joined the staff at the Southeast Center for Education in the Arts where she currently serves as the director of music education. A nationally known organization in arts education, the Center provides professional development for K-16 teachers with a mission toward strengthening arts education and promoting the arts as core curriculum.

Her work at the Center has reached teachers across the Southeast as well as the Nation, and since 2008 has enjoyed a presence in the international arena through the International Society of Music Education. Her interests in curriculum integration have led her to advanced studies and research in instructional design, authentic assessment and arts curriculum. It is these interests that have prompted the pursuit of an Ed.D. in Learning and Leadership at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.