

It's About Time

JUDITH ANNE JELLISON

Judith Anne Jellison is the recipient of the 2004 Senior Researcher Award from the Music Educators National Conference (MENC). The following speech was presented on April 16, 2004, at a special session of the Society for Research in Music Education at MENC's National Biennial In-service Conference held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, which was then printed in the Journal of Research in Music Education 52, no. 3 (Fall 2004) 191–205. Reprinted by permission. Copyright © 2004 MENC: The National Association for Music Education.

It is indeed a great honor to receive this award. I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the National Executive Board of MENC, to the Music Education Research Council (MERC) and its Executive Committee, and to the members of the Society for Research in Music Education. It is a particular honor for me to join the ranks of the distinguished scholars who have received the Senior Researcher Award since its inception in 1988: Clifford K. Madsen, Allen P. Britton, Albert LeBlanc, James C. Carlson, Cornelia Yarbrough, Rudolf E. Radocy, John Geringer, and Patricia S. Campbell.¹ I can think of no greater honor than to have the opportunity to talk with all of you, my esteemed colleagues and members of SRME, and I thank you for being here on this occasion.

I am indebted, for all that they have taught me, to the many students whom I have been fortunate to work with—typical children and children with disabilities, undergraduate and graduate students—and to my colleagues and friends as well. A single teacher can have a profound effect on the lives of many individuals, and I count myself fortunate to be among those who began their careers as teachers and researchers under the tutelage of a master teacher and researcher. For that early guidance on a path to question, a path that has influenced my thinking forever, I am grateful to my teacher, mentor, and dear friend, Cliff Madsen.

The Issue: Trying to Teach Too Much with Too Little

I'd like to talk with you about concerns that have been with me for many years now. Perhaps as a result of my increasing age and definition as a "senior," I have come to feel with a growing sense of urgency that our profession, especially the revolutionaries among us, must act to remove the impediments that keep us from accomplishing all that we hope to accomplish with children. Rather than attribute my changing perspective merely to increasing age, I prefer to define it as a maturing of a research attitude—an attitude that I've learned to apply to problems

that have no immediately apparent solutions.

You here today are respected colleagues, friends, and interested people who share a deep concern about the welfare of children and their music education. My comments are about elementary music education, an area that may seem unglamorous to some. But I hope to engage you in this topic to the point that you will share my concerns. Better yet, I hope to engage you in such a way that you will work to bring about what I believe are much-needed changes.

As I see it, many, many elementary teachers are confronted with an insurmountable problem: that of trying to teach too much content in a limited amount of time to far too many children and with limited resources. I think many of you would agree with my assessment.

My thinking about this issue is a direct result of collecting and reviewing years of descriptive, experiential, and anecdotal data about music participation and achievement in our country and the realities of the elementary music teacher's school life. I want to clarify that my concern is not about the quality of elementary teachers, most of whom work very hard to bring meaningful music experiences to children. Nor am I concerned about the National Standards² or the myriad published curricula

la, any of which can serve as useful resources for teachers.

Most of you who know me know that I am a positive and optimistic person, although the concerns I express today may seem somewhat disheartening. But we need to look carefully and honestly at all types of data available to us, even those that are less than positive, including data that suggest that children may not be learning what we intend to teach them. My optimism leads me to believe that we have the capacity to improve the quality of school music experiences for children. I'd like to give you some personal background that may explain my optimism.

Changing Ineffective Practices with Data and Courage

Much of my career has involved children with disabilities in a variety of educational settings.³ When you make mistakes in teaching children with disabilities, the consequences of those mistakes are often immediately visible in the responses of the children. Mistakes in teaching that persist across many years of school are magnified exponentially in the behaviors of adults with disabilities. As a result of years of mistakes by us well-intended teachers of the 1960s and 1970s, many children with disabilities grew to adulthood having few choices in life, dependent for their well-being on the monetary policies of society and the goodness of caretakers.

I was a young teacher who followed the traditional approach, for lack of a better term, in special education and music education, as all teachers were taught to do. For children with disabilities, we tried to teach everything needed in life in a limited time frame. We did the best we knew at the time, and children encountered many positive experiences. But we came to learn, from years of descriptive assessments of adults who were “graduates” of institutional special education programs, that our approach was fundamentally flawed. Children with disabilities had not learned what we had intended to teach, and our failings were clearly visible in their adult behavior.

Within the field of special education, a small group of professionals, considered rebels at the time, made public their criticisms of traditionally accepted teaching approaches and services in special education. Acting on behalf of individuals with severe disabilities, a number of these people in higher education made substantive changes to their teacher-preparation programs, and advocates, parents, and professionals in state and federal agencies pressed for changes in educational and social policies.⁴ Positive data subsequently obtained from children and adults who had been taught by graduates of those iconoclastic university programs led to even broader changes in thinking across the field—changes in research and changes in teacher preparation. As a result, adult data collected over the past two decades demonstrate improvements in the quality of life of hundreds of thousands of individuals with disabilities, although much remains to be done, particularly in secondary education.

I'm telling you about this because I have witnessed the entire field of special education change dramatically in my lifetime, and, being the optimist that I am, I believe that similarly dramatic positive changes can happen in music education as well. (I know there are some rebels in this group.) Although some of the oldest among us may not see such a transformation in music education in our lifetimes, others will. Most important are the significant improvements that can happen in the future musical lives of children and adults.

One reason I'm pleased to talk to this group, the honor of the occasion notwithstanding, is that this meeting comprises the majority of data people in our organization. You are advocates for change based on data. You know the data that show that, in many ways, the art of music is flourishing in this country, but you also know that relatively few people are participating in the types of music activities for which they were prepared in school. You are also data people who hold influential positions in teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities. Some of you are directly responsible for the education of

children in music classrooms and rehearsals, and others of you are students who represent the future of music education practice and research.

In a moment, I will summarize a collection of data, some of which is probably familiar to you. I hope to make a strong enough argument from these data so that you will turn your attention and time to the area of elementary education—an area that most would agree can be the foundation for a musical life. I will not make separate comments about children with disabilities, since the issue I will talk about today affects all the children we teach in inclusive elementary classrooms—those with and without disabilities.

The goal of providing a high-quality elementary education for young children is a major theme of our citizenry (most noticeably among politicians during election years). There are positive relationships between success in the elementary years and success in secondary school and in life. Although we have no data to support the idea that there are similar positive relationships between high-quality music experiences in the early school years and successful music participation in secondary schools and throughout adult life, this seems a reasonable hypothesis.

Many of us have lived long enough to have experienced the flux of highs and lows in education across time, and we've lived long enough to actually remember where we were, both physically and intellectually, when the various movements in the histories of our society and music education occurred. Throughout my lifetime, music professionals have continued to express the concern that active music participation and the demonstration of music skills in children and adults are not what they should be.

Unfortunately, the persistence of this concern may have desensitized us to the issue. Less-than-positive outcomes are often attributed to factors outside the control of music education professionals: usually instructional time, money, and other resources. Teachers, however, still have control of some of the most powerful and influential variables influ-

encing educational outcomes—what we teach and how we teach.

I value, as you do, the privilege to exercise this freedom to control what happens in our classrooms and to encourage prospective teachers to do this as well. We have always had opportunities to make changes in music classes and in our teacher preparation programs, and there are some good reasons to think about further changes that I hope you will consider today. There are data, hard and soft, but data nonetheless, that support the institution of changes in elementary music programs and in the way we go about preparing elementary teachers.

My least favorite data come from several surveys and the National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP).⁵ These data indicate unhappy truths that we have known for some time: children in music classrooms often do not learn what we intended to teach them. There are, of course, reasonable cautions to be considered in interpreting these data, but the results cannot be ignored. The data I'm about to summarize, along with years of observations of classrooms and anecdotal evidence from teachers and students, have convinced me that the way we think about elementary music, music curricula, and instruction must change. At the end of this presentation, I hope that you data people will agree and will begin to challenge those traditional practices that simply are not working.

The Data: Population Growth and Teacher Shortages

I'd like to begin with some demographic data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). I'm reporting 2001–2002 school population data, which were used to make predictions for the year 2013. In 2001–2002, more than 90,000 schools provided instruction for 53 million students, most of them in grades K–8. Of the school-age population, approximately 13 percent were reported as having disabilities, and 8 percent were identified as non-native English speakers. In 2001–2002, 37 percent of school-age children—that's more than

17 million children—were eligible for free or reduced-price school meals.⁶

If the statistical predictions by NCES are accurate, by 2013—only 9 years from now—we can expect a 5 percent increase in the school-age population, an increase from 54 million in fall 2001 to 56.7 million students. With the growing population of children, we can expect teacher shortages for all areas, including music. By their fifth year of teaching, nearly one-third of all new

and orchestra). I suspect that the data may be skewed in a more positive direction as a result of the specialized programs, but with that in mind, some of the findings are still relevant to understanding the teaching conditions of elementary music teachers.

Ninety-four percent of the elementary schools reported having an elementary music program, 72 percent of which were taught by music specialists. Only 67 percent had dedicated rooms

Recorded classical music represents less than 3 percent of all shipments to music companies and retailers.

teachers will have left the workforce. It is estimated that nearly 11,000 music teachers will leave their positions each year due to retirement, burnout, or dissatisfaction with their jobs, yet only 5,000 to 6,000 bachelor degrees in music education are awarded annually.⁷

Many of us are aware that several states are attempting to alleviate these problems by issuing emergency certificates, developing alternative certification programs, and studying standards specific to licensure, certification, and evaluation—all of which raise questions about teacher quality. As a result of the growing school-age population and district budget cuts, many elementary music teachers are traveling among several schools, seeing more and more children less and less frequently.

Time and Resources

A study of arts education in public schools during the 1999–2000 school year was reported by NCES in June 2002, and elementary music is included in that report.⁸ Unfortunately, there is no breakout of elementary general music from other specialized types of elementary music instruction identified in the report (i.e., elementary chorus, band,

with special equipment for instruction. Among the 94 percent that offered music instruction, only 6 percent had music every day, and 73 percent had music only one to two times a week. Class periods for music instruction lasted, on average, 38 minutes, and, for a typical school year based on 40 weeks of instruction, children had an average of only 46 hours of music instruction.

Given the seriousness of challenges in education caused by population growth, teacher shortages, and dwindling budgets for children's educational and health programs, arguments to promote and improve the quality of music education and music teaching conditions can understandably seem less important to those outside our discipline. Of course, many of us would argue that the more troubled the times, the greater and more far-reaching the benefits of a musical life.

In the past, music educators, concerned members of communities, the MENC leadership, and music advocacy organizations have rallied, sometimes successfully, to preserve music opportunities for children. Fortified with the results of systematic research, the philosophies that seek to describe a

meaningful life, and an inherent belief in the goodness of music and the benefits of music learning for all humankind, the arguments are timeless.

Until these arguments are more successful in increasing instructional time and resources, training and hiring more skillful music teachers, and bringing additional weight to the merits of music instruction in school, elementary teachers will continue to face tremendous challenges in bringing high-quality, meaningful music experiences to children in their classrooms. But, remember, I am an optimist, and I believe that teachers and prospective teachers can, in fact, accomplish something meaningful in those precious, fleeting 46 hours of instructional time spread across 40 weeks.

Music Participation

Considering the limited quantity of instructional time in music, the data about music participation by adults and music achievement of eighth-grade students from the NAEP report should not be surprising. Many of you are familiar with most of these data, but I'd like to review the findings for background.

I will refer to data from annual reports from the music industry, reports from the National Endowment for the Arts, survey reports on attitudes toward music and attitudes toward music making from the Gallup Organization for the American Music Conference, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress *1997 Arts Report Card* for music. I brought together most of these data in preparation for my work as one of six commission authors for *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education*.⁹ An expanded report of these data and papers from other commission authors can be found in the published document from the symposium.^{10, 11}

We know that a large majority of adults have positive attitudes about music, music making, and music education, although more than half of those who once played instruments stopped playing before the age of 18, and another 25 percent, before the age of 35. A large majority of current and former players report that they began to study because of

parent encouragement or their own interest, and less than 15 percent because of encouragement from a teacher. Most of these adults, with or without ensemble experiences in schools, did not join community choirs, bands, or orchestras.

Although sales of electric guitars and electronic keyboards have grown, sales of band and orchestral instruments are not consistently increasing, a result that some attribute to the high numbers of rental returns and used instruments on the market. Recorded classical music represents less than 3 percent of all shipments to music companies and retailers. Adult attendance at live performances of classical music continues to decline, even though incomes rise and hair turns gray.

I find it fascinating that 90 percent of all adults continue to report highly positive attitudes about music and believe that music should be part of a well-rounded education; 70 percent believe that the state should mandate music education in schools; 88 percent believe that playing a musical instrument can be fun; and 96 percent believe that playing an instrument can provide lifelong enjoyment. Yet, perhaps paradoxically, 41 percent of adults believe that it isn't worthwhile to invest in an instrument unless a child has some degree of talent. This response came from approximately equal percentages of adults who play or were former players of instruments. What factors would lead to such a response?

Consider next the students who were the participants described in the NAEP Report for music. They are now in the adult world. You are familiar with the results of this report. Although I well recognize the limitations of the research, I cannot help but see the results as disappointing. Recall that the average scores were low for Responding (150 or below on a scale of 0–300) and extremely low for Creating (34 on a scale of 0–100) and Performing (34 on a scale of 0–100). Of the 18 percent who reported playing in a band, 3 percent in an orchestra, and 22 percent singing in a chorus, scores were also low, with ranges of 43 to 52 for Performing and 40 to 50 for Creating. Performance

averages for the 16 percent of the students who played instruments every day and the 13 percent who sang every day were higher than the average of 34, but were still low. The average performance score for students who played instruments daily was 53; for students who sang daily, the average performance score was 40.

Scores were low even for students attending schools with the attributes we frequently associate with good programs. For the 91 percent of the population who received music instruction, their scores on the assessment were unrelated to the frequency of music instruction or whether a full-time music specialist or a part-time specialist was teaching music. Students' scores were also unrelated to the presence or absence of required district or state arts curricula, and to visiting artists programs in the schools.

In addition to these data, we all have stories and personal observations of student performances that are charming but musically mediocre, teachers who are dedicated but exhausted, and adults who, by their self-reports, love music but confess to being terrible singers, never having played an instrument, and not being musically "talented." Even though a large majority of our students leave school with positive attitudes about music (perhaps as a result of participation in music classes), it seems that many have not internalized the values, knowledge, and skills taught in music classes, irrespective of the efforts of hard-working teachers.

Elementary music education is the common music experience for children in schools, and it is here that future generations may begin to experience the joy of music. Although more surveys and systematic assessments will undoubtedly be conducted in the future, I am of the opinion that we now have sufficient information to act—to change the way we think about elementary music education—before more and more children move through the system of school music and new generations of adults leave school without the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that we care so deeply about imparting. Of course,

changing our thinking about elementary music education will lead to changes in the ways we prepare undergraduates in professional education programs as well.

Rethinking the Notion of a “General Music Curriculum”

It is not uncommon for all of a child’s elementary school experiences to be provided by a single music teacher who sees 600–800 students every three days or less, and may travel between schools, valiantly trying to teach (1) singing; (2) playing instruments; (3) improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments; (4) composing and arranging; (5) reading and notating music; (6) listening to, analyzing, and describing music; (7) evaluating music and music performance; (8) understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts; and (9) understanding music in relation to history and culture. How does someone do all of that in 46 hours a year?

Our current practices in elementary education do not predict a new generation of musical adults who provide musical homes for their children and who support the art music community. There is simply not enough instructional time to accomplish all of the many tasks with which teachers are charged, especially when they are thought of as separate components, each of which needs “a lesson on it.”

Changes in elementary music can begin by rethinking the notion of a general music curriculum as it is traditionally practiced. Again, my concerns are not with the teachers, the National Standards, or with extant published curricular materials, but more with the interpretation that content areas (Content Standards, in the language of the *National Standards for Arts Education*) are separate.

One way to resolve the problem of an overcrowded curriculum in elementary music education is to give teachers better resources, more money, and more time. Teachers should have more time, but they don’t. Yet despite the reality of limited instructional time and resources, the elementary curriculum, over a period of decades, has become “supersized,”

with all of the consequences that come from having too much of a good thing.

This is not to ignore that there are exemplary programs that ascribe to what many refer to as the traditional general music curriculum. In many cases, these programs are deemed exemplary based on highly visible music performances by the children who participate. But I wonder how “general” these programs are? We should applaud successful programs, of course. But my concerns are more for the vast majority of schools where teachers are trying to distribute teaching time across a general music curriculum for hundreds of students whom they may see 20 to 40 minutes once a week.

School and teaching have always been governed by the clock. Many of you will recall the 1994 report from the National Education Commission on Time and Learning titled *Prisoners of Time*,¹² which considered the amount of instructional time necessary to teach the recently adopted National Standards in what was referred to as the core subjects, which did not include music at the time. The topic of attitudes and time was eloquently expressed by the following statement:

The simple truth, however, is that none of [the recommendations about time] will make much difference unless there is a transformation in attitudes about education. The transformation we seek requires a widespread conviction in our society that learning matters. Learning matters, not simply because it leads to better jobs or produces national wealth, but because it enriches the human spirit and advances social health.

And in another statement, “Both learners and teachers need more time—not to do more of the same, but to use all time in new, different, and better ways.”¹³

Learning matters. Music learning matters. We cannot continue to use precious instructional time to “do more of the same.” Change can begin by recognizing transfer of learning as an essential part of education and facing the reality that teaching for transfer requires almost all instructional time. From a substantial base of research in human learning, we know that the probability of transfer increases when valuable

instructional time is used to create frequent opportunities for students to (1) learn skills and knowledge deeply and thoroughly, (2) practice the same skills and tasks, (3) apply the same skills and knowledge in a variety of contexts and with numerous and varied examples, and (4) learn meaningful principles rather than isolated facts and skills. Teaching a general music curriculum, as we currently define it, in 46 hours or less per year, violates many of these principles.

Although the principles of human learning can be taught successfully to prospective teachers and practiced in the course of teacher preparation programs, the disparities between methods course experiences and the real-world pressures of a full-time position in a traditional general music program can send even the best young teachers reeling.

Trying to do it all often results in children’s demonstrating poor to mediocre performing skills and encountering bits of knowledge that are fleeting and ultimately meaningless. Competent teachers, while trying to meet the demands of a general curriculum within the strictures of limited time, can become disillusioned. They may lower their expectations, limit performances, avoid assessment of their students, and perhaps eventually burn out. Or worse, teachers may simply resort to frivolous activities as a way to fill class time.

The Proposal: Make Music

In an elementary curriculum where instructional time is dispersed across numerous, disconnected activities, there is no time for children’s music skills to be refined and no time for a deeper understanding of music. My goal here today is to place on the table the following proposal: that we make performance the core of the elementary curriculum and the core of elementary methods courses for music teachers. I don’t want to rehash the ideas of Elliot and Reimer. You have read their arguments.¹⁴ The point is that learning to perform with competence and confidence is central to a musical life. Expressive, technically accurate performance incorporates

skills and knowledge from many other standards.

Time and good instruction are required if we are to expect children to not only learn to perform, but perform beautifully and with confidence. Teachers must be prepared for this task. Undergraduate students in elementary music courses can be taught to go beyond simply introducing new music to sing or play—to *refining* the quality of children’s performance skills.

nities to make independent musical decisions and evaluations of their own performances as well as the live and recorded performances of others. Where they practice using the language of music to express preferences and describe and analyze music they perform. Where they have successful experiences leading to feelings of self-efficacy, and where children come to develop personal values and attitudes about the importance of music in their lives.

faculty in teacher preparation programs can have a profound influence on the quality of music education in the schools.

Teacher Preparation and Research

Ultimately, children’s learning in schools is at the core of professional activities in music research and teaching. Ironically, the performance (success) of children in classrooms and rehearsals is rarely used in music education research as a dependent measure of teacher effectiveness.¹⁷ The lack of research examining causal relationships between teaching and learning, in teaching practice and in teacher preparation, is a void in music education research. The advancements that we have made in research are notable, although (with apologies to those who have read this phrase far too often) “more research is warranted,” and as amended for this address, “more research examining causal relationships between teaching and learning in elementary classrooms is warranted.”

Rudy [Rudolf E.] Radoocy, in his senior researcher address, suggested that the problems of teachers “will not be served simply by producing more research, regardless of how elegant it may be,” and he went on to say that the basic problem lies with the lack of a research-oriented attitude on the part of teachers.¹⁸ He makes an important point. I would like to add further that assessment of student learning, even with young children, is part of that attitude. Application of research-based findings to teaching singing is part of that attitude. Knowledge and skillful application of principles of learning is part of that attitude.

Learning to think with a research-oriented attitude takes time and requires consistency in values across a college curriculum. Many of us have integrated components of research, for lack of a better phrase, into our courses. Although a research-oriented attitude is the goal for future teachers, if we teach students to make important discriminations, to assess their students, and to understand causal relationships between their teaching and their stu-

Learning to think with a research-oriented attitude takes time and requires consistency in values across a college curriculum.

For the vast majority of children who will not experience private lessons, their only opportunity to learn to sing or play instruments is in school. If children do not leave the elementary grades competent and confident in their music making, for many, their music education in school is essentially over.

The performance program I visualize for the elementary grades is vastly different from the narrow focus of some secondary programs, where all efforts are on public performances and contests; where students have few opportunities to gain a deep understanding of music and learn musical independence. I have in mind an elementary performance curriculum where children have frequent opportunities to learn a varied repertoire of music and have frequent opportunities to sing and play instruments expressively and with technical accuracy, alone and with classmates, in large and small ensembles, in informal settings with audiences composed of classmates, teachers, parents, and administrators. Where children develop skills of reading and interpreting music through singing and playing instruments. Where they become discriminating listeners and have frequent opportu-

These goals are attainable at all elementary grade levels if teachers make appropriate decisions about music literature, tasks, and contexts.

Some of these ideas are reminiscent of Bruner’s Spiral Curriculum,¹⁵ and to some extent the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program (MMCP) and comprehensive musicianship practices.¹⁶ I find a closer association with empirically derived research findings about teaching and learning—principles from decades of research examining environmental factors and cognitive factors that influence learning: perception and attention; memory and forgetting; concept learning; practice and study strategies; transfer and problem solving; motivation and affect; expectancies; attributions; and self-determination, self-efficacy, and competence.

The challenge for all of us in teacher preparation programs is to bring prospective teachers to the point where they internalize principles of teaching and learning and independently apply them in classrooms with children. Many factors contribute to the success of new teachers, of course, but it is we who perhaps can have the greatest influence on their success. The sobering truth is that

dents' learning, they are well on their way to developing a research-oriented attitude.

It's difficult to find time in a semester's course to do it all. Although our daily routines are dramatically different from music teachers' in schools, we do share the problem of having too little time and too much content. The consequences of our decisions in teacher preparation courses ultimately influence the musical lives of vast numbers of children every year, if prospective teachers teach as they were taught to do. Again, a very sobering reality.

Summary

Changes in elementary music programs must begin with those of us in teacher preparation programs. Considering the evidence that students may not learn what we intend to teach them, considering the overcrowded elementary curriculum that is taught to increasingly more students within less and less instructional time, I am proposing that we prepare teachers for elementary programs in which the focus is on children's competent performance of music.

Our own limited instructional time in music methods classes should be directed toward teaching prospective teachers the refinement of music performance skills. Not merely the demonstration and introduction of skills, but the refinement of skills. The goals of elementary music education must move beyond "exposing" (a word I believe should be expunged from all curricula) or simply "introducing students to . . ." Competence and confidence must be our goals. If we are successful, new teachers will (1) devote themselves to providing a high-quality music education for young children, one that is based on competent, confident performance; (2) successfully apply well-established principles of teaching and learning in the development of fluent skills in all children; (3) demonstrate attitudes and skills for self-evaluation based on the progress of their children's performances; (4) make informed decisions regarding children's repertoire and activities; and (5) embody the research attitude that we have longed for and

demonstrate this attitude in decision making.

It is difficult to change tradition, even when faced with compelling empirical data that support change. When enough individuals become dissatisfied with the way things are, a movement begins and change happens. I've suggested that a movement to improve the quality of elementary music education and the quality of teachers' lives can best begin with faculty in higher education who prepare new generations of elementary music teachers.

Researchers are wonderfully optimistic people in that they frequently tackle problems, examine data, and propose solutions. I hope that my concerns for the elementary education of all children are shared by many of you and that you find some merit in my proposal, or at least find merit in the conclusion that change is warranted. Monday will be here shortly, and a new teaching day begins.

Notes

1. Most acceptance addresses of former recipients of the Senior Researcher Award can be found in alternate years beginning in 1988 of the Fall issues of the *Journal of Research in Music Education*: Madsen (1988); Britton (1990, unpublished); LeBlanc (1992); Carlson (1994); Yarbrough (1996); Radocy (1998); Geringer (2000); Campbell (2002).

2. Music Educators National Conference (MENC), *The School Music Program: A New Vision* (Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference, 1994).

3. On a personal note, one of my earliest professional experiences with children and adults with disabilities was in a residential institutional setting where I worked as a music therapist. Increasingly more children with disabilities were included in regular schools and communities as a result of the deinstitutionalization movement and particularly with the mandate of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). My experiences in music education, music therapy, and teacher training provided an ideal opportunity to combine my professional goals for research and teaching. For information about the field of music therapy, contact the American Music Therapy Association (<http://www.musictherapy.org/>).

4. Many current curricular and instructional practices in special education can be traced to the early actions of professionals

and parents who questioned the quality of educational services for persons with severe disabilities. Until the 1970s, the human development model dominated curricular and instructional decisions in special education services. A significant challenge to the model was presented in a 1978 paper by Lou Brown, Mary Beth McLean, Susan Hamre Nietupski, Ian Pumpian, Nick Certo, and Lee Gruenewald titled "A Strategy for Developing Chronological Age Appropriate and Functional Curricular Content for Severely Handicapped Adolescents and Young Adults." The paper was first published by the authors in 1978 in a grant report, *Curricular Strategies for Developing Longitudinal Interactions Between Severely Handicapped Students and Others and Curricular Strategies for Teaching Severely Handicapped Students to Acquire and Perform Skills in Response to Naturally Occurring Cues and Correction Procedures*, vol. VIII, part 1. Madison, WI: MMSD. A revised version appeared in 1979 in the *Journal of Special Education*, 13 (1), and a 1996 version is available on the first author's Web site through the University of Wisconsin. Ideas from these authors and other "rebels" who challenged early educational practices are noted by Ed Sontag and Norris G. Haring in "The Professionalization of Teaching and Learning for Children with Severe Disabilities: The Creation of TASH," *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps* 21 (1): 1996.

For an interesting and contemporary overview of basic concepts, supportive research, and strategies that have been used to facilitate inclusion and improve the quality of life of individuals with mild and severe disabilities, refer to Diane L. Ryndak and Douglas Fisher (Eds.), *The Foundations of Inclusive Education: A Compendium of Articles on Effective Strategies to Achieve Inclusion*, 2nd ed., 2003, available from TASH (<http://tash.org/>).

5. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *The NAEP 1997 Arts Report Card* (NCES 1999-86) by Hilary R. Persky, Brent A. Sadene, and Janice M. Askew, Washington, DC: 1998; also available online at <http://www.nces.ed.gov/>.

6. For detailed statistical reports, refer to the following publications from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Overview of Public and Secondary Schools and Districts: School Year 2001-02* (NCES 2002-411, by Lee McGraw Hoffman, Washington, DC: 2002); and *Projections of Education Statistics to 2013* (NCES 2004-013, by Debra E. Gerald and William J. Hussar, Washington, DC: 2003), also available online at <http://www.nces.ed.gov/>.

7. Teacher shortage data, prepared by the MENC Information Resources Depart-

ment, were presented byCarolynn A. Lindeman, past president of MENC, in a speech, "How Can Higher Education Address the K–12 Music Teacher Shortage?" at the 78th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music in New Orleans, November 2002. The speech is published in *Proceedings: The 78th Annual Meeting, 2002* (no. 91, July 2003): 30–33.

8. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1999–2000* (NCES 2002–131, by Nancy Carey, Brian Kleiner, Rebecca Porch, and Elizabeth Farris; Project Officer, Shelley Burns, Washington, DC: 2002), also available online at <http://www.nces.ed.gov/>.

9. Judith A. Jellison, "How Can All People Continue to Be Involved in Meaningful Music Participation," in Clifford K. Madsen (ed.), *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education* (111–37). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference, 2000.

10. Clifford K. Madsen, ed., *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education* (Reston, VA: MENC: National Association for Music Education, 2000).

11. The Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education, which took place in September 1999 at the Florida State University in Tallahassee, was the vision of June Hinkley, then president of MENC. *Vision 2020*, as it was called, was created and developed in the spirit of the Tanglewood Symposium of 1967 and named to honor Wiley Housewright for his leadership as president of MENC during the implementation of the findings of Tanglewood. The published document begins with Michael Mark's description of Tanglewood and the historical context for *Vision 2020*. His article is followed by papers from six commission authors (Terry Gates, Judith Jellison, Paul Lehman, Bennett

Reimer, Carlesta Spearman, Cornelia Yarbrough) who were asked to respond to questions that would give direction to music education in the next millennium. Responses to authors' papers by professionals in education, music administration, music performance, and music industry are included in the document. The final product was the result of the collective wisdom of small groups of members working with authors, commission members, and more than 150 participants representing music education at all levels and with representation from industry and the community. In keeping with the tradition of Tanglewood, the symposium ended with a summation of agreements concerning the future of music education.

12. National Education Commission on Time and Learning, *Prisoners of Time* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994). Public Law 102–62 (The Education Council Act of 1991) established the National Education Commission on Time and Learning as an independent advisory body and called for a comprehensive review of the relationship between time and learning in the nation's schools. Many of the concerns regarding instructional time and learning expressed in the commission's 1994 report persist in contemporary educational settings.

13. Archived Information, *Prisoners of Time*, April 1994, available online at <http://ed.gov/pubs/PrisonersOfTime/Prisoners>. No page numbers available. Refer to section "The Imperative for an American Transformation."

14. I am aware of the danger in attempting to summarize what have been defined as two conflicting philosophies of music education and refer you to extensive descriptions of each in major books by the proponents. One of the historically influential philosophies, "aesthetic education," has been articulated for the field of music education by Bennett Reimer (*A Philosophy of Music Education*, 2nd ed., Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989). David J. Elliot proffers

a new philosophy based on music as human activity (*Music Matters*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

15. Jerome Bruner, in his book *On Knowing: Essays for the Left Hand*, put forward the idea of "a spiral curriculum in which ideas are first presented in a form and language, honest though imprecise, which can be grasped by the child, ideas that can be revisited later with greater precision and power until, finally, the student has achieved the reward of mastery" (New York: Atheneum, 1976 [originally 1962]): 107–8.

16. The MMCP and comprehensive musicianship practices were innovative programs that had their beginnings in 1965. One phase of MMCP included a "spiral" curriculum with emphasis on expressive music making and creativity throughout the curriculum. The idea of comprehensive musicianship was based on recommendations from collaborations among teachers and composers as participants in the Contemporary Music Project during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Consult Ronald B. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report* (New York: Manhattanville College. ERIC, ED 045865AA000653, 1970) and William Thomson, *Comprehensive Musicianship through Classroom Music* (Belmont, CA: Addison-Wesley, 1974).

17. Robert A. Duke, "Measures of Instructional Effectiveness in Music Research," *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, no. 143, 1–48.

18. Rudolf E. Radocy, Senior Researcher Acceptance Address. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46, 346.

Judith Anne Jellison is the Mary D. Bold Regents Professor of Music and Human Learning, University Distinguished Teaching Professor, and division head of Music and Human Learning, School of Music, at the University of Texas at Austin.

Copyright of Arts Education Policy Review is the property of Heldref Publications and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.