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ABSTRACT

This study concerns the ideas and practices of general music teachers regarding multiculturalism in elementary music education, specifically, general music educators in the public schools of Champaign County, Illinois. Data was collected by mailed, open-ended questionnaires completed by the general music teachers from 11 of the existing 37 schools. Responses were analyzed by frequency and according to a theoretical framework of multicultural education rendered by James Banks (1997). Major findings included that teachers were very positive about the concept of multicultural education, but that they failed to recognize multicultural education to its fullest extent conceptually or in or practice. Teachers thought of and practiced multicultural education mainly in terms of content integration and somewhat in terms of reducing prejudices and providing an empowering school and social structure, neglected the aspect of an equitable pedagogy, and failed to realize the import of reflecting on the knowledge construction process in music education. This incomplete realization may be due to the practical constraints of teaching, such as administrative concerns or lack of resources, or a school setting that is seemingly culturally homogenous, but is most probably due to music educators’ failure to realize the necessity for understanding musics as cultural phenomena and not as a universal constant. Overall, findings indicated that teachers lacked the necessary preparation in terms of pre-service and in-service training and education to approach multicultural education in a comprehensive manner.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The diversity of the population of the United States is simultaneously the society’s greatest strength and its greatest weakness. The country’s unique composition presents the richness of an abundance of cultural groups, as well as the contention deriving from these distinct groups of people living in an overarching community. The conflicting interests of specific groups become more problematic when combined with the claims of a larger and more dominant group. In the United States, this quagmire is especially apparent in the society’s public educational system. The system claims to offer an equal educational opportunity for every student, but growing criticism argues that the equal access to education given to all students is not necessarily an equivalent education for every student (Grant, 1997, p. 185). Due to this criticism and in an attempt to rectify the situation, a trend has emerged within the past 20 years or so in the public schools of America—the development of multicultural education (Noll, 1997, p. 86).

Multicultural education is a way to think about and approach education that offers students and educators a solution to the inequities seen so frequently in public schools, inequities like student representation in courses, access to educational resources, and learning about course content from different viewpoints. Multicultural education seems especially fertile for development in areas such as music, dance, drama, visual art, literature, and similar fields. The reason for this is the fact that cultural products, such as works of music or literature, can easily be integrated into the course content. The

1 Definitions and a detailed discussion of multicultural education are in Chapter 2.
problem with this simplified integration is the lack of cultural understandings associated with these products. In addition, focusing solely on curriculum content issues has an "other-izing" effect. In other words, multicultural education becomes studying a collection of "other" cultures. This sort of focus, although helpful in some ways to broaden students' perspectives, is a narrow view of what multicultural education encompasses. It lacks thoughtful reflection on the equity of students' education within the classroom, the classroom and school as cultures that can empower or dis-empower students, the reduction of prejudices within the classroom and school, and the knowledge itself that is being transmitted in a subject area. This type of multicultural education also centers on ethnicity, race, and national heritage as the primary distinguishing components of culture, thus neglecting issues such as gender, special needs, religion, sexual orientation, and other such issues that help to create a cultural viewpoint. Likewise, multicultural approaches often focus on increasing the students' understandings and perspectives, without including teachers in this equation.

The underlying reason for these problematic issues, however, is that having an ideal approach to education neglects the practical, mundane aspects of teaching. For instance, are teachers prepared to undertake the task? Do they have adequate resources? Do they have the time to overhaul their current methods, and are they even motivated to do so? The current study is an attempt to discover what is happening in multicultural education from this pragmatic standpoint and, hopefully, find ways of making the ideals of multicultural education congruent with the practical aspects that teachers face.
Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the beliefs and practices of in-service educators regarding multicultural education, specifically, what elementary general music teachers believe and practice. A need for multicultural education exists, but a consistent definition of multicultural education does not, and whether practicing educators hold the same views as educational theorists and researchers regarding the need for multicultural education is a question. Also, if multicultural education is being implemented in schools, how is it seen in terms of teaching practices, and are teachers adequately prepared to meet the challenges of creating a multicultural classroom? These questions led the researcher to survey currently practicing elementary general music teachers regarding: 1) their beliefs about the purposes and goals of multicultural education; 2) their feelings towards the concept of multicultural education; 3) the teaching practices they use in an attempt to establish a multicultural learning environment; and 4) whether or not their backgrounds have adequately prepared them to do so. (See Appendix A.)

Research Questions and Hypotheses

In order to discover teachers’ definitions of multicultural education and their ideas regarding the necessity for it, teachers were asked to provide information on a number of different related items. First, they were asked to estimate the “ethnic/racial diversity” of their students and were allowed to designate ethnic/racial diversity however they wished (e.g., White, Anglo-American, American Indian, Native American). (See Appendix A, Question 7.) They were also asked to estimate the number of male and female music students and the number of students in their classrooms with disabilities (i.e., special
needs). (See Appendix A: Questions 8 and 9.) It was hypothesized that teachers would automatically assume that multicultural education focused on awareness of ethnicities, but not necessarily on other cultural factors\(^2\), such as gender and special needs. Information on the teachers themselves was also requested, including teacher age and gender, length of time as a music educator, and current class load. (See Appendix A: Questions 2, 3, 4, and 6.) The survey asked questions that would force teachers to reflect on themselves, while not being overt enough to give them clues about the researcher's definition. Asking teachers about their own ethnic identity may have influenced their responses. It was conjectured that teachers would not include themselves in defining multicultural education, but would assume it to be mainly for the benefit of students.

These demographic questions led to more specific questions about the definition of and ideas about multicultural education, such as “For whom is multicultural education,” “What is the purpose(s) of multicultural education,” “Does multicultural education apply to every academic area,” and “If not, to which subjects does it apply?” (See Appendix A: Questions 11, 12, and 13.) The hypothesis was that, again, teachers would focus on students as being the beneficiaries of multicultural education, while leaving out themselves. Also, in terms of its purposes, the researcher guessed that the teachers would mainly discuss the facets of an awareness of other cultures (“other” being the key word) in terms of integrating new content into the curriculum and a reduction of students’ prejudices. The researcher was fairly certain that teachers would not think about the construction of their own knowledge or the accepted knowledge base of their

---

\(^2\) Additional cultural factors, such as age, religion, language, socio-economic status, etc., were not forgotten, but gender and special needs seemed especially salient in the classroom and were, thus, included in the survey.
field. In other words, they would not think about why they held their own beliefs about music and music education or how this knowledge came to be accepted in the field of American music education in the first place. (For example, why are white, European male composers from the classical period often revered, but not African-American female composers from the twentieth century?) Finally, in terms of defining multicultural education, the question of which subjects to include under this rubric were estimated to apply more to arts-related subjects or subjects that could be obviously distinguished by cultural influence (e.g., literature, rather than math).

In order to investigate whether or not teachers felt that a need for multicultural education existed, a simple attitudinal question was asked, “Do you have positive or negative feelings regarding multicultural education?” (See Appendix A: Question 10.) Although need does not necessarily follow attitude, it would seem to at least give an indication as to whether multicultural approaches would be used given the opportunity. It was hypothesized that teachers would be overwhelmingly positive in their responses mainly because the idea of multicultural education (whatever that may be) seems positive in facilitating learning for all students. In addition, increasing exposure has been given to the notion, giving way to pressure to accept multicultural education from administration, colleagues, and parents of students.

In an attempt to ascertain current teaching methods being used, teachers were asked whether or not they used multicultural methods in their classes and if so, what sorts of techniques they used. (See Appendix A: Question 14.) It was estimated that in music classes, teachers would use an “add-on, other-ized” approach, meaning that they would “add on” music of “other” cultures to the existing curriculum. The main reason for this
hypothesis rests in the current advocacy from American music education to focus on universal concepts in music (i.e., melody, harmony, rhythm, timbre, and form). Teaching all musics through these concepts is supported so that students and teachers see that music is a common, global phenomenon linking all humans together. (Apparently, this notion is an attempt to reduce prejudices in teachers and students.) This topic will be further discussed in the study, but it should be mentioned that filtering all musical cultures through the current conceptual lens of American music education obviously does not lead to cultural understanding.

Finally, teachers were asked what sorts of training or education they had that they felt would help them to use multiculturalism in the classroom. (See Appendix A: Question 15.) The researcher’s personal experience with music education pre-service education/training has revealed that very little, if any, required training is given that would help to prepare teachers to create a multicultural environment for their students. In addition, teachers have little extra time after becoming employed that would allow them to pursue education and/or training in this area, if they so desired. It was estimated that teachers would be forced to rely upon occasional professional training (e.g., seminars, conferences) and personal experiences to enable them in this area.

After evaluation, these research questions neglected information that could have been helpful, which will be discussed in Chapter Five. However, the responses did yield very important results, which will hopefully make a positive contribution to the body of research on multicultural music education. These research questions, hypotheses, and the actual results will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four.
Definition of Terms

There are no specific technical terms that need to be defined especially for this study. However, if there are terms that are ambiguous in meaning or need clarification, they will be addressed within the body of the paper.
A Look into the Universality of Musical Elements

In order to understand the “other-izing” way of looking at multicultural music education, it is important to discuss how and why this particular focus originated. As stated previously, one commonalty that many contemporary music educators share when trying to teach in a multicultural way is that of teaching through a common elements approach. However, this method does not promote cultural understanding, but attempts to unify musics into a mono-cultural “frame” (Agar, 1994, p. 130). How and why does this happen? One main problem confounding this approach is its very name, “common elements,” suggesting a universality of features across all musics. Consider the following. Velocity is equal to a particular distance traveled divided by the time required to reach the destination. The earth is 7,920 miles in diameter. In nearly all cases, pressure should be applied to a wound to slow bleeding. Joining two or more chemical elements, which cannot be separated from the combination by physical means, creates a chemical compound. These are all examples of fundamental concepts to particular areas of investigation, in these cases, physics, astronomy, medicine, and chemistry. But, what makes these concepts “fundamental”? Why are these ideas basic to their topics of

---

3 Although this section is not specifically related research into multicultural music education, I feel that it is important for understanding how multicultural education is currently being approached and problems related to that approach.
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inquiry, and why are they universally\(^4\) accepted? What, for instance, separates these notions from musical theory or conceptions of visual art?

I would argue that what distinguishes the former assertions from the latter is the element of human culture. The beginning statements exist regardless of how an individual wishes to express them, where in the world an individual is located, the level of technology an area possesses, what language is spoken, what religious beliefs are held, whether an individual is a male or female, and so on. The point is that no component related to human culture will change these facts. (Of course, throughout history and currently, some humans have not and do not accept certain ideas as *truth*, as they sometimes contradict religious or philosophical beliefs. However, as theories are proven through scientific methods, they are absorbed into the body of facts residing outside human culture.) Thus, the “scientific” remarks differ from musical or visual art concepts in that the latter are bound within and cannot exist outside human culture. For example, the reverence towards Bach, Beethoven, and Mozart is not independent of the individuals who esteem them. Similarly, the notions of *ragas, kushaura* and *kutsinhira*, and “acceptable” chord progressions are not acknowledged by all humans around the world.

With this introductory argument in mind, I wish to focus on the topic of music and its “basic” elements and how educators in the United States and other locales of Western European influence base music education on, or at least incorporate into their teaching the use of, musical elements. It is true that cultures around the world, regardless of musical practice, include some sort of fundamental teachings and models in order to educate neophytes. The main point of contention with these practices within the United

\(^4\) By universal or universally, I mean generally accepted around the globe and thought of in similar ways or terms.
States and other areas adopting this educational philosophy lies in their incompatibility with notions of multicultural education.

**Defining music.** To begin, an overview of ideas regarding the nature of music is germane to this discussion. In other words, what constitutes music, and is music a universal construct? To define music is certainly no easy task. This is poignantly illustrated by the lack of definitions for "music" or "musician" in Randel's *Harvard Concise Dictionary of Music* (1978) and Baker's *Pocket Manual of Musical Terms* (1978). However, any music student schooled in the United States can probably recite the explanation given in most classrooms: music is organized sound moving through time. Although this meaning may seem somewhat vague, it is actually more specific than Ferris's definition, "Music is an art of organized sounds," given in the music appreciation college text, *Music: The Art of Listening* (1991, p. 5). (In this case, a further argument regarding the nature of art could ensue!) Music has been designated as "[t]he art of organizing sound as to elicit an aesthetic response in a listener," ("aesthetic" being another term that confuses a clear definition of music), and as "[v]ocal or instrumental sounds having some degree of rhythm, melody, or harmony" (*The American Heritage Dictionary*, 1983, p. 451). This brief summary of explanations may seem remedial to some readers, but it is important in order to portray the lack of a definitive general notion of music and to illustrate culture-specific definitions of music taken as universal definitions of music.

**Universal versus culture-specific definitions of music.** To explain the differences between universal and culture-specific definitions of music, it is necessary to look to those focused on music and culture—ethnomusicologists (or anthropologists of music, as
many prefer to be called). Ethnomusicologists and anthropologists have long been reflecting on the possibility of universals while also examining differences in cultures. As Bruno Nettl explains, “[E]ven the teacher of music appreciation in North America as late as the 1930s and 1940s was quite prone to consider music as a ‘universal language’” because music was thought to be something that superceded conventional language barriers and could be easily understood by any person, regardless of culture (1983, p. 36). However, “[a]nthropologists and comparative musicologists, when they became established early in the twentieth century, saw it as their job to cry out against this unified view of culture” (Nettl, 1983, p. 36). As Nettl further discusses, finally gone were the books entitled, “‘The History of Music,’” and courses called, “‘Introduction to the Art of Music’” (1983, p. 36).

The reason for the backlash to the universality of music lay in the realization of what was necessary to establish something as a universal. Substantiating universals in music is problematic because in addition to providing some sort of definition or conception of music as a whole, it is also necessary to furnish empirical evidence from musics around the world that support the definition. As Nettl details:

They [seekers of universals] must find those features that (1) fit the definition of music, (2) are found everywhere (a term yet to be defined), and (3) exclude what could conceivably be regarded as music but is not actually done in the cultures of the world. In other words, the task is to state the outer limits of music, and then to ascertain what within these limits has been selected by humans for musical expression. (1983, p. 38)
Helen Myers corroborates what Nettl says regarding the controversy over universals in the field of ethnomusicology and suggests that conflicts continue between those looking for a way to examine all cultures through a universal system of analysis and those trying to use a framework specific to a culture being studied (1992, p. 15). For example, like many in his field, Alan Merriam discusses the approaches to studying music in comparative and/or collective fashions. Merriam also confirms that all musical systems around the world seem to be built upon some sort of musical concepts which circumscribe music in that culture and make it significant as a phenomenon of life (1964, p. 63). But, Merriam argues, “Our [Researchers’] interests here are not directed toward the distinction people may make between major and minor thirds, for example, but rather toward what the nature of music is, how it fits into society as a part of the existing phenomena of life, and how it is arranged conceptually by the people who use and organize it” [italics added] (1964, p. 63).

From these arguments concerning universal and culture-specific definitions of music, it seems that at best, an overarching explanation of music as a concept would not explain a substantial portion of musical practices in various cultures. At worst, it would completely misrepresent and misconstrue entire musical systems throughout the world. Indeed, many cultures in the world do not even have a term for what is commonly referred to as “music.” Unfortunately, universal descriptions of music are rampant, and in the United States and other areas of Western European influence, explanations are given based upon an ethnocentric view of music being constructed of organized sound moving through time which is categorized according to its musical elements.
Support for common elements. So, what are musical elements? Some readers will probably need no explanation. But to clarify exactly what is being discussed in this study, I will be referring specifically to rhythm, melody, harmony, timbre, and form. These components are often assumed to be the least common denominators of music, and since they are designated as the common elements of music, it can be understood that proponents of these elements have an overarching definition of music.

For example, music education philosopher, Bennet Reimer, defines art (and music as an art) through its common use: “The major function of art is to make objective and therefore accessible the subjective realm of human responsiveness” (1989, p. 53). Thus, when talking about worthy teaching practices, Reimer explains that the elements of music should be taught because they “are objective; they are identifiable, nameable, capable of being manipulated, created, discussed, isolated, reinserted into context” (1989, p. 54). Again, when discussing music in the broader context of all art, Reimer argues that one can only gain insight “not by going outside of art to non-artistic references but by going deeper into the intrinsic qualities the art work contains” (1989, p. 52). His idea of studying the “intrinsic qualities” of a musical work is by looking to its musical elements.

---

5 For a more in-depth look at musical elements, readers may refer to most general music theory books. See also Ferris (1991) and Atterbury & Richardson (1995).
6 Dynamics is sometimes cited as another common element, but most books I have referred to list dynamics as a subcategory of the listed elements. Additionally, tone color and texture are occasionally substituted for timbre.
7 From now on, when using the term, “music,” I mean the vague term commonly applied to all musics around the world. “Musics” will be used to refer to distinct musical systems, styles, genres, or otherwise culture-specific musical practices.
8 Again, the term “art,” like “music,” is a term often used, but seldom clearly and acceptably defined. For the purpose of brevity, I will not give an analysis of the term, but will use “art” as the nebulous category as it is ordinarily used (which includes many “arts,” such as music, dance, visual art, drama, etc.), unless otherwise stated.
9 The notion of a “work of art” as an isolated entity is problematic in and of itself. For example, the Shona people of Zimbabwe do not recognize music as existing, except when it is being created. Thus, written compositions or sound recordings are not music, nor are they musical works. “Works of art” and “Music-as-object” will be discussed again later.
The text on the page is not legible due to the quality of the image.
Therefore, according to Reimer, any music could be examined through dissecting its musical works according to the works' musical elements. Furthermore, he posits that music education should encompass music of the past and present and music from a wide variety of genres and styles in order to "widen people's understanding of the possibilities of human responsiveness" (Reimer, 1989, pp. 53-54). But again, Reimer suggests that the only objective and collective way in which to teach music from different historic periods and from around the world is through a common elements approach. To reiterate, educators need to present a cohesive and general view of music balanced upon a diverse menu of human expression, consequently, as Reimer recommends, they need to utilize the structure of music's common elements.

Are common elements an ethnocentric imposition? Although Reimer has supporters and is joined by common-elements advocates, many individuals have abandoned the idea of universals in music, and thus, with the idea of these five common elements in music. Wayne Bowman asserts that universals, or essential qualities, of music are constructions that enable humans to order the musical world. Universals (or intrinsic qualities or common elements) help humans to define music and non-music, distinguish good music from bad music, and decide between music that is worth teaching and music that is not (Bowman, 1998b, p. 2). Certainly, it is easier to classify music into particular categories based upon certain qualities the music may or may not possess than to attempt to view all musics in relation to the contexts from which they come, but is an objective classification possible? Bowman eloquently contends:

Musical meaning cannot be culturally transcendent because music is culture.

Thus, the ideals and qualities we have been encouraged to regard as universal are
culture-specific. There is no essence of music separate from the way our words and actions situate it; no music that is meaningful without regard to context; no music that is independent of the contingencies of the sociopolitical world of human interaction. Indeed, there is no objective point outside of culture and acculturation from which we might scrutinize the whole of “music” in order to verify pronouncements about its “essential” nature and value. (1998b, pp. 3-4)

Hence, if the five common elements were used to classify music from any point in time or place, would a thorough and accurate picture of that music be portrayed?

To illustrate, Dr. Tom Turino of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has explained that the mbira music of the Shona people of Zimbabwe is not conceptualized in terms of rhythm, melody, harmony, timbre, and form, although these concepts could certainly be placed upon the music. In other words, the musical sounds that exist could be interpreted within these frameworks, however, it may not be representative of how the Shona conceptualize the music. For instance, the components integral to making the music, such as the cooperation of the creation (e.g., do the mbira work together in the sound production) and the energy levels reached collectively by the participants while producing music are important in this musical culture. To reiterate, Shona mbira music could be analyzed in terms of its melodic or rhythmic content, but if the Shona themselves do not focus on these particular elements as being most important, the best view of the music one could gather would be misinterpreted and diluted. It would be inaccurate to say that the Shona do not find rhythmic or melodic qualities of the music important, but these qualities are not abstracted to form “musical concepts.” For instance, if a novice mbira player was playing a rhythm incorrectly, the expert mbira
player may say, “No, do it like this,” but the focus on rhythm would be in its practice, not in its abstraction. The focus for the Shona is on an integrated whole, rather than component parts (Tom Turino, personal communication, April 19, 1999).

In addition, even the definition of music to the Shona goes beyond mere sonic representations, so that any factors comprising the creation and performance of the music (e.g., the dance) are as essential as the sounds coming from playing the mbira. Moreover, as footnoted previously, because of the different foci of musical conceptual importance, it is interesting to note that a recording of mbira songs is not considered to be music by some Shona (Tom Turino, personal communication, 1998); music does not exist, except when it is being collectively created. As Berliner explains, “The problem of describing Shona mbira music and illustrating the music with notation is a considerable one, for there is something unique about the quality and the effect of a live performance of mbira music that defies description” (1981, p. 52). This is in part due to the fact that an mbira piece is not a “fixed musical structure with a specified beginning and end,” rather it is a framework of cycles and patterns that are manipulated by the participants (Berliner, 1981, pp. 52-53), referring again to the importance of practice over abstraction in this musical culture.

**Works of music or music-as-object.** The idea that music can be classified according to its elements naturally leads to a discussion of musical works. In order to examine music in terms of its melody, harmony, etc., there need to be parameters for that which is to be analyzed. Thus, studying musical works\(^{10}\) seems a logical place to begin such an analysis. As Reimer holds in his Absolute Expressionist view, a work of art

---

\(^{10}\) By works of music, or music-as-object, I am referring to tangible, isolated, pieces of music, such as a written composition, an audio recording, or a particular performance.
exists within the larger sphere of artistic/cultural influences, but the work of art can be examined as an isolated entity of collective musical elements, since these elements are common to all musics (1989, p. 28).

In contrast, David Elliott argues that a focus on musical works, or products, marginalizes the appreciation for the creation, or process, aspect of music, as is illustrated in the section on Shona mbira music, and concentrates on individual perceptions and contemplation (1995, p. 30). Elliott characterizes the type of analysis of music that Reimer favors as aesthetic\textsuperscript{11} listening, or immaculate perception (1995, p. 33). This idea implies that in order to reach an aesthetic experience, all music should be listened to in the same way (in terms of music’s common elements). Elliott further argues that an aesthetic concept of music is an ethnocentric way in which to homogenize diverse musical endeavors by “(1) imputing a single purpose to all of them, (2) imposing a single mode of response on all their listeners, and (3) attributing a single motivation to all music makers and music listeners everywhere” (Elliott, 1995, p. 33).

Musical meanings. More aligned with Elliott than with Reimer, feminist music educator, Lucy Green suggests that meaning can come from music in two ways: inherent meanings and delineated meanings. Inherent meanings consist of the organization and relationships of the sounds of the music (Green, 1997, p. 6). Delineated meanings are the contextualizing factors through which inherent meanings are strained (Green, 1997, p. 7). Hence, the perception of pure inherent meanings is actually impossible. She contends that “the gendered delineation of music does in fact not stop at delineation: it continues from

\textsuperscript{11} I will not delve deeply into a discussion of aesthetics, as that is another work entirely, but readers can assume for purposes of this study that to have an aesthetic experience is to have an experience that goes beyond mere human emotions, is indescribable, is unique to art (whatever that may be), and is above the mundane human aspects of life.
its delineated position to become part of the discourse on music, and from that position to affect listeners' responses to and perceptions of inherent meaning, and thus our very musical experiences themselves" (Green, 1997, p. 16). Although Green focuses on gender in relation to musical meaning, her explanation is applicable to culture in a more general sense. Clearly, the idea of music being constructed of objective common elements is not possible if these inherent relationships cannot be disentangled from the delineated social associations that helped to form them. As Green warns, delineations seem as though they are immediate and autonomous truths exactly because they have the ability to appear as though they are inherent to the musical processes (1997, p. 131). Furthermore, it may seem easier to attempt to isolate musical elements across musical cultures, but as Israel Sheffler states, “The philosophical mind...eschews ‘untrammeled coherence’ and ‘blind certainty.’ ‘Doctrine’...is ‘the death of theory,’ and ‘the quest for certainty is the quest for an end to inquiry’” (cited in Bowman, 1998a, p. 15).

How Do the Common Elements Impact Multicultural Music Education?

An example of the music profession’s view. This overview of definitions of music, components of music, and musical practices and meanings provides a basis for looking at music education from a multicultural perspective. Volk’s (1997b) investigation into the history of multicultural perspectives in the Music Educators Journal (MEJ) demonstrates an increase in the music profession’s awareness of the topic, availability of multicultural resources, and gradual acceptance of musical cultures outside the traditional canon. However, an overlooked thread of reform has gone unchecked
through MEJ’s coverage—the unquestioned value of teaching through a common elements approach, exactly what has been discussed thus far.

For example, James O’Brien is an advocate of using Western and non-Western musics in music appreciation classes, but also argues that the only cohesive way in which to teach all music is through musical elements (1980). In O’Brien’s article from MEJ, “Integrating World Music in the Music ‘Appreciation’ Course,” he explains, “We can incorporate non-Western music into the appreciation class by presenting the elements with which we perceive all [italics added] world musics—rhythm, harmony, melody, timbre, intensity, and form” (1980, p. 41). Likewise, Sue Gamble argues that “[m]usical elements such as pitch, rhythm, form, dynamics, and timbre can be found in all [italics added] major musical cultures. When musics are studied through the common elements approach, their diversities become an advantage rather than a problem, because these diversities provide insights into unique ways in which human beings express themselves” (1983, p. 40). William Anderson’s, “Toward a Multicultural Future,” reviewed some presentations given in MENC’s multicultural music education symposium in 1990, and in this discussion, he included sample lesson plans from various presenters, such as Han Kuo-Huang who presented a lesson based on a traditional Chinese song (1991). This example is a very clear way of how to include a non-Western music into a Western music classroom through the elements of melody, rhythm, and form (Anderson, 1991, p. 31).

As Doug Goodkin sums, “Though it is important to identify pieces from specific cultures and present them in the context specified in the culture study and celebration units [Orff-Schulwerk pedagogy], it is equally important for students to see these pieces as just another way of structuring sound” (1994, p. 42). In other words, “here’s how this
specific community approaches this specific concept” (Goodkin, 1994, p. 42). Apparently, cultural understanding is not of primary importance.

Curriculum frameworks for multicultural music education. Due to a lack of cultural and musical understandings, Elliott argues that there exist several curriculum models of multicultural music education that do not meet the goals of a multicultural perspective (1989). Elliott based the following curriculum models on Richard Prate’s conceptual maps of multiculturalism from his book, **Pluralism in Education** (1979). The first model is called the assimilationist music curriculum. This curriculum is focused on Western European classical music and sees the music of any other cultural group as inferior. The next model, the amalgamationist curriculum, is also centered on the traditional Western European canon, but does include a limited span of musics from other cultures. However, these “other” musics are recognized for their contribution to the evolution of the currently recognized “majority” tradition or as they may be used to further expand the existing canon. The open society curriculum is one that argues for a “new secular, corporate, nation-state” (Elliott, 1989, p. 16). This view denies the ties to any cultural heritages and focuses on the study of contemporary musical styles and new musical forms. These three curriculum models share the goal of eliminating cultural diversity in order to reach the destination of a unified majority culture. They stand in contrast to the next three curriculum frameworks that attempt to preserve cultural diversity.

As Elliott explains, the next three models incrementally evolve towards multicultural music education as it should be. Insular multiculturalism is the music curriculum founded upon the musics of one or two minority groups. These minority
groups come from groups within the community of a majority culture. Although this curriculum acknowledges the presence of different cultures, it expresses the musics of these cultures as alternatives to the dominant musical culture. The next curriculum, modified multiculturalism, accepts musics from around the world. They are accepted as being equally valuable, and attempts are made at the "authentic" representation of musics. The main problem with this model is that all musics are taught through musical concepts. Thus, the conceptual framework for teaching and learning all musics is still mono-cultural. It is based upon a common elements approach, which in turn, stems from a music education as aesthetic education (MEAE) viewpoint. Elliott says that the only way to reach true multicultural music education is through the model of dynamic multiculturalism. This model emphasizes learning musical cultures through that culture's practices, artifacts, and concepts. The goal is for students to become proficient procedurally and propositionally in order to apply these understandings to a larger musical community.

Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes

Existing attitudes of educators. As stated previously, an ideal approach to multicultural education, such as what Elliott (1989) posits, is not always what is understood by or available to practicing educators. Thus, an area of research directly applicable to the current study is that of teachers' beliefs and attitudes regarding multicultural education. Moore's (1993) study looked at the attitudes of general music teachers in the United States to determine how they felt about recognizing and incorporating musics from around the world into the curriculum. Moore assessed
attitudes by sending an 80-question survey to 300 randomly selected educators across the U.S. His results indicated that teachers seemed positive about the idea of global awareness in education (86%) and including world musics in the classroom (75%). However, teachers were not including world musics in the classroom as much as they would have liked. The averages for types of music used in the classroom were as follows: American folk (27%), European art (17%), pop/rock (13%), American jazz (13%), contemporary (9.7%), musics from Latin America (9.5%), musics from Africa (8%), Native American Indian musics (7.5%), musics from East Asia (5.5%), musics from the Middle East (3%), musics from India (3%), and musics from Southeast Asia (2%). The primary reason given by educators for not including more world musics in the curriculum was that they did not feel their training prepared them to do so.

**Affecting teachers’ attitudes.** In addition, studies have also focused not only on existing attitudes of educators, but also on how to affect teachers’ attitudes toward multicultural education. One such study actually dealt with pre-service teachers enrolled in undergraduate music teacher education courses. The research undertaken by Stephens (1984) focused on whether these students’ attitudes regarding African-American popular music could be changed by incorporating music, lectures, films, readings, and discussions into their coursework. Stephens found that whether or not subjects preferred African-American popular music was only slightly affected, but the students’ degree of acceptance of this type of music was strongly affected. This suggests that incorporating exposure to and education of this type of music, and perhaps any non-traditional types of music, would have an impact on future teachers’ attitudes and preparedness for teaching a broader array of musics. Furthermore, Mumford (1984) discovered that the type of
exposure to music individuals have significantly affects their attitudes. His case study found that direct experiences with African-American popular music was far better than readings and lectures for influencing positive attitudes among music education students.

Teicher's (1997) study on the effects of experiences with multicultural music also looked at pre-service teachers. This research, however, dealt with students in elementary education programs that were asked to develop and implement music lessons. They were later tested to see if students teaching non-traditional music lessons (e.g., music from Japan, Indonesia, and West Africa) were more willing and prepared to teach from a multicultural perspective than the students teaching traditional music lessons (i.e., European/American music). Teicher found that there was no significant difference in both groups' attitudes regarding preparedness to teach, but that the students who taught non-traditional lessons were much more willing to teach from a multicultural perspective than the students who taught traditional music lessons.

Effecting change in teachers' attitudes is more problematic when they have already been through pre-service training and do not have the time or opportunity for further education. Quesada (1992) took a slightly different approach than the previous three studies by looking at how to effect change in teachers through the use of in-service workshops. This research included exposing teachers to both a nine-hour workshop on Puerto Rican music and teaching materials related to the workshop, both as separate and combined treatments. Quesada's results indicated that there was no significant difference in the willingness of the teachers to utilize what they had learned. However, the teachers' feelings of self-efficacy was improved by the treatments, with the combined treatment
being the most effective for improving teachers’ self-confidence in their abilities to teach the material.

**Teacher Training and Education**

**Examinations of training.** As Volk (1993b) concludes, teacher training is still an area needing to be addressed when attempting to employ multiculturalism in music education. One way in which researchers have investigated teacher training is through investigations of teacher training programs. Montague’s (1988) study is the broadest and most comprehensive in this area. Montague attempted to assess, through the use of personal, telephone, and mail interviews, music education programs in select colleges and universities in terms of multicultural teacher training components. In addition, the research looked at the existence of state legislation and policy regarding multicultural education and whether it correlated with the multicultural teacher training components in the colleges and universities. Montague concluded that no correlation seemed to exist between state legislation and the existence of multicultural teaching training components in the schools. Even when multicultural policy existed within a state, multicultural components in music education programs were inconsistent. What was significant in this research, however, was whether faculty or administrators in the higher education institutions had a personal background or training in multicultural education. This was significantly correlated with the existence of multicultural components in the music education programs.

Other studies of teacher training have focused on specific types of teacher preparation. Gilchrist (1980) used questionnaires and interviews to see whether public
school vocal music teachers in North Carolina were adequately prepared to teach the performance practices of Black gospel music. Gilchrist's results indicated that these teachers were not adequately prepared to teach this type of music, and it was rarely included in the classroom (0-25% of the time). In addition, teachers responded that methods for teaching this music were not available and they did not feel like their pre-service music education programs adequately trained them to teach this music. Surveys conducted by Thomas (1980) focused on the inclusion of jazz education courses in colleges and universities in Mississippi. The major findings from this study included jazz education courses were offered in 64% of the institutions, but all of these courses were electives for music education majors, and music educators in the public schools were offered instruction in jazz at 43% of the institutions. In addition, 91% of the institutions felt that jazz education should be offered in public schools, but that adequate instruction in the public schools was not available. The institutions indicated that reason for the lack of instruction in public schools was the fact that teachers were not prepared by their pre-service education to offer appropriate instruction (53%). Finally, 74% of the institutions responded that they would not replace any music education courses with jazz courses, but despite this indication, 53% admitted that the music education programs at their institutions were not meeting the needs of current music educators.

Teachers' attitudes about training. Another way in which researchers have tried to gain information regarding teacher training is by asking teachers about their attitudes toward multicultural teacher preparation, either their own or the concept in general. Maltese's (1985) survey polled 384 elementary and secondary teachers, not specifically music educators, who were currently teaching in urban settings to discover their opinions
about their perceived and actual needs for pre-service field experiences related to
teaching in a multicultural, urban environment. Maltese’s results concluded that teachers
who perceived their own pre-service training as adequate preparation for teaching in a
multicultural, urban environment saw themselves as effective educators in their current
settings. Furthermore, teachers’ perceptions of their effectiveness in their current context
were correlated with their attitudes regarding teaching and the classroom environment
and with their participation in in-service development programs.

McGeehan (1983) looked at possible reasons for different responses to teacher
training in multicultural education. McGeehan used a number of different data-gathering
techniques, such as tests for multicultural knowledge and interviews, and hypothesized
that differences in responses were due to four main variables. First, whether a person
was ready for multicultural training was due to more than just previous inter-ethnic
experiences, current inter-ethnic knowledge and behaviors, and attitudes toward self and
other. However, teachers who had more inter-ethnic experiences did show an increased
awareness of strengths and weaknesses of other and their own ethnic groups. In addition,
subjects who held negative attitudes toward multicultural teacher training needed to
change these attitudes before cognitive changes could be possible, and differing attitudes
may be partially explained by sex-differences. (In this study, females tended to be more
positive towards multicultural education than males were.)

Teaching Practices

To complement this focus on music teachers and multiculturalism, the actual
practices of in-service teachers also needs to be investigated. As Navarro (1989)
explained in her comparative look at teacher practices in 1838 and 1988, music education in the United States held very similar values and practices in both time periods. Music education was first influenced by a number of social conditions, musics outside the U.S., and cultural values of the majority of people that influenced the content of music education curricula and the training of teachers in the nineteenth century. Navarro's main assertion is that since the content, training, and practices have gone unquestioned, for the most part, they have continued to contemporary times. Thus, the only way to effect change in American music education is by questioning the status quo.

Some teachers, however, are trying to incorporate innovative practices for broadening students' musical experiences. Roberts (1982) surveyed elementary general music teachers in Missouri with heartening results. Respondents said that they did have appropriate materials available to them to expand their students' musical experiences and that they were drawing on a wide variety of musical styles and genres. However, teachers were not focusing on using this variety of musics for the purposes of cultural awareness or development of musical skills, but were teaching towards the development of aesthetic responsiveness. In other words, teachers saw all music as having particular "teachable" components that they could separate and analyze in order to encourage students to reach a "learned" aesthetic response.

Yudkin (1990), similar to Roberts (1982), attempted to assess the world music education implemented and sustained in public elementary schools in California. This research was undertaken first, by creating a model curriculum by which to compare existing curricula and second, by issuing approximately 1200 questionnaires to educators throughout California. Results indicated that world musics are often taught in a
superficial manner in which the use of world musics is justified by being structured around holidays or integrated with other subjects, and matters of authenticity are not necessarily a consideration. The main reason for this superficiality was deemed to be the lack of expertise of the educator.

Klinger’s (1996) ethnography of an elementary school music program in a Pacific Northwest suburban school district revealed many of the same problems discussed thus far. Lack of knowledge and inadequate teacher training were significant influences on the superficial nature of music instruction. In addition, many constraints exist that limit teachers in what they are able to implement, such as whether the administration dictates a concert schedule for teachers and a lack of monetary resources. Furthermore, the aspect of authenticity is one that is a concern for educators, but teachers said that “authentic” resources were difficult to find. Many multicultural music education resources available to teachers did not offer original sources for their material, and music educators did not have the background to speculate on the original sources.

Sleeter’s (1989) study of teachers in Wisconsin across varying subjects and grade-levels differs from the previous studies in that it focused on teachers who were trained in multicultural education. This research investigated how these teachers implemented or failed to implement multicultural approaches in their classrooms. Significant to the current study was what Sleeter discovered regarding music educators. In comparison to other arts instructors, music educators did not necessarily see the importance of multi-ethnic, non-sexist text materials, whether student-student relationships were encouraged, or the need for students to be involved in decision-making. More significantly, music teachers saw it as their job to teach a body of knowledge to the students without seeing
the relevance of re-evaluating that body of knowledge from a multicultural perspective. Daniel (1984) offered one possible explanation: teachers whose multicultural training was experiential in nature were better prepared to effectively teach from a multicultural perspective. Those teachers who did not have experiential training could not re-evaluate their own musical practices and understandings.

Gallavan (1998) offered further explanations as to why teachers do not use effective multicultural practices. After multicultural training, respondents were asked to discuss and assign specific causes for the lack of appropriate multicultural teaching practices. Subjects found more than 50 specific reasons, and these reasons were categorized into five major categories. First, subjects indicated that teachers are ignorant of a standard definition of multicultural education. Next, teachers are not prepared to use effective multicultural education practices, nor are they motivated to learn them. Teachers may also be resistant to learn effective practices. Finally, even if educators are using multicultural practices, they may not realize their full responsibilities in doing so.

History of Multicultural Music Education in the United States

Thus far, literature regarding musical definitions, concepts, and practices has been discussed in addition to how the field of music education has demonstrated and could demonstrate ideas and practices of differing musical cultures, attitudes and beliefs about multicultural education, and practices in multicultural music education. To frame this information, it is important to see how the trend of multiculturalism has evinced itself in music education over time. Volk (1993a) has written the most comprehensive study on the history of multiculturalism in American music education that investigated the various
forms of multicultural music education in the public schools from 1900-1990. As she describes, multicultural music education began to take shape in the early part of the century when educators moved from exclusively teaching classical music of the Euro-Germanic tradition to including Northern and Western European folk musics as well. Following this beginning, the music curriculum began to include African-American spirituals and Native American songs in the 1920s, and American and Eastern European folk musics and Latin American musics were a part of music education by 1950. In 1953, the expansion of music educators’ views of music of the world led to the founding of International Society for Music Education (ISME), and the Yale Seminar of 1963 and the Juilliard Repertory Project of 1964 spurred music educators to change existing music curricula to include musics from a variety of cultures. This impetus was strengthened by the Tanglewood Symposium of 1967 that declared all musics were valuable and belonged in music curricula. From 1968 through 1990, the amount of information available to educators for teaching musics from different cultures increased. In addition, there was gradual change in how teaching various musics was perceived—from teaching Western musics through folk musics to teaching all musics as a source of human expression. Finally, at the Multicultural Symposium in Washington, D.C. in 1990, the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) committed to using a multicultural perspective for teaching music. As Volk explains, the evolution of multiculturalism in music education reflected the historical and educational contexts of the United States. Such events as immigration, desegregation and the civil rights movement, two world wars and federal foreign policy, and the Cold War affected education tremendously. In addition, educational ideas and practices were shaped by governmental actions, expanded
communication between ethnomusicology and music education, and the advances in musical technology.

In addition to Volk's (1993a) look at multicultural music education in public schools, Quesada and Volk (1997) cited two studies investigating more particular educational settings. Buckner's (1974) research focused on music education in minority schools of Kansas City, Kansas, from 1905-1954. This study documented possibly the first instance of music education used for the bi-musicality of students through the use of musics of African-Americans and Western Europeans (Quesada and Volk, 1997, p. 48). The second study by Forbes (1974) looked at the history of how Berea College, Kentucky, included a program of study devoted to the Appalachian folk musics of people in the area.

Along with these historical studies, Quesada and Volk (1997) offer a thorough historical overview of all research in music education and world musics in the United States from 1973-1993. This includes areas of study such as philosophical research, attitudinal and methodological studies, research of classroom materials, curriculum development research, and studies of music teacher preparation. Although some of these topics have been discussed, many subjects are tangential to the current study and will not be reviewed. Readers should look at Quesada and Volk (1997) for a broader summary of multicultural research in music education.

Volk also researched the history of multicultural music education in the United States through an investigation of the *Music Educators Journal (MEJ)* from 1967-1992 (1993b). As she details, MEJ has steadily increased its coverage of multicultural music

---

12 It should be noted that MEJ is the official journal for MENC, and MENC is the largest music educator organization of the United States.
education through articles, special issues, and book reviews. For instance, in November, 1971, the journal covered African-American musics and was the first example of a multicultural special issue. Following this, in October, 1972, another special issue, "Music in World Cultures," was intended to be a resource for music educators and included an overview of various musical cultures, articles focusing on the need for multicultural music education, and a resource guide for music teachers. "The Multicultural Imperative," a special issue in May, 1983, reiterated the need for music teachers to use a multicultural perspective. It also included information on reasons for multiculturalism in the classroom, teaching methods and tools, and multicultural music resources. The last special issue released in 1992, "Multicultural Music Education," was a compilation of articles from a variety of perspectives and topics. It included such authors as Anthony Seeger, Patricia Sheehan Campbell, Judith Tucker, Will Schmid, and Joan Conlon. This issue emphasized the need for instrumental and choral programs, not just general music classes, to also approach music education from a multicultural perspective.

In addition to articles, book reviews and special focus issues, Volk goes on to explain that reports from MENC conferences and symposia on the topic of multiculturalism in music education have been made available by MEJ (1993b). The most important of these being the 1990 Multicultural Symposium cited previously in Volk's (1993a) dissertation. This MENC symposium was presented in conjunction with the Society for Ethnomusicology (SEM), the Smithsonian Institution's Office of Folklife Programs, and MENC's Society for General Music. Volk states that the symposium demonstrated the positive attitude most music educators have developed towards
multicultural music education, and it could also "be considered a report card for how far the profession has come since 1967" (1993b, p. 149). MEJ has helped the profession understand multiculturalism in a number of ways, but teacher training is still an area that greatly needs to be addressed according to Volk.

An Overview of Multicultural Education

Hopefully, it is evident that this particular study focuses on multiculturalism as it affects music education settings. In order to understand this phenomenon, however, it is critical to provide at least a brief view into multicultural education from a broader perspective\(^\text{13}\). To begin, the multicultural education movement was supported by the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education's "No One American" statement in 1972, which advocated educational reforms that would increase global awareness and a better understanding of cultural diversity (Noll, 1997, p. 86). In other words, the purpose of multicultural education was, and is, to address educational inequities experienced by minority groups (i.e., any group in a subordinate position to that of the dominant group) and to address the lack of understanding held by the majority groups about minority groups and about their own positions within this framework. These goals obviously sound very positive in nature, but does a need actually exist for multicultural education?

A need for multicultural education. According to Concha Delgado-Gaitan, they do indeed. Delgado-Gaitan (1986) focused her research efforts on the Mexican-

\(^{13}\) This review is not meant to be comprehensive of the general multicultural education literature since it is not the focus of the study, but is meant to be complementary to the preceding look at multicultural music education.
American community of Portillo, a small city of California, in an attempt to discover whether poor school achievement, specifically related to literacy, was actually linked to a low value of education held by low-income minority families, as research regarding children's learning in these situations often infers (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990). Regarding said research, she states, "the general premise in these studies is that minority working-class families fail their children linguistically and cognitively by not providing them with the middle-class language and values which tend to prevail in middle-class mainstream families" (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990, p. 45). In response to this conclusion, Delgado-Gaitan argues that this idea does not offer a "holistic explanation of the family's sociocultural context" (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990, p. 45). In her particular study, she discovered that underachievement was related to a host of factors which stemmed from an incongruity between the cultural values of a student's family and the values and expectations of the school (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990).

John Ogbu conducted a study (1968-1970) that focused on the lack of academic success of African-American students in the public schools of Stockton, California (1991). He discusses the fact that although African-American students, on the whole, were motivated and desired to achieve in school in order to obtain higher-paying jobs, the African-American students' achievement was far below that of Anglo-American students (Ogbu, 1991). For instance, on elementary and high school standardized reading and math achievement tests, schools categorized as "black" or "minority" usually scored below the district average, while schools listed as "white" often scored at or above this average (Ogbu, 1991, p. 252). He concluded that the lack of success experienced by these students could be attributed in a number of ways not just to cultural differences between
the students and their families and the schools, but to the *resistance* of the minority students to adhere to the values and requirements of the schools (Ogbu, 1991).

This causal theme concerning the conflicting ideals of minority families and schools is seen throughout educational research in many different cultural contexts. Such was the case when the U.S. Department of Education contracted research groups to conduct a comparative study during 1987 and 1988 of the academic progress of a variety of elementary Native American students in relation to their school environments (Development Associates, Inc., 1988). This study collectively sampled 2,086 students who came from 40 different isolated rural schools, 23 different tribal groups, and 26 different native language backgrounds and who lived on or near Native American reservations (Development Associates, Inc., 1988, pp. 1.6-1.7). It was found that these students had academic aptitudes equal to published national norms (as determined by the Raven Progressive Matrices Test), but had extremely low academic achievement test scores in comparison to national norms (as determined by the Stanford Achievement Test) (Development Associates, Inc., 1988). It was concluded that the disparity between aptitude and achievement could be attributed primarily to language difficulties (Development Associates, Inc., 1988). However, it was further concluded that many other cultural factors not able to be explored in detail during the course of this study would probably offer a broader and more sufficient explanation for the lack of academic achievement (Development Associates, Inc., 1988).

From the above examples, it seems apparent that something is not working in education that is related to the cultural backgrounds of students and the values of the schools. Is multicultural education the answer? Many scholars would argue that
multicultural education is the only possible solution, and schools across the United States should take measures to prevent any further academic catastrophes from occurring. However, the means by which schools can meet the goals of multicultural education have been disputed. Further, many scholars feel that the ends of multicultural education cannot possibly be met with any means and that although the goals sound beneficial, they undermine more traditional educational objectives. In an attempt to better understand the issue of multicultural education and its potential gains and drawbacks, the following is a presentation of some of the strongest arguments in favor of and in opposition to multicultural education in the United States.

Arguments for and against multicultural education. James Banks is an advocate of multicultural education who says that multicultural practices in the public schools of America, although far from perfect, are creating a more culturally tolerant atmosphere in schools which will lead to a stronger, more unified country (Noll, 1997, p. 87). Problems in multicultural education arise, however, when attempting to define multicultural education—many people are prone to “oversimplify the concept” (Banks, 1997, p. 92). In fact, Banks posits that most people assume that multicultural reforms consist of content reforms (1997, p. 92). In other words, multicultural education equals the integration of a variety of cultures and groups into the educational content being taught. Content integration, although integral, is merely one facet of Banks’ definition of multicultural education. He also includes the dimensions of the reduction of prejudices, an equal pedagogy, a school culture and social structure which are more empowering to students, and the knowledge construction process (Banks, 1997, p. 92). The area of prejudice reduction in multicultural education looks at students’ attitudes about race,
ethnicity, social class, gender, religion, language, and so forth, and attempts to encourage positive opinions and ideas about “other” groups (Banks, 1997, p. 95). Equity pedagogy refers to educators using strategies and methods of teaching that will accommodate all students, regardless of cultural background (Banks, 1997, p. 95). An empowering school culture and social structure could be attained through practices such as an elimination of tracking which help to foster educational equity and a feeling of empowerment among students (Banks, 1997, p. 95). Finally, and most importantly, the knowledge construction process focuses on the construction of various types of knowledge—personal/cultural, popular, mainstream academic, transformative, and school—and would be put into multicultural practice by having teachers assist “students to understand how knowledge is created and how it is influenced by factors of race, ethnicity, gender, and social class” (Banks, 1997, pp. 92-93).

Contrary to Banks’ position, Linda Chavez argues that multicultural education does not support a unification of the citizens of the United States, but in fact, fosters divisions between people (Noll, 1997, p. 87). She attributes its lack of success to multiculturalists who confuse the concept of cultural attributes with race and national origin (Noll, 1997, p. 87). In other words, these advocates are assuming that ethnicity and race, which are uncontrollable and unchangeable traits, are the same as culture, which consists of learned values, languages, traditions, and similar cultural attributes (Chavez, 1997, p. 99). (Chavez’s definition of ethnicity, however, would possibly be disputed in fields of anthropological study. The term is often not only seen as inextricable from national heritage, but from cultural practices as well.) Further, Chavez says that multiculturalists assume that culture derives from the ancestry and phenotypic
characteristics of people, and due to this erroneous assumption, tend to force a false cultural identification onto students (1997). They are, in essence, undermining their attempts at unification by creating cultural divisions. In addition, Chavez states that the most culturally distinct citizens of America, recent immigrants, merely want to blend into a common culture, rather than have their differences pointed out (1997, pp. 100-101). Strangely, the individuals who are collectively the minority impetus behind this movement are native-born, affluent minorities who are “learning” that they are oppressed from multiculturalists (Chavez, 1997, pp. 100-101). Banks does refute Chavez’ argument by saying, “The claim that multicultural education will divide the nation assumes that the nation is already united,” (Banks, 1997, p. 90). Although this society may be unified politically, Banks contends that it is still socially divided in areas such as social class, religion, gender, and race (1997, p. 90). Grant agrees and explains that multicultural education actually provides an avenue to a “common culture that doesn’t presently exist” (1997, p. 187). Despite the reasoning of multicultural advocates, Chavez maintains her positions and is not alone in her criticism of multicultural education.

Many other scholars hold similar beliefs to Chavez and offer additional reasons for the repudiation of such practices. Carl Grant describes many of these criticisms, but refers to them as “myths” because they lack insight into what multicultural education actually “is and what it isn’t” (1997, p. 185). The first myth he addresses is the main argument that Chavez put forth—multicultural education will divide, rather than unify, American citizens. In addition, this myth says that multicultural education does not target or eliminate basic inequalities (Grant, 1997, p. 186). In response to this argument, Grant cites a multitude of authors who have researched this problem and have concluded:
that people of color, women, the disabled, and the poor are oppressed by racism, sexism, and classism, and that one goal of multicultural education is to empower students so that they may have the courage, knowledge and wisdom to control their life circumstances and transform society. (1997, p. 186)

The second myth that Grant speaks to is the idea that for all citizens, the United States is a "melting pot" (1997, p. 186). However, Grant refutes this declaration and discusses citizens who have not been fully accepted into this society (1997). For example, gay and lesbian men and women have had difficulties serving in the armed services, minority groups and women are underrepresented in the political arena, and citizens with physical challenges often have a plethora of problems in otherwise mundane contexts, such as accessibility to businesses. Next, Grant discusses the incorrect assumption that multicultural education is political correctness (1997, p. 187). In essence, multiculturalists are trying to teach the etiquette of living in American society. Grant explains that not only is this equation erroneous, but it reduces the recognition of minority groups and their difficulties of being rejected from the mainstream of society (1997, p. 187). Another area of concern to Grant is the idea that multicultural education is minority education (1997, p. 188). Many people wrongly take for granted that multicultural practices are aimed at assisting minorities who feel underrepresented or have low self-efficacy. In doing so, members of the majority (i.e., English-speaking, European-descent) may develop attitudes of racism and ethnocentrism (Grant, 1997, p. 189). Finally, Grant addresses the myth that multicultural education will hinder "basic" education that is necessary for survival in a "global technological society" (1997, p. 189). He argues that multicultural education will not impede this goal, but will continue to
educate and challenge students, in addition to better equipping them with critical thinking skills and an understanding of the purposes for education (Grant, 1997, p. 189).

When evaluating the need for and the effectiveness of multicultural education, practical concerns also need to be taken into account. Ladsen-Billings describes several areas of research which should be considered in a multicultural context: the beliefs that teachers hold about their students, the materials and content of the curriculum, approaches to instruction, educational settings, the manner in which teachers are educated, and the ethnicity and race of teachers (1997, p. 181). To begin, the attitudes and expectations of teachers toward particular students or groups of students can be especially influential in the success of these students in school and outside of school. For example, in “Educating the Resistance,” Brown explains that adolescent girls are often assumed to be compliant and cooperative by teachers and are pressured, although not necessarily consciously, to fit a particular, feminine mold (1997, p. 167). This bias affects girls’ academic performance, as well as psychological well being. Brown offers a shocking illustration, “With hands raised or waving patiently, they [girls] are rarely called upon by teachers who, while well armored with good intentions, may be unaware of their own learned biases or internalized oppression” (1997, p. 167). This process seems particularly insidious when the oppressed are doing the oppressing. Next, when thinking about curriculum content and materials, Wills argues that these components of instruction need to be fully representative of cultural groups that may be involved (1996). Specifically, Wills addresses American history in a multicultural setting and explains that often, students are taught about African Americans in history only within the context of the Civil War (1996). While the lessons may be informative, “it provides a very limited
and narrow understanding of African Americans’ experiences in U.S. history, one that provides few tools for thinking critically about contemporary race relations” (Wills, 1996, p. 386). The issue of the curriculum becomes even more problematic if its overall focus is not in line with the interests of a particular group of people. This issue was illustrated in the case of Wisconsin vs. Yoder (1971) in which the general public school curriculum and broader educational system was based upon principles contrary to the religious beliefs held by the parents of a particular group of students (MacKaye, 1971).

Instructional approaches are also extremely important when one considers the individual learning styles and broader group mentality of students. For instance, Kramer talks of the problems that the Ute Indians of Utah have consistently had from being forced to integrate into public schools (1991). One of the underlying reasons for the struggle comes from the completely different concept of education that the Ute tribe holds in comparison to the non-Ute educators (Kramer, 1991, p. 303). Additionally, educational settings are significant when attention is given to ethnic groups who transmit education in a manner different than the usual public school process, such as many Native American groups who value a communal and kinship-oriented context (Reagan, 1996, p. 67). In relation to educational settings, the education of teachers should not be overlooked. Ladsen-Billings explains that because of a lack of experience with students of varied backgrounds and ignorance regarding multicultural education, teachers may attribute academic failure or difficulties of students to a student’s ethnicity, rather than their own inability to accommodate these children in a multicultural setting (1997, p. 184). Finally, the ethnicity and race of the teachers is a practical consideration in that no evidence has been found to support that students learn better with teachers of a similar ethnicity. This
means, "all teachers are accountable for teaching all students" (Ladsen-Billings, 1997, p. 184).

**The goals of American education.** With the overwhelming idea of all teachers being accountable for teaching all students and the contrasting arguments for and against multicultural education in mind, can a compromise and practical solution be reached regarding this issue? Until the goals of American education are aligned, conflicts, such as multicultural education, will probably remain unresolved. The goals of American education refer to Labaree's trichotomy of democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility (1997). Democratic equality says that schools should be focused on preparing students to become responsible citizens in order to maintain a democratic society (Labaree, 1997, p. 42). Social efficiency dictates that schools should vocationally train students to fill needed market roles in an effort to promote a healthy economy (Labaree, 1997, p. 42). Both of these goals view education as a public good of the society. The third goal, however, sees education as a private good of the individual. This goal is social mobility. The educational approach following social mobility is competitive and attempts to train students to be successful in acquiring preferred roles in the job market (Labaree, 1997, p. 42). What does this have to do with multicultural education? These three distinct ways of looking at American education have created a counterproductive and contradictory structure on which to base educational practices (Labaree, 1997, p. 70). Thus, without a stable and focused educational structure, multicultural educational practices will inevitably be, at best, partially successful. In order to understand better Labaree's divisions of educational goals and how they may affect educational practices, examples of these goals need to be given.
To begin, Weeres and Rivera offer examples of both social efficiency and social mobility from the industrial age of America that are still in effect today. Beginning in the 1920s, children were already being tracked based upon intelligence tests (Weeres & Rivera, 1995, p. 77), reinforcing the notion of social mobility. These curricular tracks were mainly divided according to future employment of the students (Weeres & Rivera, 1995, p. 70), supporting social efficiency in the facet of specific interest productivity. Finally, social efficiency in the area of overall productivity was strengthened by placing “great emphasis on socializing students in habits of punctuality, listening attentively, obedience, silence, accommodation to routine, regularity in delivering homework assignments, and other social traits they would need to succeed in the new economy” (Weeres & Rivera, 1995, p. 70). These industrial-age educational practices are still prevalent in most schools today. However, social efficiency and social mobility practices such as these are not necessarily in direct conflict by themselves. When the goal of democratic equality is added, problems occur. Democratic equality practices focus on either becoming a part of society—an attempt at unification—or changing the society through the students. Thus, an argument for equal education for all students is in direct conflict with an education stratified by achievement or intelligence scores, and a cooperative learning environment of which tracking is not a part collides with training for future vocations.

Concluding remarks. In summary, the unique diversity of the United States calls for a tailored school system in which students are given not only equal access to education, but also equity in education. The attempt to accommodate this need by the American government with the public school system has, unfortunately, not proven
successful. In response to this failure, reformists have turned to multicultural education, which offers to empower students and provide equal educational opportunities for those students. Nevertheless, multicultural education is now under attack by critics who claim that multicultural educational practices are a failure and actually diversify students.

Regarding this issue and these concerns, I would argue that minority groups in the United States are not adequately represented in schools, or other social arenas, and the majority group fails to see its own ethnocentric behavior, even when attempting to remedy the situation. However, this inequality stems from the structure of the American education system—one that is contradictory in its goals—rather than the multicultural practices used in education. If these goals were aligned, then such practices would be unnecessary. It is the *structure* of the American school system that does not meet the needs of all students. This structure is based upon a narrow view of content and ways of learning that content. In addition, the school structure does not take into account the contexts for learning that are so diverse outside the classroom. The American public school system needs to be reformed in terms of equal representation of minority groups and recognition of ethnocentric biases by the majority group. Until the structure of the school system is reformed, multicultural education, whether flawed or effective, is the only attempt currently available that addresses these issues.

**Summary**

There are several implications from the previously discussed literature. First, music education is finally recognizing the need for multicultural approaches in music. This is a heartening finding in that at least a favorable environment exists for
multicultural education. This seems, at least in part, to be related to the question in this research concerning teachers’ positive or negative attitudes toward multicultural education. Although need is not demonstrated through attitude alone, it seems that if a teacher is positive about the concept, she would be more willing to try using the practices. (See Chapter 4, Research Question 1.)

Regarding teacher attitudes and training, it seems obvious that teachers who have training and education in multicultural music education, or at least experience with a wide variety of musics, feel better prepared to teach from a multicultural approach. However, music education programs do not seem to be providing the training that music educators need in order to do so. Furthermore, teachers do not necessarily see multicultural education as something that may benefit them. It is often seen in terms of an approach useful to helping students. These points are connected to questions in this study concerning whom multicultural education is for and teachers’ training and background. (See Chapter 4, Research Questions 3 and 6.)

In addition, this review shows that other constraints may be hindering music teachers from implementing multicultural practices, such as administrative and resource concerns, resulting in approaching multicultural education in a superficial manner. Although this point is not directly addressed in this study, it seems to be an important consideration when thinking about the practical applications of a multicultural approach.

Most importantly, however, in order for music teachers to understand multicultural education and recognize its importance, they first need to question their own knowledge of music. Why do they teach what they do, and is that way the best way? More essentially, why do they know what they do, and is this knowledge appropriate for
everyone? This relates to questions in this research concerning teachers’ ideas regarding the purposes and goals of multicultural education, their own multicultural teaching practices, and the subjects to which multicultural education applies. (See Chapter 4, Research Questions 2, 4, and 5.)

Furthermore, teachers need to not only question their knowledge of music but their entire conceptualization of it. In other words, the subject matter and practices they use stem from a particular notion of music which is product-oriented and atomistic. To merely use instruments or recordings from other places within the same conceptual framework is not truly multicultural. Educators need to situate understandings and practices within their own cultural context. For example, to refer back to the example of Shona mbira music, if a teacher wanted to teach a song from this culture, it would need to be in the manner of how the music is understood in this culture and for the goal of cultural understanding, not to illustrate a lesson on rhythm patterns. Thus, the teacher would have to model the song appropriately on the mbira in order to not only transfer the knowledge of the song, but also the cultural practices of playing the mbira. So, singing and playing hoshos would also have to be demonstrated. In addition, the sonic properties alone do not make up what is music for the Shona, as discussed previously, so the teacher would have to include dance in the instruction, as well as practices integral to creating music, such as reciprocity and cooperation between participants. Most importantly, the teacher would need to provide the appropriate context for understanding what constitutes this music, why it is important, who engages in music, and so on. It is essential that the music of a particular culture be viewed through its own terms and practices, not in comparison to an existing framework of Music (capital “M”). It seems that many of the
problems outlined above actually stem from this very basic issue of cultural differences in what music is. If this issue were addressed first in multicultural approaches, it would clear up many unintended misunderstandings and misrepresentations.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Design of the Study

The intention of this study was to get a broad overview of elementary general music teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding multicultural education within Champaign County, Illinois. Champaign County is an area accessible to the researcher and the county’s schools seemed likely to be positive about research, since the University of Illinois is located here and conducts much research with area schools. This study looks at public schools because using a multicultural approach may be more beneficial in public school settings, where the student population may be more diverse than in private schools in terms of ethnic heritage, socio-economic status, religion, and so forth. Therefore, it seemed more probable that public school teachers would be using a multicultural approach. Also, general music lends itself to a multicultural approach more so than other American music courses that may have an existing mono-cultural or bi-cultural foundation (e.g., concert choir). Thus, this research focuses on general music classes. Finally, general music is included in elementary schools more often than in middle and secondary schools, so it is more standardized (i.e., occurs more regularly and continues throughout grades), making it more comparable for the present study.

It should be noted that teachers were the actual respondents in this study. However, since there is usually one general music teacher per elementary school, the terms, “teacher/educator” and “school,” will be used interchangeably. Furthermore, requests for responses for the survey had to first go directly to the school administrator
for approval prior to being filled out by the music teachers. Thus, the teacher and the 
teacher's students are seen to represent their particular school. In only one case is this 
not true. The results from two schools were actually combined on one completed survey 
in which one teacher taught all classes at both schools. Due to this anomaly, a single label 
throughout this study, School #6, represents both of these schools. In all, ten general 
music teachers in this study represented eleven schools.

Requests for approval of this survey were originally intended to be sent to all 
public elementary schools in Champaign County. Unfortunately, because this research 
dealt with public schools in this county and many individuals from the University of 
Illinois conduct research within this area, the potential pool of respondents was 
minimized. There were a total of 37 public elementary schools in this county, but the 
actual number of public elementary schools available for the current study was 28. So, as 
Table 1 illustrates, the music teachers who responded (n=10) represent 29.73% of the 
total population of Champaign County public elementary schools (n=37) and 39.29% of 
the available population (n=28). Out of the 28 schools in the available population, 17 
schools agreed to participate in the study (60.71%), five did not agree to participate 
(17.86%), and six did not respond to queries to participate (21.43%). (See Table 1.)
### Table 1

**Population and Participation Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers, representations, &amp; contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Public Elementary Schools in Champaign County, Illinois (Region 09, County 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Public Elementary Schools in Champaign County Available for Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Schools that Agreed to Participate in Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Schools that Did Not Agree to Participate in Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Schools that Did Not Respond to Queries to Participate in Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Schools Represented by Completed Surveys Received in Current Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Current Study's Representation of Total Population of Champaign County Public Elementary Schools         | 29.73% |
| Current Study's Representation of Available Population of Champaign County Public Elementary Schools     | 39.29% |

| Contribution of Schools in Available Population that Agreed to Participate in Current Study              | 60.71% |
| Contribution of Schools in Available Population that Did Not Agree to Participate in Current Study      | 17.86% |
| Contribution of Schools in Available Population that Did Not Respond to Queries to Participate in Current Study | 21.43% |

| Actual Survey Response Rate in Terms of Available Population in Current Study                          | 39.29% |

**Notes.**

*School #6 represents two separate schools, but the music educator completed a single, collective survey for both schools. Thus, the total number of schools available, schools agreeing to participate, and surveys received represent the actual number of schools. But for ease of analysis and reading, I treated School #6 as a single entity in the overall study.

### Instrumentation

Since a goal of this study was to obtain an overview of ideas, using a survey/questionnaire seemed like an efficient way of collecting information that would also provide a measure of comparability in the results. (See Appendix A.) A survey is a fairly quick method of gathering information and also allows subjects to think about their answers before responding. In addition, this seemed like a less stressful way to obtain information from teachers than using interviews or observations. Since multicultural
education is considered by some individuals to be a sensitive issue, the teachers might have been pressured to conform to what they felt were “politically correct” ideas and practices if being interviewed or observed. However, one drawback of using a survey method is trying to gather qualitative information, so the survey was designed with mainly open-ended questions, rather than a Likert-scale format. The survey did include one question with a positive/negative response only, and two questions with a yes/no response. (See Appendix A: Questions 10, 13, and 14.) However, the positive/negative question seemed straightforward enough that an explanation was not needed, and the yes/no questions included space for detailed explanations of the response. The remaining questions were all open-ended. This allowed teachers to give in-depth information without the constraints of pre-selected responses.

Interpretive Content Analysis

The data collected in this study were analyzed according to frequency and through interpretation. Yes/no and similar responses were looked at according to frequency. (See Appendix A: Questions 10, 13, and 14.) The remaining responses were categorized first according to similarities in responses where the researcher attempted to use the responses in as a literal a form as possible. (See Appendix A: Questions 11-15.) For instance, a classification entitled, “Music is a universal language,” included the actual written responses, “Music is a universal language,” and “To broaden study of and appreciation of other countries with a universal language.” In some questions, this was how the data were represented in final form. (See Appendix A: Questions 12 and 15.)
larned by some provision like the United States Tariff Act of 1922. The "law of supply and demand," as it is known, is based on the principle that prices tend to rise as demand increases and fall as demand decreases. However, this simple model does not account for the complex interactions between producers and consumers in the global market. The Tariff Act, for example, aimed to protect domestic industries by raising prices and reducing competition, but it also had unintended consequences, such as increased prices for consumers and retaliation from other countries. The "law of supply and demand," therefore, is a useful tool for understanding how prices are determined in the market, but it is important to consider the broader economic context in which it operates.
Two of the questions, however, were further analyzed according to a theoretical framework taken from James Banks (1997) that was discussed previously. It is the researcher’s opinion that the definition of multicultural education given by Banks is the most comprehensive available. Thus, the responses to, “What is the purpose(s) or goal(s) of multicultural education,” (see Appendix A: Question 11), and “[P]lease explain what sorts of techniques you use and/or how you make your classes more multicultural,” (see Appendix A: Question 14), were also classified according to Banks’ components of multicultural education. These components include Content Integration, Knowledge Construction Process, Reduction of Prejudices, Equity Pedagogy, and Empowering School and Social Structure. So, for example, the classification described above, “Music is a universal language,” became a subcategory of Knowledge Construction Process, since this subcategory refers to ideas about musical knowledge. These responses and subcategories were mutually exclusive in most cases. If overlapping or similar subcategories were used, it was noted in the analysis (e.g., “creating an entire school program focusing on cultural diversity” functioned in both the Reduction of Prejudices and the Empowering School and Social Structure categories).
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Description of the Sample

Music Educators

As stated above, the music educators for this study represent 39.29% of the available population of elementary general music teachers in Champaign County, Illinois. In other words, 11 of the 28 available public elementary schools are presented. However, due to the irregularity discussed previously, the schools represented by these teachers will be numbered 1 through 10, and again, the terms, “teacher/educator” and “school” will be used interchangeably.

The participating teachers represented a wide range of ages and years of experience. (See Table 2, Appendix A: Questions 2 & 3, and Appendix F: Figure F1.) As can be seen, educators’ ages were from 26 to 61 years—a range of 35 years. The mean educators’ age was 46.5, with the median age being 50. The educators’ years of experience ranged from 0.5 to 37 years—a span of 36.5 years. The mean number of years was 17.2, while the median was 19 years. Generally, the pattern for the number of years of experience related to that of the age of the educator, with the exception of School #1, #7, and #8. In addition, these educators were generally female. (See Appendix A: Question 4 and Appendix F: Figure F2.) The actual number of females to males was eight to two, creating a ratio of four to one.

These teachers also varied in their class loads. (See Table 2, Appendix A: Question 6, and Appendix F: Figure F3.) As is illustrated, the educators’ total number of
classes taught (lessons taught to a particular group of children) per week deviated from 16 to 58—a range of 42 classes. The mean number of classes was 36.4, while the median number was 38. The number of different classrooms seen each week (meaning a specific group of children such as those in “Mrs. A’s third-grade classroom”) was also surveyed to get a better idea of how often each classroom was receiving instruction and how versatile educators had to be in terms of adjusting their instruction to match different age groups. The total number of different classrooms seen each week varied from eight to 24—a range of 16 classrooms. The mean number of classrooms was 14.875, with the median being 14.

Related to the educators’ number of classes (lessons) and classrooms (groups of children) was the number of times each classroom had music each week and the average length of each music class period. (See Table 2, Appendix A: Question 6, and Appendix F: Figure F4.) The average number of times each classroom had music per week ranged from 1.45 to 3.77—a span of 2.32 times. The mean number of times was 2.573, and the median number of times was 2.335. From a practitioner’s perspective, this is a great variation and is compounded by the fact that the average lengths of the class periods were very similar for teachers. The class periods ranged in minutes from 25 to 35 minutes—a span of 10 minutes. The mean number of minutes for a class period was 29.5, while the median number was 30 minutes. Thus, if the average number of instructional minutes (29.5) is applied to both ends of the range of number of times each classroom has music instruction (1.45 and 3.77), there is a difference in the total number of instructional minutes from 42.775 to 111.215 minutes—a range of 68.44 minutes.
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Music Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Total # of classes taught per week</th>
<th># of different classrooms seen each week</th>
<th>Avg. # of times each classroom has music per week</th>
<th>Avg. length of each music class period (min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>24.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>2.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>3.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>3.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>19.000</td>
<td>3.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 46.5, 17.2, 36.4, 14.875, 2.573, 29.5
Median: 50.0, 19.0, 38.0, 14.000, 2.335, 30.0
Mode: 50.0 & 53.0, none, 16.0 & 40.0
Range: 35.0, 36.5, 42.0, 16.000, 2.320, 10.0

Notes:
"N/A" indicates that the educator did not provide this information on the questionnaire. (See Schools 1 and 10)

The Respondents’ Music Students

To better understand how the teachers’ beliefs and practices were contextually framed, demographic questions regarding the teachers’ students were also asked. The total number of music students for each school ranged from 130 to 576—a span of 446 students. The mean number of music students was 295.6, with a median of 338 students. (See Table 3, Appendix A: Question 6, and Appendix F: Figure F5.) These numbers created a contribution from each school ranging from 4% of the combined population of music students to 19% of the population—a span of 15%. (See Appendix F: Figure F6.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
The differences in the total number of music students were also evident in the average number of students per music class of the respondents. The average number of students each educator had in a given music class varied from 11.82 to 27.69 students—a range of 15.87. The mean number of students per class for all educators was 19.796, while the median was 19.345 students. (See Table 3 and Appendix F: Figure F4.)

Teachers were also asked to comment on the ethnic/racial diversity of their students. (See Table 3, Appendix A: Question 7, and Appendix F: Figure F7.) They were given the option of filling in what they felt “ethnic/racial diversity” meant, and because of this, minority groups have a variety of names. For instance, teachers listed both Mexican-American and Hispanic as categories. Similarly, the overlapping categories of Asian, Chinese, and Philippine were given. However, White, European-descent majority students were always labeled Anglo-American. It is interesting to note that several respondents also wrote in a category for the ethnicity/race of students called Other, and gave no indication as to the reason for this category. (Were there only one or two students from a given ethnic/racial group, or did the teacher not know the ethnic/racial background of student?) In addition, the minority group labeled African-American was the largest and most frequently cited minority group. With regard to the ethnic/racial diversity of the students from all schools, the percentage of ethnic/racial majority students (i.e., Anglo-Americans) varied from 62% to 99%—a range of 37%. The mean percentage of ethnic/racial majority students was 88%, with the median being 94.5%. The percentage of ethnic/racial minority students (i.e., all listed minorities)

14 It seemed important to the researcher to allow teachers to create these labels as an indication of how they viewed ethnicity and race.
varied from 1% to 38%—a range of 37%. The mean percentage of ethnic/racial minority students was 12%, while the median was 5.5%.

The gender representation of the music students was fairly regular among all schools. (See Table 3, Appendix A: Question 8, and Appendix F: Figure F8.) The percentage of female music students in the schools ranged from 40% to 60%—a span of 20%. The mean percentage of female students was 50.4%, with the median being 50%. The percentage of male music students also ranged from 40% to 60%—a span of 20%. The mean percentage of male students was 49.6%, while the median was 50%. (Keep in mind that the music students in elementary general music class are generally not electing to take music as a course, but are required to have the class.)

Finally, educators were also asked to comment on the representation of their music students who had “disabilities of any kind.” (See Table 3, Appendix A: Question 9, and Appendix F: Figure F9.) All educators indicated that they had some students with special needs. The percentage of students with special needs varied from 1% to 15%—a range of 14%. The mean percentage of music students with special needs was 6.9%, and the median percentage was 6.5%.
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Subjects' Music Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avg. # of students</th>
<th>Total # of music students</th>
<th>% of students of ethnic maj.</th>
<th>% of students of ethnic min.</th>
<th>% of female students</th>
<th>% of male students</th>
<th>% of students with special needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>330.0</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>24.000</td>
<td>576.0</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>26.670</td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>19.220</td>
<td>346.0</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>17.500</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>27.690</td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>11.820</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>132.0</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>19.470</td>
<td>370.0</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>172.0</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 19.796  295.6  88.0%  12.0%  50.4%  49.6%  6.9%
Median: 19.345  338.0  94.5%  5.5%  50.0%  50.0%  6.5%
Mode: none  none  99.0%  1.0%  50.0%  50.0%  1.0% & 10.0%
Range: 15.870  446.0  37.0%  37.0%  20.0%  20.0%  14.0%

Notes:
"N/A" indicates that the educator did not provide this information on the questionnaire. (See Schools 1 and 10.)
"Ethnic majority" refers to the Anglo-American category indicated by teachers; "ethnic minority" refers to the combined non-Anglo-American categories. These category names are only meant to be numeric descriptors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment 1</th>
<th>Treatment 2</th>
<th>Treatment 3</th>
<th>Treatment 4</th>
<th>Treatment 5</th>
<th>Treatment 6</th>
<th>Treatment 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1</td>
<td>Result 2</td>
<td>Result 3</td>
<td>Result 4</td>
<td>Result 5</td>
<td>Result 6</td>
<td>Result 7</td>
<td>Result 8</td>
<td>Result 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The table above shows the results of a controlled experiment comparing the effects of different treatments on a specific outcome. The results indicate that Treatment 6 produced the most significant change, while Treatment 1 had no discernible effect.
Research Question 1

Teachers’ Attitudes Regarding Multicultural Education

The first question, looking at teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, and practices regarding multicultural education, asked educators, “Do you have positive or negative feelings regarding multicultural education?” (See Appendix A: Question 10.) As stated before, it was hypothesized that educators would be positive, regardless of their definition of multicultural education, either because most definitions are positive in nature or due to pressure to accept multicultural education from administrators, colleagues, and parents of students. The actual responses were overwhelmingly positive with nine positive responses and one negative response. (See Figure 1.) Unfortunately the researcher did not ask respondents to cite reasons for giving a negative response. So, it is unknown if the negative response was due to an already burdensome workload that multicultural practices would exacerbate, resistance due to pressure from administration and colleagues to use yet another “new” way of teaching, feelings related to arguments against multicultural education, such as the ones given earlier by Chavez, or some other reason. However, the reason for not asking teachers to justify their responses was to try to avoid pressuring respondents to falsely give a positive answer.
Research Question 2

Teachers' Ideas Regarding the Purposes of Multicultural Education

In order to ascertain whether or not agreement existed related to the definition of multicultural education, educators were next asked, “What is the purpose(s) or goal(s) of multicultural education?” (See Appendix A: Question 11.) This question was open-ended, and teachers wrote out their responses. As discussed earlier, in an attempt to organize these responses, James Banks’ (1997) framework regarding the components of multicultural education was used. Again, the components of this framework include Content Integration, the Knowledge Construction Process, Reduction of Prejudices, Equity Pedagogy, and an Empowering School and Social Structure. Banks suggests that the aspect most commonly addressed in school is that of Content Integration, where new
content is added onto the existing curriculum (1997, p. 92). In addition, it has been the researcher’s experience that educators are often concerned with reducing obvious prejudices within the classroom (e.g., students cooperating with one another despite physical characteristics). Thus, these two aspects were hypothesized to be the most commonly cited purposes of multicultural education. The one component of multicultural education hypothesized to be completely neglected was the Knowledge Construction Process. After attending many workshops, seminars, and classes, and teaching classes and giving seminars as well, it has been the researcher’s experience that this is the most difficult aspect to understand and reflect on for educators and students alike. The reason for this may be due to its critical nature. In other words, reflecting on the Knowledge Construction Process of a particular subject area, for instance American music education, requires an individual to question whether or not what he or she knows is “good” or “true.” For example, is teaching music through the common elements (i.e., melody, harmony, rhythm, timbre, and form) a good method? More basically, are the common elements actually common elements for all musics?

As Figure 2 illustrates, the hypothesis for the most common and most neglected aspects held true. The third bar of each grouping represents the combined responses (n=27) of general education purposes and specific musical purposes for each aspect. As can be seen, the area of Content Integration was the most commonly cited type of response (13), followed by the area of Reduction of Prejudices (eight). An Empowering School and Social Structure received a few responses (three), with Equity Pedagogy receiving none, and the Knowledge Construction Process actually received three
responses that were antithetical to its purpose (weighted as negative three to illustrate the opposition of the responses).
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**Figure 2.** Categories of music educators' responses regarding the purposes of multicultural education.

The following figures (3-6) illustrate how each of the categories cited in Figure 2 divided into particular subcategories. Figure 3 shows that Content Integration responses (n=13) fell into four main subcategories: to broaden students' overall perspectives (four responses/31%), to further students' understandings of people and culture (own and others) (four responses/31%), to further students' understandings of the history or culture
(own and others) (three responses/23%), and to broaden students’ musical experiences (two responses/15%).

Figure 3. Subcategories of music educators’ responses regarding the purposes of multicultural education in the category of content integration (G=general; M=musical).

The next most frequently given purpose of multicultural education was the category of Reduction of Prejudices. (See Figure 4.) The responses (n=8) given were subcategorized into four types: to foster in students an appreciation for diversity (three responses/37%), to teach students respect for all people and cultures (own and others)
(three responses/37%), to prepare students to be members of a “global community” (one response/13%) and to foster in students an appreciation for their own culture (one response/13%).

Figure 4. Subcategories of music educators’ responses regarding the purposes of multicultural education in the category of reduction of prejudices (G=general; M=musical).

Although not as frequent as the previous two categories, educators also gave reasons for multicultural education in the category of Empowering School and Social Structure. (See Figure 5.) Teachers gave responses (n=3) related to three subcategories:
to promote students’ self-esteem (one response), to help students reach their highest potential (one response), and to teach students a variety of ways of self-expression (one response). All three subcategories were represented equally.

Figure 5. Subcategories of music educators’ responses regarding the purposes of multicultural education in the category of empowering school and social structure (G=general; M=musical).

Surprisingly, the category of Equity Pedagogy was not addressed at all by respondents. (See Figure 2.) The questions regarding the ethnicity/race of students, the gender stratification of students, and students with special needs were intended to be a hint for teachers to think about Equity Pedagogy. However, no mention was made
regarding whether students actually received equitable instruction or an equitable learning environment. I believe that this is related to Research Question 3 in that teachers rarely reflect on their own role in multicultural education in terms of benefiting from it or in separating their positive intentions from the "rightness" or "wrongness" of their actual behaviors.

The final category of purposes of multicultural education that was addressed by music educators was the Knowledge Construction Process (n=3). (See Figure 6.) This category, however, was explained by teachers with directly opposite descriptions of its actual meaning. As discussed previously, the Knowledge Construction Process category deals with thinking about who or what constructed the "knowledge" in a certain area and why this knowledge is valued. The respondents in this survey gave explanations for this larger purpose relating to two subcategories: music is a universal language (two responses/67%) and to compare musical elements of various cultural groups (one response/33%).

As was discussed earlier, using a common elements approach to studying all musical cultures does not promote cultural understanding; it tries to fit all musics into a singular definition of what music is. Assuming that music is a universal language is related to this view. It is more problematic, however, since it proposes that musical ideas, beliefs, icons, symbols, and meanings can be understood by anyone who "knows" music. Both of these subcategories are based on the aesthetic notion of music as object. In other words, individuals can isolate musical works from musical processes and understand them atomistically. This view, music education as aesthetic education (MEAE), does not account for David Elliott's labels of MUSIC, Music, and music
(Elliott, 1995). As he explains, “MUSIC is a diverse human practice consisting in many different musical practices or Musics... The word music (lowercase) refers to audible sound events, works, or listenables that eventuate from the efforts of musical practitioners in the contexts of particular pieces” (Elliott, 1995, pp. 44-45). The aspect of understanding music in a non-MEAE way is crucial to understanding the Knowledge Construction Process in the field of music education. Due to these explanations, the subcategories of using musical elements to compare musical cultures and explaining music as a universal language were weighted negatively in this study’s analysis. (See Figure 2.)

![Figure 6. Subcategories of music educators’ responses regarding the purposes of multicultural education in the category of knowledge construction process (G=general; M=musical).](image-url)
Research Question 3

Teachers’ Beliefs about Whom Multicultural Education Is For

Following inquiry into the purposes of multicultural education was the question, “For whom is multicultural education?” (See Figure 7 and Appendix A: Question 12.) As mentioned previously, it was hypothesized that teachers would see students as the main beneficiaries of multicultural education without reflecting on how they may gain from these practices and ideas. The responses to this question were written by teachers, and were unfortunately, not as easily comparable as they would have been if teachers had to choose from a selection of answers. However, the researcher did not want to influence or limit the responses of the teachers by giving them a few select answers. Overall, educators gave responses (n=12) that fit into three main categories: for everyone (eight responses/67%), for students (three responses/25%), and for teachers (one response/8%).

![Figure 7](image)

Figure 7. Music educators’ responses to the question, “For whom is multicultural education?”
I received a call

I have heard from my parents and from my grandmother. I called them to see how they were doing. They are both doing well, thank you for asking. I have been busy with work, but I try to make time for them. They are important to me. I miss them when I am away. I hope to see them soon.

I have been looking for a new job. I have applied to several places, but I have not heard back yet. I am doing my best to stay positive. I know that things will work out in the end.

I hope everything is going well with you. Please take care of yourself. I will check in again soon.
The problem with these responses lies in the category of everyone. It is unclear whether teachers meant this response to refer to all students or all students and all teachers or everyone in America, etc. From the remaining two categories, it is at least apparent that teachers did cite students as being the beneficiaries of multicultural education more often than they cited themselves.

Research Question 4

Teachers’ Responses Regarding the Application of Multicultural Education

Educators were then asked: “Does multicultural education apply to every academic subject area?” and “If not, to which subjects does it apply?” (See Figure 8 and Appendix A: Question 13.) Out of the 10 responses given, seven teachers felt that multicultural education does apply to every subject area, and three teachers felt that it did not. As discussed earlier, it was hypothesized that teachers would feel multicultural education would be applicable to subjects easily distinguished by cultural influence, such as the arts or literature or social studies, more so than subjects seen as abstracted from culture, such as math or science. This hypothesis was somewhat supported by educators’ responses. The three negative responses qualified their answers by adding that multicultural education “does not apply to math,” and that it only applies to “fine arts, language arts, and social sciences,” or in the words of another teacher, “music, reading, and social studies.” Even teachers who claimed that multicultural education applies to all subjects showed some uncertainty or ambiguity in its application, “I think so...[multicultural education applies to all subject areas]...some more than others.” As one teacher explained, “Subject areas like music, art, history, and languages are more
obvious areas for multicultural experiences, but most all subject areas can involve these kinds of experiences.”

Figure 8. Ratio of music educators’ responses as to whether or not multicultural education applies to all subject areas.

Research Question 5

Teachers’ Use of Multicultural Practices

Educators’ responses (n=10) to the question, “Do you apply multicultural methods in your classes?” were similar to those regarding their attitudes towards the use of multicultural education in general. (See Figures 1 and 9 and Appendix A: Questions 10 and 14.) Eight teachers said that they did use multicultural methods in their classes,
one teacher did not, and one teacher said that he/she used multicultural methods sometimes. (The last response was thus weighted as 0.5 for each yes/no category.)

Figure 9. Ratio of music educators’ responses as to whether or not they use multicultural methods in the classroom.

What was most interesting about this particular question, however, was the second part, which asked teachers if they did apply multicultural methods to “please explain what sorts of techniques you use and/or how you make your classes more multicultural.” (See Appendix A: Question 14.) The answers (n=47) to this part of the question were again written out by teachers and then categorized similarly to Research Question 2—according to James Banks’ (1997) components of multicultural education. The primary reason for this was to see if educators’ ideas about the purposes of multicultural education were similar to what they were actually practicing in the
classroom. Differences could exist due to many variables, such as limited resources, limited expertise, lack of motivation, lack of support, etc. As can be seen in Figure 10, the frequency pattern of the categories was similar to that of Figure 2, except that the areas of Reduction of Prejudices and Empowering School and Social Structure were reversed in these responses.

To begin, teachers gave 39 examples of Content Integration methods for incorporating multicultural methods in their classes, again putting this category as the most commonly cited. Teachers' next most common way of using multicultural methods in the classroom was in the Empowering School and Social Structure category with four responses. Examples from this category were more frequent than examples from the Reduction of Prejudices category, which had only two responses. The frequencies of these two categories differ from those in Research Question 2, which had Reduction of Prejudices occurring more frequently (eight responses) than Empowering School and Social Structure (three responses). Next, the category of Equity Pedagogy was not cited at all, making it equal to the number of times it was cited in Research Question 2. Finally, the area of Knowledge Construction Process was again addressed in terms that were oppositional to what it actually represents. Thus, it was weighted negatively (negative two responses), as compared to the same category in Research Question 2 (negative three responses).
Figure 10. Categories of music educators’ responses regarding personal methods used to create a more multicultural classroom.

As Figure 11 shows, explanations (n=39) regarding the types of methods teachers used in the area of Content Integration were classified into 16 subcategories. Listening to, singing, and studying songs from various cultures (five responses/12.8%) and listening to, playing, and studying instruments from various cultures (five responses/12.8%) were the largest subcategories. These subcategories were followed by listening to and studying “traditional/authentic” music of various cultures (four responses/10.3%) and teaching the language of a given culture (four responses/10.3%). The next largest subcategory defined was that of playing games from a culture being studied (three responses/7.7%). After playing games, there was a large cluster of equally
cited subcategories: learning about holidays of a culture being studied; having musical programs or performances of music from various cultures; studying the history of a musical style, genre, or culture; asking musical or cultural specialists, such as ethnomusicologists, to give demonstrations and/or lectures; going to professional musical performances or taking related field trips; watching videos focusing on the music of a given culture; and teaching about non-musical aspects of a given culture, such as customs or geography. Each of these subcategories accounted for 5.1%, or two, of the responses. The last cluster of subcategories each represented 2.6%, or one, of the responses. They were: dancing and studying dance of various cultures; studying composers in a given culture; studying the general history of art in a given culture; and using visuals related to music and culture.
Figure 11. Subcategories of music educators’ responses regarding personal methods used to create a more multicultural classroom in the category of content integration.

The category of an Empowering School and Social Structure was the next most frequently cited for multicultural methods used in the classroom (n=4). (See Figure 12.) Responses in this category were classified into four equally represented areas accounting for one response each: creating an entire school program focusing on cultural diversity (i.e., an interdisciplinarity program, such as “Hands Around the World Day”); integrating material from other subject areas into music lessons; asking students to share stories about their own cultures; and involving students in school programs.
they now require action on the part of governments to be genuine. Yet, many governments do not take action. Why is this? It is because they often prioritize other issues over environmental protection. However, it is crucial for governments to take action on environmental issues to ensure the well-being of future generations. The role of science in this context is critical, as scientific evidence supports the need for immediate action. Governments must prioritize environmental protection to ensure a sustainable future for all.
Figure 12. Subcategories of music educators’ responses regarding personal methods used to create a more multicultural classroom in the category of empowering school and social structure.

The category of Reduction of Prejudices includes responses (n=2) aligned with two subcategories previously cited in Empowering School and Social Structure. The reason for this is that the subcategories seem to have more than one function in relation to Banks’ (1997) components of multicultural education. The subcategories are creating an entire school program focused on cultural diversity and asking students to share stories
This page contains diagrams and text discussing various concepts or processes. The diagrams are divided into different sections, possibly indicating different stages or parts of a process. The text accompanying the diagrams provides further explanation or analysis related to these sections.
about their own cultures, and they were equally represented. As stated previously, each subcategory accounted for one response each.

The last area of methods used by teachers to create a more multicultural classroom is that of the Knowledge Construction Process (n=2). This category’s answers, similar to the Research Question 2 responses, were antithetical to the Banks’ (1997) description of the Knowledge Construction Process. The two subcategories are studying the “use of music all over the world” and stressing the importance of music “being the same all over the world.” Each subcategory received one response. Both of these subcategories were couched in the context of music being a “universal language,” thus negating the possibility of reflecting on music as a culturally framed practice.

Research Question 6

Teachers’ Multicultural Training, Education, and Backgrounds

The final area of inquiry for this study asked educators, “What type of training/education have you had that enables you or would enable you to employ multiculturalism in the classroom (e.g., world music course in college, multicultural education teaching seminar)? (See Figure 13 and Appendix A: Question 15.) There were twenty total responses to this question. The most frequent response to this question was having taken a relevant college music course, such as a world music course. This category received four responses. Following college music courses taken, there was a cluster of categories receiving three responses each: professional education, such as workshops or seminars; a unique performance background, like performing in various countries; knowledge of other languages; and personal experiences, for example,
travelling, reading about various cultures, or listening to music of other cultures. Using other people as a resource was another category cited (two responses). This category includes activities like personal communication with individuals from other countries and professional associations with individuals involved in multicultural endeavors. The final two categories, receiving one response each, were teaching a related college course, "Cross-Cultural Communication," and using informational resources, for instance, the library and the World Wide Web. It is interesting to note that the most frequent category of taking a relevant college course only included two teachers who had taken world music courses, one individual who had taken a couple courses in music of other cultures, and one person who had taken a general music education course that had focused on a diverse range of musics. No reference was given to having taken a course devoted solely to multicultural education. Further, no person indicated that taking a world music course or anything similar was required during pre-service training.
Figure 13. Categories of music educators’ responses regarding personal multicultural training, education, or background.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion and Conclusions

Demographic Information

This study attempted to examine the ideals of multicultural education in comparison to the practicality of such an approach in general music classrooms. The preceding analysis portrays this study's typical general music teacher as female and 46.5 years old with 17.2 years of experience. This person teaches about 36 classes per week in approximately 15 different classrooms. These classes are about 30 minutes in length with approximately 20 students per class, making the teacher's total number of music students around 300. These students are primarily Anglo-American (~88%) with the largest ethnic minority group being African-Americans. In addition, the students are fairly evenly divided between males and females and include about seven per cent of students who have special needs.

This demographic data suggests that teachers are probably somewhat settled in their career and may be comfortable with their own teaching practices and educational ideologies. Also, teachers are dealing with seeing many different children throughout the week, even throughout the day. Because the teachers have so many students, they may find it difficult to balance what they need to do in terms of teaching and administrative work with what they would like to do. This relates to what Klinger (1996) found in his ethnography. The teacher in his case study was limited by teaching responsibilities outside the subject itself, such as administrative demands. Another point of interest is
that although the descriptions of the students show some diversity, there may not be many salient cultural differences between the groups of children. These factors combined may hinder a teacher’s critical investigation into multicultural education. It was hypothesized that teachers would not think about multicultural education in terms other than ethnic/racial differences. Although this hypothesis cannot be confirmed, it should be noted that aside from the questions specifically asking teachers about gender and special needs, no mention was made by any of the teachers regarding cultural differences other than ethnicity/race.

Teachers’ Attitudes and Beliefs

Despite these hindrances, teachers were, in fact, overwhelmingly positive about multicultural education. This is in agreement with the researcher’s original hypothesis—teachers would be positive in their responses because the idea of multicultural education (whatever that may be) seems positive in facilitating learning for all students. Although the conjectured reason for the responses cannot be substantiated, the support for multicultural education can be partially explained by the teachers’ responses regarding the purposes of such an approach. Teachers indicated that multicultural education was important in terms of integrating new content into the curriculum, reducing prejudices within the school and classroom, and, to a lesser degree, fostering a sense of empowerment within students. The idea of an equitable pedagogy was neglected in these purposes, and reflection on the construction of knowledge within music education was actually contrary to the intent of this category.
Integrating content. The findings regarding content integration are aligned with what Banks stated—most educators assume that multicultural reforms consist of content reforms (1997, p. 92). The reason for this being that integrating new content into the curriculum is the most obvious adjustment in teaching. If the curriculum needs reformed, revamped, or renewed, changing the materials on which it is based is a good place to begin. Thus, teachers are using different musics from around the world and associated resources in order to teach, but may not actually be changing their existing teaching practices, conceptual frameworks of music, or educational philosophies. This approach is exactly what was estimated at the start of the research—an “add-on, other-ized” approach. The fact that teachers are not necessarily reflecting on their own teaching practices and philosophies may be connected to what Sleeter (1989) discovered amongst music educators—the idea that teachers are supposed to teach students a body of knowledge. Thus, the teachers in this case would only need to incorporate new facts into this body, rather than changing how or why the knowledge is being transmitted.

Reducing prejudices and empowering students. Teachers were also concerned with reducing prejudices and empowering students pointing to the notion of actually changing attitudes within the classroom and the school. This is a promising finding because it suggests that teachers are aware of cultural differences within the classroom; they are not focusing only on “exotic” cultural groups. Perhaps, teachers are becoming more aware of the need to address such issues because they have had increased exposure to musics stemming from cultures within the classroom. As Stephens (1984) suggests, increased exposure to cultural groups and musics often leads to increased acceptance of them. However, the reduction of prejudices category was actually not focused on as
much as the researcher thought it would be, but was the second largest category of importance according to teachers’ responses. This could be explained by the need for attending to reducing prejudices not being especially noticeable if classrooms seem culturally homogenous, as was discussed earlier.

**Equity pedagogy.** Since the aspect of an equitable pedagogy was neglected, it seems that teachers are not critically assessing the educational environments of their students. Furthermore, it suggests that teachers may not be assessing their own role in the classroom context, and as Ladsen-Billings explained, this issue is one that certainly needs to be addressed (1997, p. 181). This particular point is emphasized by the responses to the question regarding whom multicultural education is for—teachers were only specifically mentioned in one response as being the beneficiaries of multicultural education. This is aligned with the original hypothesis that teachers would focus on students as the being the beneficiaries of multicultural education, while leaving out themselves.

**Knowledge construction process.** Finally, as hypothesized, the knowledge construction process was a problematic topic. Not only were teachers not thinking about how the body of musical knowledge ascribed to in American music education was created, they were actually assuming that this information was universal. Thus, teachers were thinking of music as a universal language and comparing so-called universal musical elements across cultures. This supports the assumption that teachers would not think about why they held their own beliefs about music and music education or how this knowledge came to be accepted in the field of American music education in the first place. This method of approaching multicultural education in music is exactly what
Elliott called modified multiculturalism (1989). It accepts and values musics from around the world, but teaches all musics through a mono-cultural frame. It has been this researcher’s experience that this is the most common way of approaching multicultural music education, even by scholars of multicultural music education in higher educational institutions. Indeed, this is what Roberts (1982) found in his study—teachers were using musics from around the world, but for the purpose of teaching musical elements in order to encourage aesthetic responsiveness. Furthermore, the idea of the music teacher transmitting a body of knowledge to students is again aligned with what Sleeter (1989) discovered in her research. Teachers did not necessarily see the need to reevaluate this information from a multicultural perspective.

A truly multicultural approach that addresses the issue of knowledge construction would have to be based on cultural understandings and practices from the musical culture from which they derive, as was described in Chapter 2. For instance if that teacher interpreted *kushaura* of *mbira* music as “the lead part,” rather than as its literal interpretation, “to lead,” the music has already been misunderstood and misrepresented. It has been atomized into “things,” rather than practices. A cultural context is necessary for not only understanding musical models, but for recognizing the more fundamental aspect of that musical culture’s conceptualization of music, and realizing the situatedness of music is crucial to creating a multicultural environment. Instead of approaching music as a universal concept with similar components, educators need to approach *musics* with culturally specific practices and ideas.
The Application of Multicultural Education

The responses to whether or not multicultural education applies to all subject areas showed some disagreement about this issue. Teachers mostly felt that multicultural education applied to all subjects, but some thought that it applied only or more readily to areas in which the content of the subject centered on cultural products or on culture itself, such as the “fine arts, language arts, and social sciences.” The select-subject responses agree with the researcher’s initial hypothesis and are supported by the fact that teachers saw the purposes of multicultural education mainly in terms of content integration. If multicultural education revolves around infusing the curriculum with new “cultural” materials, then the subjects listed above probably would facilitate this approach, as opposed to say mathematics or science. However, if multicultural education is based upon all the components that Banks (1997) refers to, then the subject matter is only one of several important features, and multicultural education is applicable to all subject areas. Responses that multicultural education applies to all subject areas were actually more frequent, so this is a heartening discovery. This suggests that teachers are beginning to think more broadly about the application of multicultural education. The fact that teachers in general were still focusing on content integration, however, indicates that applications are still thought largely in terms of infusing new materials into the existing curricula.

Teaching Practices

Integrating content. Despite this disagreement, teachers indicated that they were, for the most part, using multicultural approaches in the classroom. Similar to the
educators’ responses to the purposes of multicultural education, the responses regarding
the teachers’ methods used to create a more multicultural classroom focused on
integrating relevant content into the curriculum. Again, this was conjectured at the
beginning of the study—teachers would mainly infuse content into the original
curriculum. Teachers gave examples such as singing songs, playing games, and learning
about holidays of various cultures.

Reducing prejudices and empowering students. A slight difference between the
indicated purposes and methods was that the aspects of an empowering school and social
structure and reduction of prejudices were reversed. Teachers indicated that a reduction
of prejudices were more important than empowering students in multicultural education’s
purposes, but they were actually practicing empowerment methods more than prejudice-
reducing practices. This reversal may be due to the fact that empowering students is a
quality that is often important in American education, regardless of teaching practices;
teachers want their students to succeed and to have a high level of self-efficacy.
However, looking directly at reducing prejudices within the classroom is a sensitive
issue, exacerbated if the educators feel unable to identify with the need for looking at
biases. That is, if the teachers themselves are not a minority group within the school
system or if the student body does not include a large minority population, then this
aspect may lose its relevance.

Equity pedagogy and knowledge construction process. Similar to the indicated
purposes of multicultural education, the facet of an equitable pedagogy was not
mentioned, and the knowledge construction process was addressed in terms antithetical to
its purpose. Again, this suggests that teachers are not necessarily being self-reflective or
reflective of their subject area. The data do not give evidence regarding why this might be, but it is possible that teachers feel, as stated before, comfortable with their positions and ways of teaching. Thus, they may not feel the need to cross-examine what they do or why they do it. This is similar to what Gallavan (1998) found in terms of teachers’ motivation to or even resistance to changing their current methods and ideologies.

**Educators’ Training, Education, and Background**

**Relevant college courses.** A possible explanation as to why teachers are focusing on certain multicultural practices and neglecting others may lie in the educators’ training, education, and background. When questioned about what types of experiences and/or resources they had that prepared them to teach in a multicultural way, most often teachers indicated that they relied upon knowledge gained from a relevant college course. However, as noted before, this category only included four teachers—two of which had taken a world music course, one who had taken a couple courses in music of other cultures, and one who had taken a general music education course that included a diverse range of musics.

**Personal experiences.** More consistently, teachers were relying on their personal experiences, such as a unique performance background, knowledge of other languages, travel experiences, reading, and listening to music of other cultures. Personal experience was hypothesized to be one of the main categories teachers would cite. Klinger (1996) offers an insight into how the teacher in his study often relied on personal experience or the expertise of others to facilitate a multicultural approach. When a lack of training, education, or resources existed, the teacher used a “get-as-get-can” support system, often
resulting in her using resources aligned with her personal background or the backgrounds of others.

**Professional experiences.** In addition, some teachers indicated that professional education experiences, such as workshops and seminars, were a good source of information. As many of the studies discussed previously explained, lack of teacher training or expertise was the main reason teachers were not successful or not motivated to use a multicultural approach; teachers did not feel prepared to do so. A lack of preparation was given as an explanation or at least alluded to as an explanation in Moore (1993), Stephens (1984), Mumford (1984), Teicher (1997), Quesada (1992), Montague (1988), Gilchrist (1980), Maltese (1985), McGeehan (1983), Yudkin (1990), Klinger (1996), Daniel (1984), and Gallavan (1998). Obviously, research is quite supportive of the need for a change in teacher training.

**Teachers' background summary.** To sum, four of the teachers in this study had taken a relevant college course. However, only one person had taken an ethnomusicology course, and none of the teachers indicated that they had taken a course specifically about multicultural education or non-Western cultures (in a non-musical sense). Furthermore, only three out of the twenty total responses dealt with professional training. Thus, it seems that the teachers in this study may not have adequate training to rely on as a resource. The fact that so few teachers mentioned professional education as a resource may also be indicative of a lack of available professional training in music education or a lack of available time or resources on the part of the teacher. The category of professional education was originally guessed to be one of the main sources of training for teachers, but the responses did not support this assumption. The other primary
background source was hypothesized to be experiences related to the teachers’ personal backgrounds. Several categories fit this classification and supported the hypothesis.

**Recommendations**

Although this study did not cover the mundane aspects of teaching, such as how much money was available to fund the acquisition of materials or how much time teachers had to try new teaching techniques, it did look at the pragmatic issues of teachers’ “constraints” and “affordances” in terms of their multicultural understandings and applications (Norman, 1988). From the preceding summary, it seems that teachers are positive about multicultural education, and from the number of teachers employing multicultural methods in the classroom, they feel that it is a worthy approach to education. However, teachers are not fully covering all aspects of multicultural education in their practices or even their understandings. Moreover, teachers are not critically assessing their own position in multicultural education or the Euro-centric position of American music education, which causes a superficial treatment of multicultural education. This neglect is possibly due to a lack of motivation on the part of the teachers, but is more probably due to a lack of preparation in terms of training and education.

Like others who have focused on teachers and multicultural education, the recommendation of this researcher to help overcome this problem is further teacher training and education, and in order for the training and education to be appropriate, it needs to be centered on recognizing differences in how music is represented and interpreted. This training would be similar to the example given in Chapter 2 of introducing Shona mbira music to students. The training would have to be experiential in
many in past, it has been suggested that the development of new drugs and treatments can be slow and expensive. However, recent advances in technology and biotechnology have led to the discovery of new therapies and treatments for various diseases. It is important to continue supporting medical research and development in order to find effective treatments and cures for these conditions.

In conclusion, it is crucial to prioritize medical research and development in order to improve the quality of life for those affected by various illnesses and diseases. Continued support for medical research and development is necessary to address the many challenges faced by healthcare providers and patients alike. It is important to work together to find effective treatments and cures for these conditions and to improve the overall health and well-being of society.
nature, as Daniel (1984) and Mumford (1994) suggest, in order for teachers to understand the musical practices of a culture, as opposed to a didactic approach, and it would also need to force teachers to think about how conceptualizations of music differ. It is critical for educators to understand that a universal notion of music is not appropriate, nor are the “common elements” applicable to all musics if the musical cultures are to be fully understood.

Not only does a need exist for further pre-service training and education, but also for continued in-service training and education; teachers are not “finished” once they have graduated. They need to continually adapt their teaching to the students at hand, the current classroom culture, and to the larger cultural context of society. Further in-service training will also encourage teachers to realize that knowledge is not a monolithic entity, but a fluid collection of ideas and practices that should constantly be de-constructed and re-constructed. Educators are not the holders of the keys of Knowledge, but facilitators of new understandings. However, without adequate teacher preparation and continued teacher support, there is no hope of realizing the true objectives of multicultural education.
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APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE
Questionnaire on Multicultural Education and Multicultural Practices  
in Music Education

The responses to this questionnaire will be used to learn more about practicing music educators’ understandings of multicultural education and multicultural methods used in music instruction. Please answer the questions as honestly as possible, and only write your initial reactions to the questions without researching the answer. If needed, feel free to write your answers on another piece of paper and return it with this questionnaire. Thank you very much for your participation.

Demographic Information:

1. Your name: __________________________ (This information will not be disclosed in results. It is used only to keep track of persons participating in this research project.)

2. Your age: __________________________

3. How long have you been a music educator? __________________________

4. Are you male or female? Male Female

5. Please write the name of the elementary school(s) for which you teach:

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

   (This information will not be disclosed in results. It is used only to keep track of schools represented in this research project.)

6. What is your current class load?
   a. number of classes taught per week: __________________________
   b. number of different classrooms seen each week: __________________________
   c. length of each class period: __________________________
   d. total number of students: __________________________

7. Please estimate the ethnic/racial diversity of your students (e.g., 50% Anglo-American, 25% African-American, 25% Mexican-American).
8. Please estimate the gender stratification of your students (e.g., 60% female, 40% male).

_________ Female _________ Male

9. Do you have any students with disabilities of any kind? Yes No

If so, please estimate the total number of students with disabilities. Number of Students ___________

_Ideas and Practices Regarding Multicultural Education:_

10. Do you feel positive or negative feelings regarding multicultural education?

Positive Negative

11. What is the purpose(s) or goal(s) of multicultural education?

12. For whom is multicultural education?

13. Does multicultural education apply to every academic subject area? Yes No

If not, to which subjects does it apply?

14. Do you apply multicultural methods in your classes? Yes No

If so, please explain what sorts of techniques you use and/or how you make your classes more multicultural.

15. What type of training/education have you had that enables you or would enable you to employ multiculturalism in the classroom (e.g., world music course in college, multicultural education teaching seminar)?
APPENDIX B
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION/Passive CONSENT
April 21, 1999

General Music Teacher
John Doe Elementary School
101 S. Jane Doe St.
Champaign, IL 61111

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a graduate student at the University of Illinois and am conducting a study on the current practices and ideas of general music teachers regarding multiculturalism in elementary music education. In an attempt to collect data on this subject, I am sending a questionnaire to select general music teachers in Champaign County, Illinois, hoping that these teachers will contribute information about themselves. The questionnaire consists of information about current practices and ideas on multiculturalism in music education and demographic facts. The results of the questionnaire will offer participating music educators a comparative look at how music teachers in the county understand and practice multicultural education. In addition, participating teachers will be able to assess their own understandings and practices in relation to other educators from the findings. This information might be used to strengthen and/or enhance teaching methods, hopefully, resulting in a more effective general music program. My ultimate goal for this research project is to offer the results to music education curriculum research in an attempt to assist in curriculum creation and/or reform. No known risks are involved in participating in this research project, and names of teachers and names of schools will not be revealed in the results. This information will be used solely to keep track of participants by the researcher. All completed questionnaires will be kept confidential, and all data will be referred to under pseudonyms. Results from the study will only be used for purposes of academic research. Your participation is voluntary. If you wish to participate, you are free to withdraw your participation at any time and for any reason, and you are not required to respond to any question you do not wish to answer. The questionnaire may take approximately 20 minutes to fill out. If you could spare the time to fill out this questionnaire and mail it back to me, it would be greatly appreciated, and the results of the study will be sent to you upon completion of the project. (The preliminary results should be compiled by May, 1999.) I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at the address, telephone number, or e-mail address listed below. In addition, my faculty adviser in this project is Dr. Jacquetta Hill. If you need to contact her, she can be reached at 226A Education Building, Champaign, IL, 61820, 217-333-8512, j-hill@staff.uiuc.edu. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dawn T. Corso
Doctoral Student in Educational Psychology,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
APPENDIX C
APPLICATION FOR RESEARCH PROJECT IN THE SCHOOLS
PROCEDURES FOR APPLYING TO DO A RESEARCH PROJECT IN THE SCHOOLS

1. Complete and file an application with Sonda Gabriel in the Office of School-University Research Relations (OSURR), 236C Education Building, University of Illinois, 1310 S. Sixth St., Champaign, Illinois 61820. Telephone: 217-244-0515, fax: 217-244-0538, e-mail: sgabriel@uiuc.edu.

   a. MOST IMPORTANT TO NOTE: The Fall 1998 deadline for submitting completed research project applications to the OSURR for projects in the Champaign or Urbana schools is Thursday, September 24, 1998.
   b. Please remember that doing research in the schools is a privilege, not a right.
   c. Your application must be typed with a typewriter or computer—handwritten forms will not be accepted.
   d. Be as specific as possible about the aims of your project, the value of the research results, and your plans for providing copies of the results to the participating schools.
   e. Be realistic in the number of subjects you request. Do not assume the Champaign and Urbana schools are always available.
   f. Attach copies of any consent letters and questionnaires you plan to use in your research to your completed application form.

2. It is generally helpful if the researcher has already established a contact in the school(s) where he or she wishes to work. Although this is not always possible, where it does occur there is a better chance for acceptance of the research.

3. Please indicate below any school or district where you would like to conduct your research and the name and title of any contact person you know there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or District</th>
<th>Name and Title of Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisher Community Unit School District 1:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher Grade School, Fisher, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahomet-Seymour Community Unit District 3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Trail Elementary School, Mahomet, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangamon Elementary School, Mahomet, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton Early Childhood Center, Mahomet, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Champaign Community Unit School District 4:
  Bottenfield Elementary School, Champaign, IL
  Carrie Busey Elementary School, Champaign, IL
  Dr. Howard Elementary School, Champaign, IL
  Garden Hills Elementary School, Champaign, IL
  Kenwood Elementary School, Champaign, IL
  Robeson Elementary School, Champaign, IL
  Washington Elementary School, Champaign, IL
  Westview Elementary School, Champaign, IL
  Columbia Elementary School, Champaign, IL
  South Side Elementary School, Champaign, IL

Tolono Community Unit School District 7:
  Pesotum Grade School, Pesotum, IL
  Philo Grade School, Philo, IL
  Sadorus Grade School, Sadorus, IL
  Tolono Primary School, Tolono, IL
  Sidney Grade School, Sidney, IL

Heritage Community Unit School District 8:
  Heritage Elementary School, Homer, IL
  Heritage Elementary School, Broadlands, IL

Urbana School District 116:
  Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School, Urbana, IL
  Leal Elementary School, Urbana, IL
  Prairie Elementary School, Urbana, IL
  Thomas Paine Elementary School, Urbana, IL
  Yankee Ridge Elementary School, Urbana, IL
  Wiley Elementary School, Urbana, IL

Thomasboro Community Consolidated School District 130:
  Thomasboro Grade School, Thomasboro, IL

Rantoul City School District 137:
  Broadmeadow Elementary School, Rantoul, IL
  Eastlawn Elementary School, Rantoul, IL
  Northview Elementary School, Rantoul, IL
  Pleasant Acres Elementary School, Rantoul, IL

Ludlow Community Consolidated School District 142:
  Ludlow Elementary School, Ludlow, IL

St. Joseph Community Consolidated School District 169:
  St. Joseph Elementary School, St. Joseph, IL
Gifford Community Consolidated School District 188:
Gifford Elementary School, Gifford, IL

Prairieview Community Consolidated District 192:
Royal Elementary School, Royal, IL

Ogden Community Consolidated School District 212:
Ogden Elementary School, Ogden, IL

4. Do you have transportation available to travel to schools outside Champaign-Urbana?

Yes

__________________________________________ Signature of Applicant (required)
APPENDIX D
APPLICATION FOR RESEARCH PROJECT
APPLICATION FOR A RESEARCH PROJECT
OFFICE OF SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

I. Applicant: Dawn Corso (graduate student in Educational Psychology)
   Responsible Project Investigator: Dr. Jacquetta Hill (adviser)

   Applicant’s Position and Department:
   Ph.D. student in Educational Psychology, SCUPE Division
   50% T.A. in Educational Psychology (Ed. Psy. 236)

   Applicant’s Office or Departmental Address and Telephone:
   220C Education Building MC-708
   1310 S. Sixth St.
   Champaign, IL 61820
   Telephone: 217-333-6356

   E-mail Address: d-corso@uiuc.edu

   Home Address and Telephone:
   1107 ½ East Main St.
   Urbana, IL 61802
   Telephone: 217-367-0054

   Date of Application: Tuesday, September 14, 1998

II. Title of Project:

   An Examination of the Ideas and Practices Regarding Multicultural Education of
   Elementary General Music Teachers in Champaign County, Illinois

III. Anticipated Duration of School’s Involvement in Project:

   From: October, 1998 To: December, 1998

IV. Type of Subjects or Respondents:

   Teacher
V. Involvement of Participants:

Number and Grade Level(s) of Subjects/Respondents Needed-

1 respondent per school (This would be the general music teacher for the elementary school. If a particular teacher taught at more than one of the schools listed, then the number would be less than one respondent per school.)

Amount of Time Involved (per Subject/Respondent)-

approximately 20 min. (enough time to complete a 15-question survey)

Amount of Teacher’s Time Needed-

The respondent would be the teacher.

Amount of Administrator’s Time Needed-

None

Will School Staff Be Involved in Planning and Carrying out Project?

No

Names of People Visiting the School in Connection with the Project-

No visitation should be necessary.

VI. A. Project Aims:

The responses to the questionnaire will be used to learn more about practicing music educators’ understandings of multicultural education and multicultural methods used in music instruction. The ultimate goal for the research project is to offer the results to music education curriculum research in an attempt to assist in curriculum creation and/or reform.

B. Potential Value of Research Results to the School:

The results of the questionnaire will offer music educators a comparative look at how music teachers in their county understand and practice multicultural education. In addition, teachers will be able to assess their own understandings and practices in relation to other educators. This information may be used to strengthen and/or enhance teaching methods, hopefully, resulting in a more effective general music program.
VII. Briefly describe your plans, including anticipated timeline, for providing feedback regarding your research results to the participating school(s):

The data collection for this project will consist of mailing the questionnaire to the listed schools in Champaign County (37 schools total) during the fall semester, 1998. I expect to undertake approximately three mailings in order to achieve the needed response rate. The results from the questionnaire will be analyzed during the spring semester, 1999, and I expect to mail out preliminary results to participating schools at the end of that semester. The results will ultimately be included in a Master's thesis, which should be completed by the fall semester, 1999, and will be forwarded to participating schools desiring a copy.

VIII. Information about the use of human subjects in the project:

A. Will the research be conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings involving normal educational practices?

Yes

B. Will the participants in the research be placed at a risk greater than that encountered in normal living?

No

C. Describe the procedures you will use to obtain the informed consent of the appropriate individuals and the procedures you will use to ensure that their participation is voluntary. A copy of the proposed consent form must be attached.

The questionnaire used to collect the data for the project will be mailed with an explanatory letter and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. If subjects wish to participate, they need only to fill out the questionnaire and return it. If they choose not to participate, they do not return the questionnaire. I am following the protocol of passive consent, in which subjects are informed of the research and if they choose to participate, they are consenting to the research. I did not feel that an additional consent form was needed since I will be informing the subjects of the research, filling out the questionnaire is voluntary, the subjects are adults, and the subjects will not be placed at any risk greater than that of normal living.

D. What procedures will be used to ensure that the information obtained will be anonymous and/or confidential?

Each school for which the teacher represents will be listed under a pseudonym, as will each subject, in the results. When mailing back results, each subject will, of course, recognize his or her own responses, but all
results will be coded under these pseudonyms. The only person responsible for analyzing the results is the researcher, and the researcher will keep this information confidential. Also, each subject is informed, in the questionnaire and accompanying letter, that the name of the teacher and the name of the school will be kept confidential. This information will only be used to keep track of participants by the researcher. The results of the questionnaires, listed under the pseudonyms, will only be used for purposes of academic research.

E. Will the proposed research involve the use of deception?

No

F. When will the participants be informed about the objectives and aims of the research? Explain the nature of debriefing.

The subjects will be sent a letter with the questionnaire that informs them of the nature of the research project. Additionally, the questionnaire includes a brief description of the aims of the research. This information is included in order for the subjects to make an informed decision as to whether or not to participate in the project.

IX. Prior Review:

The researcher is obligated to read the Handbook for Investigators: For the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (May, 1995). This publication is available from the Office of School-University Research Relations, departmental offices, and the Institutional Review Board. All research projects must be reviewed by the designated human subjects review committee or individual in the researcher's department or college, or the Institutional Review Board.

Note: This research project was mailed to Ms. Janet Glaser at the Institutional Review Board for registration and review on September 3, 1998. It was thought by the researcher to be exempt from review according to Federal Regulation 46.101(b)1 on page 15 of the Handbook for Investigators. The researcher was unaware that the project also had to be processed through OSURR at that time.

For Human Subjects Reviewer:
Reviewed by- Date-
Exempt from formal prior review? Yes No
If exempt, please indicate exemption category.

X. Researcher Obligations:
A. If there is any significant change in research design that makes the information in this form inaccurate, the researcher must notify the Office of School-University Research Relations and the participating school or organization as soon as possible.

B. The researcher is required to notify the Office of School-University Research Relations as soon as possible of any problems or concerns encountered in working with the subjects, staff, or parents.

C. It is extremely important for all researchers to share the results of their work with cooperating teachers and administrators. This can be in the form of a written report, an oral presentation, or a copy of a journal article or thesis that describes the research results.

______________________________
Signature of Applicant

______________________________
Signature of Responsible Project Investigator (required if applicant is a student)
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RESEARCH PROJECT SUMMARY
RESEARCH PROJECT SUMMARY

Researcher:

Dawn T. Corso

Title of Project:

An Examination of the Ideas and Practices Regarding Multicultural Education of Elementary General Music Teachers in Champaign County, Illinois

Brief Abstract of Procedure:

This research project is a study of the current ideas and practices of general music teachers regarding multiculturalism in elementary music education. In an attempt to collect data on this subject, I am sending a questionnaire to select general music teachers hoping that these teachers will contribute information about themselves. (The teachers selected are general music teachers in all public elementary schools in Champaign County, Illinois.) The responses to the questionnaire will be used to learn more about practicing music educators' understandings of multicultural education and multicultural methods used in music instruction. The ultimate goal for the research project is to offer the results to music education curriculum research in an attempt to assist in curriculum creation and/or reform.

Anticipated Duration of School's Involvement in Project:

From: October, 1998 To: December, 1998

If research involves students:

Research does not involve students.

If research involves teachers, administrators, parents, or other non-students:

Number of Subjects/Respondents Needed—

1 respondent per school (This would be the general music teacher for the elementary school. If a particular teacher taught at more than one of the schools listed, then the number would be less than one respondent per school.)

Time Needed (per Subject/Respondent)—

approximately 20 min. (enough time to complete a 15-question survey)
Special Considerations (kinds of students, classrooms, etc.):

Respondents need to be general music teachers in the listed elementary schools.

Information needed from the cooperating teacher, school, or district:

From Teacher—answers to the questions on the questionnaire
From School—approximate number of students enrolled in the school for the 1998-99 school year and approximate dollar amount spent per student by the school during that academic year

Potential Benefits to Participating School(s):

The results of the questionnaire will offer music educators a comparative look at how music teachers in their county understand and practice multicultural education. In addition, teachers will be able to assess their own understandings and practices in relation to other educators. This information may be used to strengthen and/or enhance teaching methods, hopefully, resulting in a more effective general music program.
Figure F1. Age and years of teaching experience of music educators.
Figure F2. Gender ratio of music educators in the schools.
**Figure F3.** Music educators’ current class loads.
**Figure F4.** Description of music educators’ classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Avg. # of Students per Music Class (0 indicates no data available)</th>
<th>Avg. # of Times Each Classroom Has Music per Week (0 indicates no data available)</th>
<th>Avg. Length of Each Music Class Period (Minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure F5. Total number of music students in the schools.
Figure F6. Contribution of each school to the total number of music students represented in the current study.
Figure F7. Diversity of the schools as represented by music educators’ categorizations of music student ethnicities.
Figure F8. Gender representation of music students.
Figure F9. Representation of music students with or without special needs in the schools.