ABSTRACT

Title of Document: THE STATUS OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPOSITION IN
                        ELEMENTARY GENERAL MUSIC CLASSROOMS OF
                        MENC MEMBERS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND

                        Kerry Bowman Phelps, Master of Arts, 2008

Directed By: Professor Philip Silvey, School of Music

The purpose of this study was to examine the status of composition activities in

elementary level general music classrooms in the state of Maryland. Participants

(N=60) completed an online questionnaire with questions in the areas of teacher

demographics, beliefs about composition, and frequency of composition activities in

the classroom. Responses indicated that composition was present, at a low frequency,

at all student grade levels. Relationships were found between student grade level and

structure of composition activity and student grade level and group structure of

composition activity. Implications of the frequency of composition activities as well

as relationships found for music education are discussed. Suggestions are made for

increasing the frequency of composition activities by building upon the most common

practices identified by this study.

THE STATUS OF INSTRUCTION IN COMPOSITION IN ELEMENTARY
GENERAL MUSIC CLASSROOMS OF MENC MEMBERS IN THE STATE OF
MARYLAND

By

Kerry Bowman Phelps

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2008

Advisory Committee:
Professor Philip Silvey, Chair
Professor Michael Hewitt
Professor Janet Montgomery

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

> I only see my students once a week for forty minutes, and there just aren't
> enough hours in the year to have my students learn to sing, play instruments,
> read, learn about great music and musicians, and create! I know that
> composing is supposed to be part of their musical learning, but I just can't fit
> it in. (music educator response to question posed by Strand & Newberry,
> 2007, p. 14).

The above quote from an anonymous music educator reveals one teacher's

frustration in trying to find enough time to teach creative activities. While many

music educators do value musical creativity and more specifically, composition, their

actual teaching practice (especially in terms of class time spent where students are

asked to be creative) may or may not reflect this value. For many children today,

their earliest formal experiences with music occur in their elementary general music

classrooms. Therefore, this study will investigate the use of composition activities in

the elementary general music classroom.

As a general music teacher, I was motivated to undertake this study based on

personal experiences with composition activities in my classroom. While I have had

little formal study in composing, I have found composition activities to be a valuable

component of my curriculum. The most powerful benefits that I have personally

experienced in teaching composition include student motivation, differentiation

(addressing the needs of a varied student population), and application of concepts.

Frequently, composition is useful for assessment purposes as well. Despite these

benefits, it is not uncommon to hear colleagues share that they have difficulty

implementing composition activities in their classroom. This study endeavors to

determine the amount of time devoted to composition activities in the general music

classroom in the state of Maryland.

In this chapter, I will present reasons why scholars in music education assert that composition is a critical component of an elementary general music education. This includes both philosophical rationales and evidence of a growing interest in composition as seen through the development and dissemination of curricular ideas and materials in journal publications, textbook series, National Standards for Music Education, and the Maryland State curricular documents. Secondly, I will provide definitions of important terms to clarify my intentions regarding the vocabulary surrounding the topic of composition, which can sometimes be interpreted in different ways. Finally the purpose of this study and research questions will be set forth.

Why Composition?

Philosophy

Should composition be a critical and integral part of a school music curriculum? The following section will examine this question from a philosophical and theoretical standpoint. Two of the most prominent music education philosophers, Bennett Reimer (2003) and David Elliott (1995), devote full chapters to the topic of creativity and music composition in their fully developed discussion of the elements of music education. Additionally, composition as well as improvisation finds its way into learning theory, even from general theorists such as Howard Gardner, Benjamin Bloom, and Lev Vygotsky.

In current times, David Elliott and Bennett Reimer are perhaps the two best known and most widely read music education philosophers. While the two have different views and beliefs about the value and nature of music education, they both write that creativity is a key component of music and musical experiences. Creating

is featured prominently in Reimer's philosophy as one of his four dimensions of music education: feeling, meaning, contextual, and *creating* (Reimer, 2003). While composition is traditionally thought of as the creative process in music, there are several other musical elements in the creative dimension. Reimer discusses performance, improvisation, and listening, in addition to composition as being the elements of the creative dimension (2003).

Elliott also speaks out against the compartmentalization of performing and creating. A musical performance is inherently creative as the performers make artistic choices to create their own unique performance. Elliott recognizes this creative aspect in performance (1995). Other music education researchers, such as Kratus, include performance in their classification of creative activities: "(1) exploration, (2) improvisation, (3) composition, and (4) creative performance" (Kratus, 1990, p. 35). The writings of yet another researcher, Barrett also support a broad view of musical creativity, "While composition and improvisation have traditionally been viewed as the province of creativity in music and music education, these are not necessarily the only processes through which creative activity is evidenced" (Barrett, 2003, p. 4). The current study deals with musical creativity in the form of composition and improvisation but recognizes that these are not the only creative aspects of music.

From its inception, Bloom's taxonomy has focused on the importance of the learner progressing from basic factual knowledge to higher level thinking (involving more application and synthesis of knowledge). Recently Bloom's taxonomy has been revised, resulting in an increased emphasis on metacognitive thinking, particularly in

tasks involving creating (Hanna, 2007). In his article, Hanna places the National Standards for music education into Bloom's new taxonomy. Composition and improvisation fall into the highest level of thinking because these activities require the learner to apply factual knowledge (lower level in the taxonomy) and skills (intermediate level) with his/her own metacognitive awareness to create a product (Hanna, 2007). In light of this, composition can serve as a valuable way of developing and promoting higher-level thinking in music students.

In addition to his well-known theory of multiple intelligences, which lists music as one of the intelligences, Howard Gardner has also categorized creativity into two types or groups. These are "little-c" and "big-C" creativity, useful for categorizing creativity in any of the arts (Gardner, 1993; Barrett, 2003). Works of masters such as Stravinsky, Picasso, and T. S. Eliot would be categorized as big-C creativity (Gardner, 1993; Barrett, 2003). On the other hand, the works that students create in an elementary music classroom would be examples of little-c creativity. Barrett explains, "While children's composition endeavors may not always yield a product that would be judged as a worthy addition to a society's cultural capital (a big-C contribution), through the notion of little-c creativity, children may be viewed as capable of producing creative compositions" (Barrett, 2003, p. 5). Young children's novel solutions to musical problems demonstrate little-c creativity. While these solutions that result in simple compositions would not be considered a creative masterwork and therefore would not be examples of big-C creativity, they represent an important achievement in the child's creative solution to a problem.

Several writers discuss the balance between process and product in creative activities. Webster states, "Some view the very presence of music in the schools as an example of educational commitment to creativity, while others gauge creativity solely by the products of these programs or the awards they win" (Webster, 1990, p. 22). Webster is cautioning against judging creativity on just the product and is advocating the importance of the process. Whereas the product is the most important element of a masterwork of big-C creativity, the process carries much more emphasis in the little-c creativity exhibited by elementary music students. Alfred Balkin (1990) uses a formula to represent creativity: C=3P, where creativity is made up of person, process, and product. Several other researchers echo the importance of more than just a final product in creativity. Hickey (2003) includes "place" along with the person, process, and product in Balkin's creativity formula. For optimum creativity, a safe, nurturing classroom environment is critical to this holistic view of creativity.

Central to constructivist beliefs in education is the idea of "socially meaningful activity" first proposed by Lev Vygotsky (Schunk, 2004, p. 293). Composition lends itself well to this belief, particularly as it can incorporate and allow students to apply conceptual knowledge in practical ways. By creating music, students are able to apply musical concepts learned in class in a way that provides a new context of meaning for these concepts.

Journal Publications

One way to determine trends in the field of music education is to perform a content analysis of current publications or journals in the field. The prevalence of a given topic lends credence to its inclusion in music classrooms. Sample (1992)

completed a comprehensive analysis of major music education research journals from their inceptions (the earliest being 1963) to 1989. Sample examined the *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *the Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, and *Contributions to Music Education* to determine which research studies were cited most frequently, thereby making them the most influential. The study generated a list of approximately 27 articles that were cited ten or more times in the time period examined. Of these articles, there appears to be little if any connection to composition and creativity. Only one article had the potential to address these activities in the music classroom (Sample, 1992). Based on this analysis, it can be surmised that the presence of the topic of composition in scholarly journals is minimal from 1963-1989.

More current research shows a growing presence of composition activities for school children in music education research publications. The *Music Educators Journal* frequently includes articles on composition and has also devoted several special focus issues entirely to creativity in music, with the first being in 1990 (Hickey, 2001). More recently, the *Music Educators Journal* published a second issue dedicated to composition in July of 2001. Additionally, Webster has compiled a comprehensive annotated bibliography of publications on the topic of creative thinking in music (2003a). This bibliography is extensive and includes 529 sources, which are primarily journal articles, but also dissertations, theses, books, and conference reports and transcriptions. The majority of the entries are dated from the mid-late 1970's to the present, with a just a few entries from prior to this time period.

While not all of the sources are directly related to composition, they do fall into the larger topic of creativity.

Textbook Series

Over the years, several textbook series have been developed for use in elementary (and middle school) general music classrooms. While all music educators do not universally use these textbooks, these books are present in many music classrooms and frequently serve as a teacher's curriculum guide. Four texts were analyzed to determine how frequently curriculum activities appeared in the curriculum addressed in these books. To see a representative cross-section, grade 4 teacher's edition textbooks were used. This grade level was chosen because students at this level are generally understood to have had several years of general music education resulting in knowledge of music elements and skills that support reading of standard music notation. In many cases, students make use of the textbooks themselves as opposed to earlier elementary grades where a single "Big Book" is frequently used. The four texts examined span the years 1988 to 2005. In chronological order the texts are, *Music and You* (1988), *Share the Music* (2000), *Making Music* (2005), and *Spotlight on Music* (2005).

Of the four texts listed above, *Music and You* had the fewest instances of composition. In the index, there were seven entries specifically for composition, listed under the broader categories of creative activities. These creative activities were found almost entirely in the teacher's edition (not in the student text) and while clear, were not specific. For example, one activity categorized as "compose" in the index is explained, "Choose instruments or environmental sounds in the classroom to

7

create a class composition entitled, 'Cloudburst'" (Stanton et al., 1988, p. 48). This guideline leaves a great deal for the teacher to determine regarding how to carry out the activity. All three remaining texts make use of composition as an assessment tool by including a "create" component in their unit assessments. An example found in *Share the Music* asks students to "Create a melody. Use the pitches F G A C D. Use this eight-beat pattern" (Bond, 2000, p. 47). Like the example above, these "create" sections are frequently fairly brief, but they do provide a regular occurrence of student musical creation. The index in *Share the Music* combines the listings for composition and improvisation for a total of 32 listings. *Share the Music* has some rare instances where improvisation activities are embedded in the student text. Likewise, *Making Music* and *Spotlight on Music* include some composition activities in the student and teacher text, however, these activities occur more frequently then in the *Share the Music* text. The index of *Making Music* lists 34 songs for creating, as well as three for composing and six for improvising. A feature unique to *Spotlight on Music* is the "creative unit project." This is found in the teacher's edition throughout the book and allows for a more long-range composition activity. The classified index in *Spotlight on Music* is subdivided in greater detail than any of the other three texts examined, making it difficult to list a single number of composition or improvisation activities. For example, there are 25 entries for improvising a melody, 28 entries for improvising rhythm, and eleven entries for the category titled, "composing, improvising, arranging accompaniment, improvising."

While this brief analysis of these four texts is not exhaustive, two generalizations can be formed. First, writers and editors of these texts deemed that

composition and creative activities were valued enough to be included. Second, there

appears to be a trend where there are increasingly greater instances of composition

activities included in these texts in recent years. The earliest text examined, *Music

and You*, had the least instances of composition and creative activities while the two

most recent texts, *Making Music* and *Spotlight on Music*, had the most.

<div align="center">*National Standards*</div>

In 1994, the National Standards for Music Education were adopted (Mark,

2002). The music content standards were a part of the National Standards for Arts

Education, developed as a part of legislation entitled Goals 2000: Educate America

Act. Congress passed this legislation in 1994 during the Clinton administration

(Mark, 2002). These nine music content standards were designed to provide the

framework for quality music education across the nation. Included in these standards,

are (3) Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments and (4) Composing

and arranging music within specified guidelines (*National Standards*, 1994). The

standards promote a comprehensive approach to music education, especially in the

general music classroom. The standards indicate that students should be presented

with the opportunity to improvise, compose, and more generally, create. Even though

the idea of musical creation has been a part of music education prior to the

development of the National Standards, the standards provided new attention to

creativity in music by listing it as being important and comparable to other forms of

music making. These trends and initiatives indicate a favorable attitude toward the

inclusion of composition activities in students' music education. The notable presence

of composition activities on the list of standards and the attention given to the topic

through focus issues of the *Music Educators Journal* show that there is a sense among experts in the profession that composition is an important music activity that should be present in general music education.

Composition in Maryland Schools

The Maryland State Board of Education, while adhering generally to the National Standards, has also created its own Essential Learner Outcomes (ELOs). There are four main outcomes, the third of which is "Creative Expression and Production" (*Maryland Fine Arts*, 2006). In recent years, the state of Maryland has been in the process of developing a state-wide curriculum that refines and defines the outcomes for classroom implementation. For several years, this Voluntary State Curriculum has been in a draft version and has yet to be formally adopted. Nonetheless, it does provide grade-by-grade recommendations for teaching each of the components of the ELOs. Unfortunately, since this document is in its draft form, literature is not available to determine the extent to which it is implemented in music classrooms throughout the state. This draft curriculum will be examined in greater detail in the literature review of this study with particular attention toward determining the role (or the proposed role) of composition in Maryland's music classrooms.

Definitions

The terms surrounding music composition can be defined in multiple ways. Barrett laments the way that the terms "composition" and "creativity" are used interchangeably (2003). While commonly used interchangeably, "composition," "improvisation," and "creativity" are three separate terms, and should each remain

10

distinct and be applied in appropriate ways. In an effort to clarify further discussion

regarding composition, these three terms will be defined in this section. Since these

terms have been interpreted to have different meanings in different contexts, it is

important to clarify their meanings as they are intended for this study.

Creativity

The term "creativity" is extremely broad, and therefore difficult to define.

Therefore, it is important to establish a general understanding of the term, as it will be

used in later discussion. Composition and improvisation are specific forms of music

creating and therefore fall under the larger umbrella of creativity or creative activities.

As discussed earlier, both process and product are important elements of

creativity. Kratus (1990) subscribes to a belief similar to Balkin's C=3P; "Every

creative act consists of three components: (1) the person who is creating, (2), the

process of creation, and (3) the product that is created" (p. 34). Contrary to the often-

held misconception that only those born with a talent are able to compose, creativity

is teachable as stated by Balkin; "Creativity, on the other hand, is an acquired

behavior—learnable, teachable, tangible, and crucial to human development" (1990,

p. 29). For conciseness, creativity will be used here to denote the process used to

solve musical problems and the ensuing solutions. Depending on the musical

problem posed by the teacher, students may be required to use the processes of

composition and improvisation to reach a solution.

Composition and Improvisation

Composition and improvisation share some similarities, but are fundamentally

different. Both improvisation and composition could be loosely defined as "creating

music." The key area that sets composition apart from improvisation is the *intention* of the act of composing and the ability to re-create or perform at any later point what has been created. Kratus explains that the main difference between composition and improvisation is the reflective aspect of composition, "Composition can be thought of as 'reflective improvisation,' because time to reflect and change musical ideas is an integral part of the process" (Kratus, 1990, p. 36). Unlike a composed work, an improvisation is not intended to be reproduced at a later time, either by the original creator/performer of the improvisation or by a new individual. For this reason, improvisations are not generally notated. Composition preserves the musical creation, often in a notated form, either in the traditional format of Western music, or any graphic or invented method of notation, but can also be preserved in non-written forms, such as audio recording. While composition and improvisation are two different and distinct processes, they will be addressed in this study. At the elementary level, improvisation is frequently used as a method to allow students to explore and create sounds and music. As a result, many elementary general music teachers treat or classify what would technically be considered *improvisation* as *composition.* Early pilot study findings (discussed later) demonstrate this common treatment of these terms. When given a specific definition of composition, survey respondents listed examples of improvisation activities as "composition" activities. Rather than attempt to alter this perception, the concept of "composition activities" in this study encompasses improvisation.

Summary

The frequency of composition's inclusion in curricular documents and standards supports it as a valid component of a music education. Major music education philosophers such as Reimer and Elliott agree that composition is a fundamental part of music and should be present in a music education. National and state standards have provisions for including composition and more recent textbook series are aligned with these standards in their inclusion of composition activities. The prevalence of the topic of composition in journal articles indicates that there are important issues surrounding composition for music educators. Research literature will be examined in the next chapter to determine when and how composition activities are generally made a part of the general music classroom. It has also been seen that while composition and improvisation are two separate entities (with intention, notation, and replication being at the core of their differences), elementary general music educators frequently treat them as similar activities. As a result, composition will include improvisation for the purposes of this study. While both improvisation and composition play a part in the creative element of music, they are not the only activities in music that do so. Creativity itself is a vast entity, and while many have written on the topic it is difficult to distill a single definition of the word. However, important elements are process, person, and place, in addition to the resultant end product or composition.

Purpose of the Study

In the preceding discussion, philosophical arguments, the goals of the National Standards and Maryland State Essential Learner Outcomes, and the content

analysis of the curriculum in four prominent textbook series help confirm that composition activities are considered to be an important component of a general music curriculum. It remains to be seen whether these composition activities are actually practiced in classrooms, and if so, to what extent. The purpose of this study was to determine the frequency and percentage of time devoted to composition activities in elementary general music classrooms in Maryland. The data generated was further analyzed to determine if there were any relationships in the subgroups of student grade level and teacher demographics. Specifically, the study was designed to determine whether relationships existed between:

Student grade level and:
1. Frequency of composition activities
2. Structure of composition activity
3. Group structure of composition activity

Teacher's Demographics:
1. Years of teaching and composition frequency
2. Date of graduation and composition frequency

Additionally, this study was intended to provide teachers' self-reported information on the following questions:

1. What are the purposes for teachers' use of composition in the classroom?
2. What factors inhibit teachers from using composition with their students?
3. How frequently do teachers believe composition activities should be present in their classroom?
4. How do teachers rank composition in comparison to other classroom activities and goals?

The researcher hypothesized, based on available research, that composition activities would occupy a small percentage of time in the general music classroom (<10%). Four areas were analyzed for correlations with the frequency of composition activities used. The null hypothesis was that composition frequency would not be

affected by grade level, teacher experience, or teacher year of graduation.

Additionally, any relationship between composition activity structure or group

structure was hypothesized to be due to chance.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Inclusions and Limitations (Scope of Literature Review)

Much has been written regarding composition in the music classroom. As stated earlier, the *Music Educators Journal* alone has devoted several special focus issues entirely to creativity in music, with the first being in 1990. Of these, studies and writings that have direct relevance to my research questions fall into the following categories: 1) composition in National and State Music Standards, 2) composition's current place in the music classroom, 3) practical rationale for composition's use, and 4) common factors that inhibit composition's implementation. There are other closely related topics that, although relevant, extend beyond the scope of this study. In particular, writings that provide practical ideas for how to teach and assess composition are excluded since they address issues of pedagogy. The focus of this study is not to encourage or train teachers to teach composition, but rather to determine the degree to which composition activities are present in general music classrooms in the state of Maryland.

Composition in National and State Music Standards

In the state of Maryland, there is not a mandated curriculum that all elementary general music teachers must follow. Instead, decisions are largely made at the school district or county level. Based on county curriculums, teachers have varying degrees of flexibility and rigidity regarding what must be taught and how they should instruct their students. Because of the nature of a general music philosophy, students experience a varied and eclectic curriculum in most general music classrooms. Typical fundamental goals include providing opportunities for

students to experience and develop an appreciation of a wide variety of music. At the same time, students are given the foundational knowledge and skills for future elective studies in music. While there are differences in each district's approach to elementary general music, there are several documents that represent a common thread in this discipline. All of these documents deal with and include composition in one way or another and will be discussed in more detail in the following section. These documents are; 1) the National Standards for Music Education, 2) Maryland Essential Learner Outcomes (ELOs), and 3) the Maryland Voluntary State curriculum.

As mentioned earlier, the National Standards for Music Education were adopted in 1994. These standards, designed as a framework for comprehensive music education, were developed to "describe the knowledge, skills, and understanding that all students should acquire" (*National Standards*, 1994). The standards aim to "identify what our children must *know* and be able to *do*" (National Standards for Arts Education, 1994) [emphasis in original]. The standards are not written to show how to achieve results with students, but rather, illuminate which results students should obtain (*National Standards*, 1994). There are nine National Standards for Music Education, with the third being, "Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments" and the fourth being, "Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines" (*National Standards*, 1994). The concept of having uniform educational standards and the question of what this can accomplish is part of an ongoing discussion, but for the purposes of this paper, the National Standards will serve as a point of reference for curriculum ideals. The inclusion of both composition

and improvisation in these standards reflects the value that the music education community places in these activities. Further, the distinction between composition and improvisation shows that these are two fundamentally different activities and should *both* be present in the music classroom. If music educators are to align their teaching with the National Standards for Music Education, then including one or the other is not being fully comprehensive.

The State Board of Education approved the Maryland Essential Learner Outcomes (ELOs) for the Fine Arts for publication in 1997. This document covers the areas of music, dance, theater, and visual arts and "encompasses the outcomes, expectations, and indicators of student success in the four disciplines" (*Maryland Fine Arts,* 2006). The summary document for elementary music states, "All school systems across the State are aligning arts curricular programs with the ELOs to ensure that all students are able to meet or exceed State standards in the arts" (*Maryland Fine Arts*, 2006). There are four ELOs for general music:

> I. Perceiving, Performing, and Responding-Aesthetic Education
> > Demonstrate the ability to perceive, perform, and respond to music.
> II. Historical, Cultural, and Social Context
> > Demonstrate an understanding of music as an essential aspect of history and human experience.
> III. Creative Expression and Production
> > Demonstrate the ability to organize musical ideas and sounds creatively.
> IV. Aesthetic Criticism
> > Demonstrate the ability to make aesthetic judgments.

The third of the four ELOs listed above deals directly with the subject of this paper. Students in Maryland's elementary general music should be creatively organizing musical sounds and ideas as stated in the ELO document described above, published in 1997. Creative expression is one of just four outcomes, which could be interpreted

to be one quarter or 25%, of the curriculum whereas in the National Standards, composition and improvisation are two of the nine standards that could be interpreted to be approximately 22% of the curriculum.

The Maryland Voluntary State Curricula (VSC) were developed under the recommendation of Dr. Nancy Grasmick, the State Supervisor of Schools in September 2003 (*Maryland Fine Arts*, 2006). The document is divided into grade-by-grade content standards from Pre-K through grade eight and VSC exist for dance, theater and visual arts in addition to music. The VSC became available to the public to review via website (mdk12.org) in the fiscal year 2005 (*Maryland Fine Arts*, 2006). The grade level standards are organized according to the Maryland ELOs. The specific language used in the Creative Expression and Production portion of the document is significant. For grades PreK through 5 there are two main objectives:

1. Develop the ability to improvise music through experimentation with sound.
2. Develop readiness for composing and arranging by experimenting with sound.

The document lists more specific ways that the above objectives are achieved, for example,

"Compose and use traditional notation to preserve descants which enhance given melodies" (from grade 4, p. 25 of MD VSC, 2004).

Despite the complexity of the above activity, this is still categorized in the "develop readiness for composing" objective. It is not until the sixth grade level that the VSC introduces the following objective (which is used to replace the second of the two listed above)

Preserve musical ideas through simple compositions and arrangements.

These excerpts from the VSC show that creative activities are valued and their use in elementary general music classrooms is supported. However, there is some ambiguity as to how the VSC should be interpreted. Is there a belief that students should not be composing until they reach the sixth grade level? Or rather, is the document written in such a way as to allow teachers flexibility regarding the extent to which their students are participating in creative activities? If the former is the case, then this contradicts research findings such as those by Kratus who asserts, "Students as young as 7 years old can readily engage in creative musical improvisation and that students as young as 8 years old can compose with meaning by shaping their musical ideas" (1989, p. 18). Perhaps as this is a "draft" document it should be recommended that later revisions be clarified to reveal the true intent.

Current Place of Composition in the Music Classroom

There are many articles, entire journals, and books devoted to the methodology or recommendations regarding *how* to teach and include composition in the music curriculum. If a music educator desires assistance in how to implement composition strategies, these guides are excellent resources. One such example is Jackie Wiggins' book, *Composition in the Classroom: A Tool For Teaching*, which offers insightful, practical ideas for how to teach composition. Despite the significant amount of attention this topic has received from music education scholars, there are few studies that have sought to determine the extent to which composition is actually used in practice. These studies that directly relate to the proposed research questions will be discussed in this section.

Composing in Music Class

There are a few studies that have been done with the purpose of examining composition use in music classrooms. One study in Indiana, which sought to answer a similar research question to that of the current study, used a survey to investigate the degree to which all music teachers used composition with their students (Strand, 2006). Strand also attempted to determine whether or not there is a universally-held definition for composition. Strand's survey served as a model for the survey that was developed for this current project. Strand surveyed the music teacher population (general, instrumental, and vocal music) at all grade levels in Indiana to examine compositional practices. The study examined 2 primary areas: who incorporates composition and why, as well as investigating to see if there was an "operational definition for composition" (p. 154). Strand's survey yielded the following results: 5.9% use composition often, 39.8% use composition sometimes, 19.5% use composition rarely, 23% use composition very rarely, and 11.5% never use composition. A total of 54% of Strand's 334 respondents reported using composition either rarely or less than rarely. Of those who responded, Stand found that general music teachers used composition more than instrumental or choral teachers. Based on this information, it was hypothesized that in the current study, the amount of composition would still occupy a relatively low percentage of music classroom time, but that overall results would indicate a greater amount of composition, as the subject group for the current study would consist entirely of general music teachers. As a second objective of her survey, Strand attempted to reach a universal definition of the term, "composition." No such definition was found because data indicated that

21

"respondents did not share a unified definition of composition. Rather, the variety of task goals and examples indicated that some respondents defined composition as anything that involved students in some form of decision-making in the music classroom" (p. 163).

Composition was also the topic of a study done by Dogani. Dogani examined the composition practices of a group of six music teachers in England who taught the equivalent of elementary general music (Dogani, 2004). Data were collected regarding teaching practices through questionnaires, interviews, and field observations. Across the board, the areas of maximum focus in music classrooms are performance and listening. In Dogani's study only two out of the six educators studied claimed to include creative activities on a daily basis. The remaining four teachers indicated that they included creative activities as infrequently as "once per term" (Dogani, 2004, p. 266).

Studies of Time Use

Several studies were found that measured composition in relationship to other music classroom activities. Researchers have examined the amount of time spent on and perceived ability to implement each of the National Standards (Orman, 2002, and Byo, 1999, respectively), overall instructional time usage (Wagner & Strul, 1979; Wang & Sogin, 1997) and student activity preference (Bowles, 1998).

Time Devoted to National Standards

Both Orman (2002) and Byo (1999) examined the National Standards in relation to time use in the music classroom. As previously discussed, standards 3 and 4 deal with improvising and composing in the music class. Orman's study involved

video taping typical lessons of 30 elementary general music specialists (Orman, 2002). For each participating teacher, lessons from five classes at each of the six grade levels (one through six) were recorded. The video taped lessons were analyzed and class time was categorized based on activities. These activities consisted of the nine National Standards and the additional areas of: get ready, talking, verbal rhythm, movement, listening to student or teacher, and other. Examination of the results showed that composing and/or arranging music only comprised 1.03% of the class time and improvisation comprised 3.09% of the class time. Grade level analysis of time spent on each standard revealed that generally, lower grades (1,2,3) spent more time composing and improvising than older elementary students (4th and 5th grade). This appears to contradict the popular belief that young children are unable to compose due to their rudimentary knowledge of music and music notation. Byo conducted a survey of both music specialists and elementary classroom teachers to determine their comfort with implementing the nine National Standards (Byo, 1999). It was found that "overall, both music teachers and generalists rated the composing and improvising standards most difficult to implement" (Byo, 1999, p. 117). The above studies indicate that composition, if even present, occupies a relatively small amount of music classroom time.

Overall Instructional Time

In 1979, Wagner and Strul published research examining the amount of time spent on five musical activities: singing, playing instruments, rhythm, movement, and listening (Wagner & Strul, 1979). The purpose of this particular study was to compare beginning and experienced elementary music teachers. The five activities

chosen to be examined did not include composition/improvisation or any activity that specifically involves creating music. The omission is noteworthy, but the authors' reason for omitting these activities is unclear. Among other possibilities, it may be assumed that composition activities were presumed to occupy such a small portion of class time that it was not measured.

Wang and Sogin examined the actual amount of time spent in various classroom activities as opposed to the amount of time reported by the same teachers in an earlier survey. Of the 98 participants who responded to the question pertaining to the percentage of time devoted to creating, 36 teachers reported that creating comprised between 5 and 20% of student activities and 31 teachers reported that creating comprised between 20 and 35% of student activities (Wang & Sogin, 1997). Stated differently 67 teachers indicated that they spent between 5 and 35% of their classroom time creating. Yet, when a sample of these teachers were observed, it was found that only 1.33% of the time was spent creating, making it the least frequent activity of the 7 tested (Wang & Sogin, 1997). Clearly, there is a discrepancy between what teachers believe is occurring in their classrooms and what is in fact taking place. Even though composition was not a focus of their study, one of Wang & Sogin's three recommendations was to "increase opportunities for creativity" (1997, p. 454).

Student Activity Preference

In a study examining student activity preference, Bowles administered a questionnaire to kindergarten through fifth-grade general music students (1998). A portion of the questionnaire requested students to choose their favorite activity in

music class from singing, dancing/movement, listening, composing, playing instruments, and talking about music. Overall, 6% of the students selected composing as their favorite activity. Bowles also asked whether or not students liked the same activities listed above. Results in this study indicate that an average of 69% of the participating students liked to compose. At the individual grade level, kindergarten and first grade had the largest percentage of students reporting to like composing (86% at both kindergarten and first grade) while fifth grade had the least (50%).

Types of Composition Activities

Wiggins (1990) uses clearly defined categories for types of composition activities. Composition activities can be either teacher-guided where the whole class or group works together, small-group where students work together to solve the musical problem set forth by the teacher, or free-composition where students work as individuals with very little if any teacher-imposed guidelines (Wiggins, 1990). In her study, Strand found that many teachers use the same categories to structure composition activities (Strand, 2007). Dogani found that the majority of creative activities were achieved through a teacher-directed approach (2004). Dogani highlights this finding by presenting specific examples of how the teacher guided the process and led students to what the teacher deemed the appropriate choice(s) in the compositional process (Dogani, 2004).

Technological advancements have provided further methods for implementing composition activities. Software program such as *Music Ace*, *Making Music,* and *Garage Band* are designed as tools to help create music (Reese, 2001; Webster,

2002). An advantage of these programs is that they allow students to compose in various forms of graphic notation (depending on the particular program) as well as standard notation. By using graphic notation, students that are not fluent in standard notation are still able to create music. There are three common classroom models for using composition software. The first is a single computer workstation used by the class as a whole to create a whole class composition, similar to the type described by Wiggins above. Composition software can also be used on a few (approximately two to four) computer workstations. Students would take turns on a rotating basis to use these computers as independent learning centers while the rest of the class is engaged in other activities. The final common classroom setup would be the use of a computer lab, where students could work at individual computer workstations to create their own compositions (Reese, 2001). While this technology is not available to all music educators, (often due to the high costs of providing and maintaining computers and software), it is a viable tool and method for implementing composition activities.

<center>Practical Rationale for Composition's Inclusion</center>

As previously discussed, a well-conceived philosophy of music education supports the position that composition should have a place in the music classroom. Beyond these ideals, there are practical reasons why composition activities are successful.   These main practical reasons or purposes are: 1) as an assessment tool, 2) to develop creativity, 3) to apply music concepts, 4) to differentiate instruction based on students' needs, and 5) to promote student motivation.

Assessment Tool

Assessing composition can be a delicate and difficult manner (Webster, 2003b). Despite this, composing can be a valuable assessment tool. In Strand's study, 49.8% of respondents who used composition stated that they used it to assess learning (p. 159). When clear guidelines are set for the activity, compositions can give the teacher a clear understanding as to the students' mastery of musical concepts.

Development of Creativity

While composition is certainly not the only way that music students can be creative, it would be an omission to not include fostering creativity in a list of composition's benefits. As discussed earlier, creativity is an important and valuable element in a music curriculum. Sherman echoes this sentiment; "A properly balanced music curriculum should require creativity—not for the purpose of ferreting out the creative artists of the future, but for what the act of making can do for the students" (Sherman, 1971, p. 60). Creativity's importance is familiar to music instructors; of those who reported using composition in their classroom, 48.4% said that they used it because "It is a fun and creative outlet when time permits" (Strand, 2006, p. 159). While it is not exactly clear how the respondents to Strand's survey define this "creative outlet," creativity's importance should not be overlooked for the role that it plays in teachers' rationale for including composition activities. However, "when time permits" appears to indicate that there are other activities that take precedence over composition in the interest of time.

Application of Musical Concepts

Much of the curriculum for general music centers on the idea of teaching musical elements. Composition presents an opportunity for students to use and apply the musical knowledge and skills they have learned. In this way, musical concepts are not only discussed or rehearsed, but also applied and appreciated. As Sherman states (1971), "The gathering of information for its own sake, once a respected social and intellectual grace, is now an occupation of value to none but the musical dilettante" (p. 60). When presented with a composition activity, students are frequently eager to inquire about solutions to musical problems that they encounter. In one study, it was shown that of the general music teachers who used composition in their classroom, more than 50 percent did so to enrich learning (Strand, 2007). Through composition, students can be exposed to and apply information about music history, and music of varied cultures in addition to more traditional music elements such as rhythm, pitch, and texture.

Differentiation

Another practical benefit of composition is that it allows for differentiation of instruction based on students' needs. Elementary general music is unique among most school music programs in that instruction truly must be developed to accommodate all learners. By devising activities that allow students to be creative within parameters set by the instructor, students are allowed to work at their own level. Students who come to the music classroom with a repertoire of musical skills have the freedom to apply their outside knowledge. On the converse side, students whose musical experiences may consist solely of what goes on in the general music

classroom (and anywhere in between) can experience an appropriate level of success. Composition provides a venue for differentiation and individualization for the wide spectrum of learners.

Student Motivation

In describing a small-group composition activity with her students, Wiggins touches on the motivational factor of being invested in one's own work: "The amount of outside work that students do voluntarily is a testimony to the validity of teaching in this way" (Wiggins, 1990, p. 18). As discussed earlier, Bowles found that composing was selected by 6% of her study group of elementary school children as being their favorite music classroom activity (Bowles, 1998). While 6% may seem a low percentage of students, this study questioned students for their one favorite activity from six options. In a somewhat unexpected finding, Bowles reported that children in early elementary grades (K, 1, 2,3) had a greater preference for composition activities than those in their later elementary school years (grades 4 and 5) (Bowles, 1998, p. 203). Given students' natural interest in creative activities, composing can be a significant source of motivation for student interest in the music curriculum.

Common Inhibiting Factors

In the studies reviewed, there are several issues that inhibit the presence of composition in the music classroom. The more frequently mentioned relate to time, teacher training, classroom control, as well as practical issues such as materials needed, noise produced, and class size.

Time Involved

In examining the research, perhaps the most frequently listed factor that inhibits the quantity of composition in music classroom is lack of time. Concerns with time are manifested in several ways. Hickey states, "It is clear that the process of creative thinking takes time and is messy, yet our controlled and hurry-up classroom culture is often the antithesis of this (Hickey, 2003, p. 34). In this example, the issue with composition is that it can often be a lengthy process and therefore would occupy too much time. The other common manifestation of time concerns is more universal. Of Strand's survey respondents, 56.9% indicated: "there were too many other learning activities to include composition in the classroom" and an additional 9.1% indicated "not enough time" (Strand, 2006, p. 160). Orman (2002) and Wang & Sogin (1997) include similar concerns regarding lack of time in their research.

Lack of Teacher Training

A lack of teacher training is another inhibiting factor in composition's inclusion. This concerns two areas of teacher education: training as composers themselves, and training in the pedagogy of teaching composition. Reese (2003) discusses the limited experiences that music teachers have with composition itself. Reese suggests that asking music teachers' to teach composition is like asking a teacher of one foreign language to teach a different, unfamiliar language (2003). Because many elementary general music teachers are not trained in composition, their confidence in teaching it is affected as Dogani (2004) proposes: "It appeared that the teachers' lack of confidence in creativity as a medium for self-expression prevented

them from engaging musically with their children" (p. 268). When asked about their reasons for not including composition, 8.6% of Strand's respondents indicated, "I'm not comfortable teaching composition" (Strand, 2006, p. 160). While this lack of comfort could be caused by several factors, it is likely that at least some of these respondents would have felt more comfortable teaching composition if they had had more training themselves.

<div align="center">*Diminished Teacher Control*</div>

In order for students to be creative, they must be allowed certain freedoms. This often manifests itself in a changing role for the teacher. The traditional teacher-based lecture-style teaching approach is not an appropriate structure for most composition activities. Instead, even with whole-group composition activities, the teacher's role becomes more one of guidance as Reese (2003) relates, "Teachers of composition are more like facilitators. They can never be sure what students will compose in response to an assignment, and they cannot know how students' pieces ought best to be further developed" (p. 212). While some teachers are comfortable with this reduction of control, it is not the case for all as Reese states: "Most practicing music teachers today have little prior experience in guiding such an open-ended process" (2003, p. 212). It may be difficult for some music instructors to allow their students the freedom they need to be truly creative. Hickey suggests that some educators believe that students are not capable of handling this type of freedom: "Too often it is assumed that students are only able to work within the strictest parameters and that giving fewer parameters means a loss of teacher control" (2003, p. 35).

Because of this desire to retain control of the music classroom, many teachers reduce or even omit composition activities.

Noise Level, Materials, Class Size

Due to their straightforward nature, noise level, materials, and class size are listed here together. These three factors all deal with the practicality issues associated with composition. A classroom full of students all composing and playing their compositions, particularly if it is a large class can be quite loud. This concern is reflected in Strand's survey respondents, 6.6% of which indicated, "composing is too noisy" (Strand, 2006, p. 160). Several respondents in the same survey (exact number or percentage unclear) also responded that having too many students was a reason why they did not use composition activities (Strand, 2006, p. 160). While technology is not an area for consideration in this study, it should be mentioned that in Strand's survey, 28.2% indicated "lack of access to technology" as an inhibiting factor in composition activities. This technology component can fit into the category of materials needed here as can musical instruments, which 26.5% of Strand's study group listed as another inhibiting factor (Strand, 2006, p. 160).

Conclusion

A review of the available literature on composition in the general music classroom yields some important information. First, it can be said that the community of general music educators and music professionals believe composition, along with improvisation and creativity, are important and valuable aspects of the music curriculum. But, how teachers can include composition and how educators are currently implementing composition in their classrooms is unclear. The three main

curricular documents discussed here, National Standards for Music Education, the

Maryland Essential Learner Outcomes (ELOs), and the Maryland Voluntary State

Curriculum (VSC) all include composition in one way or another, again lending

credence to its importance in the curriculum. However, studies show that

composition still occupies a relatively small part of actual class time; in Strand's

study only 5.9% of those surveyed reported using composition often (Strand, 2006).

The factors that are frequently perceived by teachers as inhibiting their ability to

utilize composition activities include time involved, as well as teacher training,

teacher control concerns, and practical reasons (materials, noise level, and class size).

In the following section, methods to determine how these factors influence the use of

composition in Maryland general music classrooms will be examined.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLGY

This chapter will outline the research methodology used for this research study. In order to answer the research questions proposed for this study, a survey was created to gather data from currently active elementary general music instructors in the state of Maryland. A survey was chosen as the basic experimental device because it offered a means for gathering data from a large sample. This procedure was chosen in order to generate quantitative data with the potential to be generalizable to other populations. This chapter will be divided into the following areas: sample selection, survey development, pilot study, and procedure.

Sample Selection

After examining the available research, it was decided that the sample would consist of elementary general music teachers since general music teachers were found to be more likely to include composition in their classrooms on a regular basis (Strand, 2006). Since the vast majority of general music teachers teach at the elementary level, they were a logical choice for the targeted sample group for this survey. For this survey, the state of Maryland was selected to be the region for the sample. The state was chosen partially because of convenience and the researcher's familiarity with the state. There are many varied populations represented in the state, ranging from large cities and urban regions to many rural and suburban areas as well. From a musical standpoint, music is a subject that is present in the curricula of the state's school districts. While there is not a mandatory state music program or curriculum, Maryland does have its own Essential Learner Outcomes for music.

Maryland was also chosen for this research study because of its recently introduced Voluntary State Curriculum for the fine arts.

In order to develop and refine an appropriate survey instrument, a pilot study was devised and implemented with a smaller research sample. Instructors of elementary general music in one school district in Maryland were targeted to complete the pilot study. This school district was chosen primarily for its accessibility to the researcher. The district chosen for the pilot study employs approximately 50 elementary general music teachers and is of a slightly larger than average size when compared with other districts in Maryland. The district's residents represent a varied population and on average fall within the medium to upper medium socio-economic status. Teachers in this county will be excluded from the final survey because of their previous exposure to the pilot survey.

<p style="text-align:center">Survey Development</p>

In order to collect data from subjects, a survey tool was developed. For ease of accessibility to subjects and simplified data collection, an electronic format for the survey was used. The online program *Survey Monkey* (www.surveymonkey.com) was the chosen format for its ease of use and ability to create multiple styles of questions. This program allows the researcher to develop a survey questionnaire as well as collect and analyze responses. Primary goals for the survey development were to create a questionnaire that could gather data to answer the questions put forth in this study's purpose, gather reliable data, and be user-friendly (both in readability and length) so that subjects would be able to complete the survey in a timely manner. A questionnaire was developed that consisted of 23 questions divided over 9 pages.

Because of its similar purpose and research design, it was hoped that Strand's survey could be used as a foundation for this survey (Strand, 2006). Strand's questionnaire (see Appendix A) provided a basic structure and helpful information, particularly in the list of reasons for teaching composition and of inhibiting factors against composition; however, the survey was too brief and did not provide the detail that was desired for the present study. Of Strand's 14-question survey, the first half (7 questions) dealt with demographics as well as a question at the end of the study regarding further contact. Therefore there were only 6 questions remaining that made up the actual "composition" portion of Strand's study. Of these 6 questions, 5 were directly related to one or more questions developed in the present study.

In most cases, Strand's questions dealing with composition specifically were expanded upon, frequently into multiple questions in order to provide more specific data (see Appendices A and B). Strand's Questions 9 and 10 are directly related to questions 14 and 11, respectively. Questions 9 (Strand)/14 (Phelps) both ask users to select reasons that inhibit their use of composition. In the current survey, a related question was added to determine what factors subjects felt would allow them to be better able to teach composition. Questions 10 (Strand)/ 11 (Phelps) both inquire as to the reasons that subjects use composition. For the purposes of the current survey, Strand's original checklist-type question was expanded to a Likert-type question. The purpose of this was to generate data that gave further detail regarding how teachers perceive the importance of various purposes for including composition activities. While Strand's question allowed users to choose all reasons why they included composition, there was no way to tell if one reason was more important than another.

By using a Likert-type inventory in question 11, subjects could choose whether each reason was very important, important, neutral, not very important, or not important at all.

One of the issues raised in Strand's study was the absence of a consistent definition of the term "composition" as it was used by the subjects in her study (Strand, 2006). Therefore, to increase consistency, the following definition was created for this study and participants were instructed to use it to guide their answers:

> Composition: Any task that involves your students creating original music in a manner that is intentional. These compositions need not be notated (either traditionally or invented), although they certainly may be. The compositions must be able to be replicated by someone other than the original composer.

This definition was placed at the top of page 6, which coincides with the start of questions pertaining to the amount of composition used in participants' classrooms.

In structuring this survey, a decision was made to order the main parts in the following order: researcher information (p.1), consent (p. 2), demographic information (p. 3), value of composition (p. 4), practical reasons in favor of and inhibiting factors against composition's use (p. 5), teacher willingness to pursue outside resources (p. 6), amount of composition present (p. 7-/), and miscellaneous (success, comfort, specific example, and comments) (p. 9). Initially, the value of composing (p. 4) had been placed later in the survey, but it was moved toward the beginning so that the questions about composition did not bias or affect the answers given in the values section.

The questionnaire consisted of both selected response and constructed response questions. The selected response questions are in the form of binary choice and multiple-choice (both single response and multiple response). Drop down menus,

clickable bullets and checklists were used to collect answers from the selected

response questions. The constructed response questions were more open ended and

allowed for subjects to input their own responses. Some questions asked for brief

responses, often numerical, and a few allowed for longer answers. For example,

question 27 asks subjects to, "Briefly describe a composition activity that you have

undertaken with your students. Be sure to include the grade level." Adequate space

was given for such questions so that users could respond appropriately.

Several of the questions in this survey can be categorized as affective.

Affective questions in this survey were designed to inquire about teachers' attitudes

toward composition and composition activities (Popham, 2008). In particular, all of

the questions on pages 3 and 4 of the survey fit in this category as they investigate

teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards composition and its role in the music

classroom. Efforts were made to avoid asking leading questions in order to allow

teachers to freely express their beliefs. The affective questions in this survey are

either checklist or Likert-type. All of the Likert-type questions gave respondents the

following options: very important, important, neutral, not very important, and not

important at all. These options were chosen for their clarity and were kept the same

to maintain consistency.

After initial development, the survey was sent to the university professors

comprising this thesis committee for further input. Based on feedback given,

questions were edited prior to administration of the pilot study. Following the pilot,

further editing was made (see later discussion), again under the advisement of the

thesis committee.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was implemented in November 2007 and lasted for approximately one and a half weeks. The purpose of this pilot was to receive feedback regarding the survey itself from subjects similar to the proposed study group. Teachers present at a meeting of elementary general music teachers were asked for their participation in the pilot study. The verbal request was supplemented with a flier (see Appendix C). A follow-up reminder was also sent via email. Of the 25 teachers asked to participate in the project, there were 20 responses to the pilot; and 14 of the 20 respondents completed the survey for a response rate of 56%.

Based on the responses given, several questions were edited. Please refer to Appendix A for edited versions of the questions described here. Question number 4 asked subjects to list the year that they received any and all degrees. Some respondents listed numbers less than 10 (e.g., 3, 5) resulting in several invalid answers. The response block was changed to a drop-down menu so that subjects could simply select the year.

Examination of responses to question 27, "*Briefly describe a composition activity that you have undertaken with your students. Be sure to include the grade level*" exposed a discrepancy between the participants' use of the term composition and the researcher's intent. Despite the definition listed earlier in the survey that asked participants to define composition as something that can "be replicated by someone other than the original composer" 4 of the 11 responses to Question 27 were clear examples of improvisation. In particular, improvisation on the pentatonic scale was a very common response (4 of 11 participants). Given this high frequency, the

decision was made to include improvisational activities in the definition of composition. Therefore, the final sentence of the definition of composition used on page 6, *"The compositions must be able to be replicated by someone other than the original composer"* was dropped.

Two participants, seemed to misunderstand the researcher's intended definition of "number of lessons" for Questions 19, 22, 23, and 24. These participants answered that they taught as many as 9 and 10 lessons each in the past 2 weeks. Due to the researchers familiarity with the school district participating in the sample, it was assumed that these participants were listing individual "classes" (e.g. Mrs. Green's class and Mrs. Brown's class as separate lessons). To more clearly indicate how these sorts of responses produced skewed data, one respondent indicated that their kindergarten students spent 5 minutes composing in the past 2 weeks (Question 21). The same respondent also indicated that his/her kindergarten students participated in 5 or more whole group composition activities and 5 or more individual composition activities (Question 23). To avoid this particular type of discrepancy, the opening directions of the seventh page were altered to reflect more clear language. The term "lesson" was changed to "session" in order to clarify the definition of a class meeting.

A question was added that clarified and simplified Questions 21 and 22 into a single question. This question asked participants to recall the number of class sessions that included composition and the amount of time devoted to composition activities in the past 10 school days.

Questions 8 and 9 were changed from Likert-type questions to rankings. Pilot responses showed that there was a difference in the valuation of the outcomes (Question 8) and standards (Question 9). By asking participants to rank these, more refined data were produced.

Questions 23 and 24 were determined to be too extensive and generally tedious in their pilot form. A large percentage of participants who skipped all or part of these 2 questions, with as few as only 6 responses for parts of Question 24 and at the most, 11 responses to Question 23. Instead of asking for specific grade level data for the past 2 weeks, the questions were adapted to ask which type of composition activities occurred most frequently. By altering these two questions, respondents were asked to consider the entire school year, instead of just the past 10 days. Several of the pilot responses indicated that while composition activities are a part of their curriculum, they had not been a part of the lessons for the past 10 days. It is hoped that by opening Questions 23 and 24 (new numbers 22 and 23) beyond the two-week time span, the respondents could include a broader spectrum of composition activities.

<div align="center">Procedure</div>

Permission was obtained from the research department of MENC: The National Association for Music Education to send an email invitation to MENC members in Maryland who indicated that they taught elementary general music (see Appendix D). An email with a hyperlink to the survey for this study was sent on March 3, 2008 (see Appendix E). A follow-up email reminder was sent on March 11, 2008 to encourage more responses (see Appendix F) and the survey was closed on

March 14, 2008. All responses from the participants who taught in the same district as

the pilot study were excluded from the study.

RESULTS

An invitation to participate in the study was sent via email to 286 Maryland MENC members who had listed their primary teaching area as elementary general music. The email invitation was not sent to any teachers from the pilot group. Seventeen emails addresses were undeliverable for a total of 269 invitations sent. An email reminder was also sent approximately one week after the initial invitation. The survey was two weeks after the initial invitation.

A total of 68 responses were received, two were removed from analysis respondents did not teach elementary general music in the state of Maryland. Six additional responses were not included because participants did not complete the survey beyond the first seven questions. Thus, a total of 60 useable responses remained for a response rate of 22.30%. Because of the low response rate, coupled with the specific group used in this sample, the data generated cannot be generalized to populations outside of this survey group.

Resulting data from the survey questionnaire were analyzed to determine answers to the research questions. Microsoft Excel and SPSS statistical software were used to organize the data and calculate tests of statistical significance. For all tests, the alpha level was set at .05.

What is the Frequency of Composition Activities?

Respondents were asked to indicate how many sessions at the grade levels of Kindergarten through grade five included composition in the past 10 days. Respondents selected from the 12 multiple choice options listed below, which were then coded numerically for data analysis (See Table 1).

Table 1
Number of Composition Sessions with Code

Code	Response
N/A	Did not teach this grade level during the past 10 days
2	0 sessions with composition in the past 10 days
3	1 session with composition in the past 10 days
4	2 sessions with composition in the past 10 days
5	3 sessions with composition in the past 10 days
6	4 sessions with composition in the past 10 days
7	5 sessions with composition in the past 10 days
8	6 sessions with composition in the past 10 days
9	7 sessions with composition in the past 10 days
10	8 sessions with composition in the past 10 days
11	9 sessions with composition in the past 10 days
12	10 sessions with composition in the past 10 days

Using the coded data above, means and standard errors were calculated for each

student grade level as seen in Table 2.

Table 2
Number of Composition Sessions in the Past Ten Days

Grade level	N	M	SE
K	45	2.34	0.12
1	29	2.44	0.10
2	49	2.46	0.11
3	48	2.51	0.13
4	50	2.66	0.14
5	49	2.73	0.17
Composite		2.52	0.84

Note: 2-12 scale with 2=0 sessions, 12=10 sessions

An overall mean and standard deviation were calculated by averaging the six grade

levels (K-5) reported by each respondent. The composite mean of 2.52 indicates that

on average, the participants in the survey used composition activities less than one

time in the past 10 days.

What Percentage of Time is Devoted to Composition Activities?

To determine the percentage of time spent composing, data from Questions 16

(How many sessions were taught in the past 10 days?) and Question 17 (How many

sessions involved composition?) were analyzed. Data were recoded to allow one

session to be represented numerically as 1 in the data. Percentages of time spent

composing was determined by calculating the percentages of sessions each

respondent spent composing out of the total number of sessions they taught over the

past 10 days. Overall means and standard deviations were found for each grade levels

and the overall mean (see Table 3).

Table 3
Percentage of Sessions with Composition in the Past Ten Days

Grade level	N	%	SD
K	45	1.19	7.36
1	49	18.00	0.29
2	49	16.00	0.24
3	49	23.00	0.36
4	50	25.00	0.35
5	49	28.00	0.38
Combined		18.53	

The results in Table 3 indicate the percentage of sessions that include composition in

the past 10 teaching days. These results do not indicate the percentage of time spent

composing, only the percentage of class periods that involved some sort of

composition activity. It can be seen that an average of 18.53% of class sessions

included composition activities.

 Relationship Between Student Grade Level and Frequency of Composition Activity

To determine if there was a relationship between the frequency of

composition activities and student grade level, the data generated from Question 17

were analyzed with a general linear model (GLM) repeated measures analysis. Using

Pillai's Trace statistic, no overall statistically significant relationship was found

between student grade level (K-5) and composition frequency. [$F_{(5, 37)} = 1.12$,

$p=0.37$]. Additionally, there were no significant relationships found between student

grade levels (See Table 4).

45

Table 4
Relationships Between Grade Level and Composition Frequency

Grade level	K	1	2	3	4	5
K		-9.89	-0.13	-0.17	-0.32	-0.40
1	-9.89		-2.68	-7.44	-0.22	-0.30
2	0.13	2.68		-4.76	-0.20	-0.27
3	0.17	7.44	4.76		-0.15	-0.22
4	0.32	0.22	0.20	0.15		-7.64
5	0.40	0.30	0.27	0.22	-7.64	

*p<0.05

Relationship Between Student Grade Level and Structure of Composition Activity

Question 20 asked: (*When using composition activities with your students, what type of task structure do you use most frequently? Heavily structured, Moderately structured, Independent student projects, do not use composition*) were examined to determine an answer to the above question. Responses were coded with: 1=heavily structured, 2=moderately structured, 3=independent student projects, and N/A=do not use composition. Using this numeric data, means and standard errors were calculated for each grade level and can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5
Composition Structure at each Grade Level

Grade level	N	M	SE
K	37	1.29	0.09
1	44	1.38	0.10
2	47	1.62	0.10
3	48	1.91	0.08
4	51	2.09	0.09
5	49	2.27	0.11

Mean responses ranged from 1.29 (Kindergarten) to 2.27 (grade 5). Using Pillai's trace, a statistically significant relationship was found between the grade level and the structure of composition activities [$F_{(5, 29)}=11.34$, $p= 0.00$].

Table 6

Relationship Between Grade and Activity Structure

Grade level	K	1	2	3	4	5
K		-8.82	-0.32*	-0.62*	-0.79*	-0.97*
1	-8.82		-0.24	-0.53*	-0.71*	-0.88*
2	0.32*	0.24		-0.29*	-0.47*	-0.65*
3	0.62*	0.53*	0.29*		-0.18	-0.35*
4	0.79*	0.71*	0.47*	0.17		-0.17*
5	0.97*	0.88*	0.65*	0.35*	0.17	

*$p<0.05$

The statistically significant relationship indicates that as students progress from grades kindergarten through five, composition activities become less structured. Additionally, it can be seen (Table 6) that composition activities at any given grade level are more likely to be structured similarly to adjacent grades. These statistical significant relationships are indicated with an asterisk (*). For example, no statistical difference in activity structure was found between kindergarten and first grade, however grades 2, 3, 4, and 5 used less structured activities than kindergarten. Similarly, composition activities of grades 3, 4, and 5 were less structured than those in grade 1. Table 4 shows that 3, 4, and 5 grade used less structured composition activities than grade 2, while kindergarten used more structured activities. Similar results are indicated above for grades 3, 4, and 5.

Relationship Between Student Grade Level and Type of Composition Activity

Responses to survey Question 19 (*When using composition activities with your students, which type of group structure do you most frequently use? Whole group, Small group, Individual, or do not use composition*) were analyzed to determine whether or not there was a relationship between the type of composition activity and the grade level of students. Means and standard error were found for each grade level. (See Table 7).

Table 7

Group Structure of Composition Activities Most Frequently Used at Each Grade Level

Grade level	N	M	SE
K	34	1.45	0.15
1	43	1.29	0.10
2	46	1.87	0.15
3	48	2.13	0.11
4	50	2.26	0.12
5	48	2.39	0.13

Note: 1=whole group, 2=small group, 3=individual

Pillai's trace statistic was again used to determine if there was a relationship between

the grade levels and group structure of composition activities. A statistically

significant relationship was found between grade level and group structure [F (5, 26)

=11.48, p=0.00].

Table 8

Relationships Between Grade and Group Structure of Composition Activities

Grade level	K	1	2	3	4	5
K		0.16	-0.42*	-0.68*	-0.81*	-0.94*
1	-0.16		-0.58*	-0.84*	-0.97*	-1.10*
2	0.42*	0.58*		-0.26	-0.39	-0.52*
3	0.68*	0.84*	0.26		-0.13	-0.26
4	0.81*	0.97*	0.39	0.13		-0.13
5	0.94*	1.10*	0.52*	0.26	0.13	

*p<0.05

These data appear to indicate that as students progress from kindergarten through fifth

grade, the group structure of composition activities moves from primarily whole

group to primarily small group with some individual assignments. An example of a

statistically significant relationship seen in Table 8 is that the group structure in 5th

grade differs significantly from that of kindergarten, first, and second grade, but does

not differ from that of third and fourth grade.

Relationship Between Teacher Experience and Composition Frequency

The relationship between teacher experience (range 1-37 years) and composition frequency was calculated using a Pearson Correlation. No statistically significant relationships were found between teacher experience and composition frequency at any grade level or with the overall mean (see Table 9). Therefore, composition frequency in the elementary school general music classroom does not appear to differ in relation to the years of experience of the teacher.

Table 9
Pearson Correlation of Teacher Experience and Composition Frequency

Grade level:	K	1	2	3	4	5	Overall
r	-0.16	-0.19	-0.11	-0.11	-0.01	0.24	0.18
N	45	49	49	48	50	49	54

Relationship Between Graduation Date and Composition Frequency

In question four teachers were asked to indicate whether they earned their Bachelor's Degree before or after 1994. The year of 1994 was chosen since it was the year that the National Standards for Music Education were issued. Responses were divided into two groups; before and after 1994. Using the six grade level composition frequencies (from Question 17) a mean composition frequency and standard deviation was found for the two teacher subgroups (see Table 10). Using a t-test, a general linear model repeated measures analysis was conducted. This test found no statistically significant relationships at any of the grade levels (see Table 11).

Table 10
Graduation Date and Composition Frequency Mean

Student Grade	Pre/Post 1994	N	Mean	SD
K	Pre	28	2.25	0.80
	Post	17	2.36	0.71
1	Pre	29	2.38	0.62
	Post	18	2.51	0.72
2	Pre	29	2.52	0.74
	Post	18	2.41	0.64
3	Pre	29	2.48	0.91
	Post	17	2.49	0.74
4	Pre	28	2.68	1.06
	Post	20	2.53	0.55
5	Pre	30	2.90	1.40
	Post	17	2.63	0.76
Total average	Pre	32	2.67	0.99
	Post	19	2.46	0.53

Table 11
T-test for Graduation Date and Composition Frequency

Student Grade	t	df	Significance
K	-0.46	43	0.65
1	-0.68	45	0.50
2	0.51	45	0.61
3	-0.04	44	0.97
4	0.58	46	0.56
5	0.73	45	0.47

As no significant relationship was found, it appears that teachers who graduated prior

to 1994 are not likely to use composition any more or less frequently than those who

graduated after 1994 when the National Standards for Music Education were issued.

In this study, graduating before or after the adoption of the standards does not seem to

impact how frequently elementary general music teachers include composition

activities in their lessons.

What are the Purposes for Teacher's Use of Composition in the Classroom?

To determine the reasons for teachers' decisions to teach composition, the

participants were asked to rate the importance of certain factors in choosing to use

composition. Respondents chose from a Likert-scale of responses, which were

numerically coded as can bee seen in Table 12. Using the numeric codes, a mean and

standard deviation was calculated for each of the factors in using composition (see

Table 13). Of the nine factors, teachers most frequently rated "to apply musical

concepts" (M=1.48), "to encourage original student work" (M=1.54), and "to help

students learn" (M=1.84) as being important in their decision to use composition.

The least influential factors were "to incorporate the National Standards" (M=2.45)

and "to assess students" (M=2.29).

Table 12
Likert-Scale Code for Including Composition

Response	Numeric Code
Very Important	1
Important	2
Neutral	3
Not Very Important	4
Not Important at all	5

Table 13
Reasons to Include Composition

Reason	Mean Response	N	SD	Rank
Apply musical concepts	1.48	58	0.57	1
Encourage original student work	1.54	57	0.66	2
Help students learn	1.84	57	0.68	3
Allow for student-centered learning	1.88	58	0.86	4
Motivate students	2.00	56	0.74	5
Provide a fun activity for students	2.03	58	0.82	6
Differentiate lessons to accommodate student levels/needs	2.16	57	0.96	7
Assess students	2.29	58	0.84	8
Incorporate the National Standards	2.45	58	0.86	9

What Factors Inhibit Teachers from Using Composition with Their Students?

Similarly to the previous question, data regarding the factors inhibiting

teachers from using composition was also collected and analyzed. Responses were

again recorded on a Likert-scale and were numerically coded and mean, standard

deviation and an overall rank were found. Because some inhibitors were not a factor

for some individuals, this response was coded as N/A and was removed from numeric

calculations (see Table 14). With a mean of 4.35 (SD=0.71), "too many other

instructional tasks to accomplish" was the most important inhibiting factor for

respondents (see Table 15). Other important inhibiting factors were "large class

sizes" (M=4.23, SD=1.04) and "takes too much time" (M=4.18, SD=0.68). The least

important inhibiting factor was "never considered it," with a mean of 1.90 (SD=0.97).

Table 14
Likert-Scale Code for Inhibiting Factors

Response	Code
Not a factor	N/A
Very Important	5
Important	4
Neutral	3
Not very important	2
Not important at all	1

Table 15
Inhibiting Factors

Reason	Mean Response	N	SD	Rank
Too many other instructional tasks to accomplish	4.35	46	0.71	1
Large class sizes	4.23	43	1.04	2
Takes too much time	4.18	45	0.68	3
Lack of resources	3.34	35	1.39	4
Lack of funds	3.19	27	1.57	5
Unsure about how to go about it	2.88	32	1.24	6
Feel under-qualified to teach it	2.80	30	1.03	7
It is too noisy	2.27	30	1.11	8
Difficult to evaluate	2.48	31	1.06	9
Does not fit in a structured environment	2.44	34	1.19	10
Not appropriate for students' age	2.29	28	1.12	11
Never considered it	1.90	20	0.97	12

How Frequently do Teachers Believe that Composition Activities Should be Present?

Survey participants were asked, *In an ideal situation, how frequently do you*

believe that composition should be present in the elementary general music

classroom? Respondents chose from five multiple-choice options that were

numerically coded 1-5 and averaged to find a mean of 2.97 (SD=0.86). This mean of

nearly 3 corresponds to the "monthly" in the coded responses. Therefore, survey

respondents most commonly selected monthly as the ideal frequency for composition

activities. Additionally, percentages of respondents choosing each of the five

available options are listed in Table 16.

Table 16
Ideal Composition Frequency

Code	Composition Frequency	N	%
1	Daily	2	3.33
2	Weekly	16	26.67
3	Monthly	25	41.67
4	Few times a year	16	26.67
5	Never	1	1.67
Total		60	100.01

With 41.67%, the greatest percentage of respondents selected monthly as their ideal

frequency of composition. Interestingly, one respondent (1.67%) reported that

ideally, composition should not be included in elementary general music.

How do Teachers Rank Composition in Comparison to other Classroom Goals?

To determine how teachers viewed composition in comparison to other music

classroom goals and activities, they were asked to rank the four Maryland Essential

Learner Outcomes (ELO's) from 1-4, with one being the highest (Question 8) as well

as rank the National Standards for Music from 1-9, again with one being the highest

(Question 9). Based on these numeric ranks, a mean rank and standard deviation for

the each of the ELO's and National Standards was calculated (see Tables 17 and 18).

Of the four ELO's the outcome related to composing was ranked the second highest

out of the four outcomes. However, with a fairly high standard deviation (SD=0.95)

the results were varied. Of the nine National Standards, the standards for

improvisation and composition were ranked as sixth and eighth respectively.

Table 17
Rank of MD Essential Learner Outcomes

Outcome	Mean Rank	SD	Ranked Mean
Perceive/Perform/Respond to music	1.25	0.65	1
Organize musical ideas and sound creatively	2.27	0.95	2
Music as aspect of history and human experience	2.32	1.08	3
Make aesthetic judgments	2.63	1.09	4

Table 18
Rank of National Standards for Music Education

Outcome	Mean Rank	SD	Ranked Mean
Singing	2.13	1.82	1
Playing instruments	3.27	2.07	2
Listening	3.77	2.00	3
Reading and notating	3.80	2.11	4
Understanding music in relation to history and culture	5.57	2.56	5
Improvising	5.77	2.30	6
Understanding music and relationship to other arts	5.92	2.61	7
Composing	5.97	2.22	8
Evaluating	6.15	2.15	9

When analyzing data, a finding emerged that was not a direct answer to the

research questions, but is worthy of mention. Upon examination of the frequency of

composition activities, there appeared to be a large number of teachers that had not

undertaken any composition activities with their students in the time period

examined. The frequency and percentages of teachers who did not use any

composition at each of the six grade levels were calculated (see Table 19).

Table 19

Percentage of Teachers Using No Composition

Grade Level	N	No Composition (N)	%
K	45	38	84.44%
1	49	33	67.34%
2	49	31	63.26%
3	49	32	65.30%
4	50	29	58.00%
5	49	29	59.18%
Total	291	192	65.98%

At all grades levels, the majority of respondents did not use any composition, with an overall mean of 65.98% of teachers using no composition. This finding relates to the earlier reported frequency of composition activities. This new information indicates that while composition activities are present, it only occurs in approximately one-third of the music classrooms surveyed.

Data presented in this chapter indicate that composition activities are taking place in Maryland elementary general music classrooms. Composition activities were present at each grade level with no statistical difference in frequency between grades. Neither years of teaching experience nor year of graduation affected the amount of composition. There were relationships between student grade level and activity structure as well as student grade level and group structure. On average, teachers felt that ideally, composition should be present on a monthly basis. In the following chapter implications of these findings will be discussed.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the frequency and percentage of time devoted to composition activities in elementary general music classrooms in Maryland. The results from the present study indicate that composition is indeed present in the music classrooms of participants in the current study. In this chapter the following areas will be addressed: limitations of the study, extent to which composition activities are present in music classrooms, description of those using composition, factors affecting composition's use, composition trends across student grade levels, teacher views of composition, and recommendations for future research.

Limitations of Study

The design and implementation of this study has several limitations that affect its outcome. The sample that was selected for the study was comprised of elementary school general music educators in the state of Maryland who were also members of MENC. Because the researcher was aware that several school districts had regulations in place that would not allow the survey to be implemented with its teachers, the decision was made to select a nonrandom sample composed of MENC members in the state of Maryland. By choosing this sample group, educators from each of the state's school districts could participate in the survey. However, music educators who were not members of MENC were excluded. This decreased the sample size and could potentially affect the data as it is possible that members of this organization may respond different than non-members would. While the data generated by this study can be used for analysis and to make claims for this study

56

group, the findings are not generalizeable outside of this sample group due to the small sample size and restriction of MENC membership and Maryland professional residency.

An electronic format was chosen for the implementation of the survey primarily for the purposes of cost and time. Additionally, it allowed for ease of downloading data to be analyzed via statistical software. However, this format limited responses to those who had access to email accounts in addition to restricting the sample group to those persons who had provided MENC with a current email address upon joining. While electronic communication is common in the education community, it is possible that some potential respondents may have elected not to complete the survey due to unfamiliarity or discomfort with an electronic survey format.

Another limitation of this study is the self-report aspect of the methodology. In any survey, one assumes that the responses accurately depict the situation in a truthful manner. In reality, the actual use of composition in classrooms may differ from the responses gathered in this survey. Wang & Sogin (1997) found that teachers claimed to have spent more time on a variety of music activities in their survey responses than they actually did when their responses were compared to videotaped lessons. Therefore, the actual composition activities present in Maryland's elementary general music classrooms may differ from this study's results, based on self-report error.

Finally, due to restrictions in MENC regulations, only one email reminder was sent to the survey group. While a second or even a third reminder to complete the

survey would have been ideal, it was not allowed by the organization. It is possible

that more frequent communication may have elicited a greater number of responses as

well as an expanded sample population.

<div align="center">The Use of Composition in the Classroom</div>

The responses from the elementary general music teachers participating in this

study indicate that composition activities are taking place in their classrooms. Of the

six student grades examined, mean reported composition data ranged from 2.34

(kindergarten) to 2.73 (grade 5) with an overall mean of 2.52. A translation of the

coded data reveals that 2=0 sessions with composition in the past 10 days and 3=1

session with composition in the past 10 days. Therefore, at all grade levels, there was

an average above zero but less than one in terms of the number of sessions that

included composition activities in the 10 day teaching period examined in this study.

While composition was present in the classrooms examined, it was occurring less

than one time in a 10-day period. This finding of a relatively low frequency is

consistent with previous studies, also indicating that composition occupies a minimal

amount of time in the music classroom (Dogani, 2004; Orman, 2002; Strand, 2006;

Wang & Sogin, 1997).

The number of sessions that included composition ranged from 1.19% of

kindergarten students to 28% in grade five with an overall mean of 18.53%. This

finding supports the study done by Wang & Sogin (1997), where the majority of

teachers reported spending between 5 and 35% of their time composing. In the

present study, composition activities were present at all grade levels, however these

percentages must not be confused with percent of time spent composing. The 28% of

sessions including composition seen at grade five does not indicate that 28% of classroom time was spent composing, rather it is the percentage of lessons that included composition in some way (roughly one out of every four lessons includes composition) If teachers included brief composition activities in many of their lessons (requiring only 5-10 minutes), the actual percent of time spent composing would likely be lower, and vise versa if they spent fewer but lengthier periods of time composing.

While it was not the intent of this study to determine an amount of time that should be allotted for composition activities, there does seem to be need for an increase of what is currently occurring. With an average of less than one composition session in a two week time period, there was an average of 65.98% of teachers that did not use any composition activities. Approximately 2/3 of those surveyed reported using no composition activities in the time period examined. Literature from music education philosophers, national and state standards and learner outcomes, and journal articles all indicated that composition is a valuable part of a music education. There is room for increasing composition activities for those not using composition at all, which is the majority of this study group.

<div align="center">Who is Teaching Composition?</div>

This study examined two categories of teacher demographics to determine any relationship with frequency of composition activities. These two categories were: years of experience and year of receipt of the bachelor's degree. Broadly speaking, neither of these categories seemed to have an impact on the amount of composition a teacher included in lessons. Teaching experience did not appear to be related to

frequency of composition activities which was consistent with previous findings (Strand 2006)

Teachers who graduated both before and after the adoption of the National Standards did report that their students spent time in composition activities. This also is consistent with the findings from Strand's study that indicate focus on national standards did not affect composition use (2006).

The findings in this study indicate that neither teaching experience, nor year of graduation, had any significant affect on the frequency of composition activities in the general music classroom. Therefore, it appears that teachers new to the field are just as likely to use composition as teachers later in their careers. Therefore, if we are to encourage music educators to include composition activities, teacher experience does not appear to be a targeted demographic.   It is likely that there are general music teachers at all stages of their careers that have the potential to increase the use of composition activities.

This study does not attempt to determine whether or not the national standards influence teachers to include composition activities as a part of their instruction. However, teachers who received their undergraduate degree before the standards' adoption were equally likely to use composition as those graduating after the standards' adoption. There are two possible ways to interpret this finding: 1) the National Standards do not affect the frequency of composition activities, or 2) participants in the study were equally aware of the National Standards, regardless of when they graduated. The latter of the above possibilities seems likely, especially

given that all participants in this study were members of MENC, the same organization that created and disseminated the National Standards.

<div align="center">Factors Affecting the Use of Composition</div>

Participants indicated the most important factors in their decision to teach composition were: "to apply musical concepts" "to encourage original student work", and "to help students learn". Strand (2006) found that two of these three factors: "applying music concepts" and "help students learn," are similar to the two most frequently cited reasons for composition in that study, "children learn more through composing" and "I use it to enrich other learning."

When advocating the use of composition in music classrooms, teacher educators can apply these findings by stressing the factors that are most important to teachers in choosing to use composition activities. Additionally, although the factors, "allow for student centered learning," "motivate students," and "provide a fun activity for students" ranked 4-6 most important, their mean responses were all very close to "important." Therefore, these factors also play a part in teachers' decisions to conduct composition activities in their classroom and should therefore not be discounted. There may be room for change by informing teachers of the benefits of composition that were less frequently chosen as "important" by survey respondents, such as "differentiate lessons to accommodate student levels/needs" and "assess students." Available literature on teaching composition pedagogy (Wiggins, 1990) would be valuable in this regard.

The most commonly selected factors that participants indicated inhibited them from incorporating composition activities were: "too many other instructional tasks to

accomplish," "large class sizes," and "takes too much time." This finding is supported by research that indicates that time is a common inhibiting factor in the use of composition activities (Orman, 2002; Strand, 2006; Wang & Sogin,1997). All three of the most common inhibitors found in this study are related to the idea that there is not enough time to complete everything that the teacher desires with the large number of students often taught by elementary general music teachers. While composition activities can be lengthy projects requiring multiple class sessions to complete, they do not have to be. By educating music teachers in methodology for teaching brief, succinct composition activities, it may be possible to help remove the inhibiting factor of time issues. The many available resources on teaching composition, such as Wiggins (1990) present activities that can be accomplished much more succinctly if time is a concern for the music educator.

Interestingly, the most important factor that influenced teachers to teach composition and the most important inhibiting factor that prevented teachers from teaching composition make an unusual pair. Teachers included composition most frequently to apply musical concepts, while they were prevented from doing so because of too many other instructional tasks to accomplish. While both of these factors are fairly open-ended, the intended meaning was that through composition, teachers can ask their students to apply previously learned concepts, such as notation skills. Likewise, "too many other instructional tasks to accomplish" was intended to refer to the other elements of the general music curriculum that must also be covered. Here again is a topic that can be addressed with music educators. By emphasizing how "other instructional tasks" can be accomplished through their application in

composition activities (in professional development courses, workshops, conferences, etc.), music educators might be encouraged to include more composition in their classroom. In doing so, composition becomes a means to an end, where through composition, students are able to expand their understanding of numerous musical concepts.

<div align="center">Composition Trends Across Student Grade Levels</div>

Three areas related to the grade level of students were examined in this study; overall composition frequency, structure of activity, and group size. Statistically, there was no difference in overall composition frequency; teachers were equally likely to compose with their students regardless of grade level. While it was hypothesized that teachers would compose more frequently with older students than with younger ones, this was not the case. Since there is research indicating that students as young as kindergarten and first grade had a greater preference for composition than those in fourth and fifth grade (Bowles, 1998), it is noteworthy that composition was present across all grade levels. On a broad level, it appears that elementary general music teachers believe that composition activities should be present on a regular basis at all grade levels.

Results indicate that there are grade level trends in the activity's structure and group size. Survey participants were asked to choose whether each grade level most frequently participated in heavily structured, moderately structured, or independent student projects. After analyzing the results, it was found that younger students were more likely to have composition activities that were heavily structured. As students became older, teachers moved toward less-structured composition activities.

Similarly, when asked whether whole group, small group, or individual composition activities were more common at each grade level there was also a statistically significant relationship. The younger the student, the more likely it was that whole group activities were used. Older elementary students progressed to small group as well as some individual composition activities. The trends seen in both activity structure and group size show a developmentally informed sequence of composition for students. Research examined indicated that the majority of creative activities were achieved through a teacher-directed approach (Dogani 2004). Although the present study finds that a teacher-directed approach is common for early elementary students, this becomes progressively less of the case for students in third, fourth, and fifth grade.

<center>Teacher Views of Composition</center>

Elementary general music curricula generally allow music educators some flexibility in making curricular choices. Therefore, the extent to which composition activities are included is influenced by the teacher's views or beliefs about composition. This study examined these views by asking teachers to rank standards and learning outcomes that included composition as well as choosing the ideal frequency of composition. When ranking the four Maryland Essential Learner Outcomes (ELO's), teachers gave creativity the second highest rating. Of the nine National Standards for Music Education, improvisation and composition were rated sixth and eighth, respectively. This appears comparable to Orman's time management of each of the standards, with composing and/or arranging music at 1.03% of the class time and improvisation at 3.09% of the class time (Orman, 2002).

<center>64</center>

The high rank of the creative outcome appears contradictory to the low ranks of the improvisation and composition standards. This may be due to the differences in the language of the two sets of goals. The ELO's are much more broad and somewhat esoteric when compared with the National Standards, which are more specific. The ELO's does not break down creativity into the specific areas of composition and improvisation as the standards do. It is likely that because of the broad nature of creativity (as discussed in Chapter One) educators feel more comfortable ranking it high than the more specific activities of composition and improvisation. The low ranking of the improvisation and composition standards is similar to Byo's (1999) findings that these are the most difficult standards to implement.

Survey respondents were asked to specify their beliefs regarding what the ideal frequency of composition activities should be. Given the choices of *daily*, *weekly*, *monthly*, *few times a year*, and *never*, the greatest percentage of music educators chose monthly (41.67%). Further, "weekly" and "few times a year" were chosen by the same percentage of respondents (26.67%). Based on these responses, a further study could perhaps examine how much composition was present within the time frame of a month, rather than the 10-day period used in this study. In this way, actual composition frequency could be compared with the teachers' stated ideal. Using the data available, we know that composition is present, although less than once in 10 days. It appears that if this is extrapolated to a time period of 20 days, roughly a month, then teachers in this study appear to be using composition as frequently as the greatest percentage of respondents (41.57%) indicated is ideal.

Conclusion

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which composition activities were present in elementary school general music in the state of Maryland. After administering and analyzing a survey questionnaire, composition activities were found to be present, but at an average of less than once in a ten school day (or two week) period. Teachers were found to be equally likely to plan composition activities in their lessons regardless of how many years they had been teaching or when they earned their bachelor's degree. This study does not presume to ascertain an ideal frequency of composition, however research does indicate that creative activities, namely composition and improvisation, are valuable assets to the music curriculum. Composition is present in music education philosophies, music education research journals, music textbook series, as well the National Standards for Music Education and Maryland Essential Learner Outcomes. The majority of participants in this study indicated that the ideal frequency of composition activities was monthly. Therefore, they affirm the belief that composition should be included in the general music curriculum.

While it is encouraging to see that composition is occurring, approximately two-thirds of respondents did not use composition activities with their students. More could be done to implement composition into the music classrooms where it is not currently taking place. It seems best to approach this by encouraging the most common types and uses of composition, rather than trying to overhaul current practices. It is hoped that this study illuminates some trends that can be used as grounds for promoting composition, perhaps in workshops and teacher in-service

sessions.   Solutions to common inhibiting factors can be addressed as well as illuminating the factors that most likely influence a teacher to choose to conduct composition activities.   Structured, whole group activities can be suggested for early elementary students, and less-structured small and individual activities can be suggested for elementary students in their later years.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Future Research</div>

After undertaking this study, several areas for future research have become apparent. In researching composition, very few studies have attempted to study actual composition practices in the manner that is attempted here, with Strand's study (2006) being a notable exception. In order to more fully understand what is taking place in our schools, more studies like this are needed. In this particular study, a questionnaire was developed to give a somewhat broad idea of composition's status, while maintaining a degree of specificity. As discussed in the limitations, a survey cannot represent actual practices as accurately as a documented observation or video recorded lesson. A case study of composition's role in several music classrooms may provide this accuracy.

Several questions included in the survey questionnaire were not analyzed; instead responses will be saved for future research. One such example is the final question of the survey, which asked respondents to describe a composition activity that they have used in their teaching. The responses to this question, or others of a similar type, could be used to build a qualitative study, investigating various composition practices.

For reasons discussed earlier, this study sample group was fairly small. A similar survey could be administered on a larger, perhaps even national level. Additionally, other subgroups of music educators such as instrumental, choral, and middle-and high school could be included in the subject group. Composition frequencies from these teaching areas could be examined to determine if any relationships exist.

Appendix A

Survey for composition in Indiana's music classrooms, (K. Strand, personal e-mail communications, October 6, 2007). [format changed slightly to fit document]

Exploring the Implementation
Of Composition in Indiana's
Music Classrooms

Demographics

1) How many years have you been a music teacher?
    1. 1-3
    2. 4-6
    3. 7-10
    4. 10-15
    5. 15+

2) How many years have you taught in your present school?
    1. 1-3
    2. 4-6
    3. 7-10
    4. 10-15
    5. 15+

3) Are you currently certified as a music specialist in Indiana?
    1. Yes
    2. No

4) Do you teach anything other than music?
    1. Yes, I teach other academic classes
    2. No, but I teach after school non-music programs
    3. No, I only teach music

5) Does your school have music standards or use the Indiana State Standards for Music Education? (Please circle one)
    1. Yes, we use local and/or state standards to develop the curriculum
    2. No, we do not use local and/or state standards to develop the curriculum
    3.

6) Does your program use the National Standards for the Arts to develop the curriculum?
    1. Yes
    2. No

7) What classes do you teach? (Please circle all that apply)
    1. Elementary general music K-5
    2. Elementary Chorus
    3. Elementary Band
    4. Elementary Orchestra
    5. Middle school general music
    6. Middle School chorus
    7. Middle School band
    8. Middle School orchestra
    9. High School chorus
    10. High School band

11. High School orchestra
12. High School Music Theory
13. Other _____
14. Other _____

Composition in the Classroom

8) Do you use composition tasks in your music classrooms?

  1. Very often
  2. Sometimes
  3. Rarely
  4. Very rarely
  5. Never

9) If you do **not** use composing tasks, what are the reasons? (Please circle all that apply)

  1. Composing is not an appropriate activity for the types of class that I teach
  2. I'm not comfortable teaching composing to my students
  3. I do not believe that it is a useful learning tool
  4. I have too many other learning activities for my students
  5. There are not enough instruments to have students compose in the classroom
  6. I would use composing if I had access to the technology, but I do not
  7. Composing tasks are too noisy and uncontrolled for my students
  8. I never thought about it
  9. Other _____

(If you do not use composing tasks in your classroom, you are finished here. Thank you for your help! If you do use composing, please turn the page over and continue)

10) If you currently use any composing tasks, what are the reasons? (Please circle all that apply)
  1. I believe that students learn more about music when they compose
  2. I use composing tasks to assess their learning
  3. I use composing tasks to enrich other musical learning
  4. Composing tasks are a fun creative outlet for my students when we have extra time
  5. I have access to technology that allow my students to compose
  6. I want to incorporate all of the National Standards in my music classroom
  7. Other _____

11) With what age group(s) do you use composing tasks to teach? (Please circle all that apply)
  1. k-2
  2. 3-5
  3. 6-8
  4. 9-12
  5. Smaller subset (please name)

  _____

Types of Composing Activities

12) Please use this space to describe your goals. When you incorporate composing, what do you want the student to learn?

13) Please use this space to describe one or two typical composing activities in your classroom.

14) Would you be willing to have a follow-up phone interview to further explore your beliefs and practices?

Yes, you can contact me _____

No, please do not contact me_____

Thank you for your help!

Appendix B

Composition in Maryland Survey, updated 29 February 2008. Can also be viewed at:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=ZH7pLI_2fGwu58kO0jpyOC1A_3d_3d

Maryland Composition Survey

1. Introduction

Colleagues,

Thank you in advance for your time and effort in completing this survey. Your input will help to describe the current practices in Maryland's elementary general music programs. If you have any questions, my contact information as well as my university advisor's (Dr. Philip Silvey) is below.

Kerry Phelps
kphelps1@umd.edu

Dr. Philip Silvey
psilvey@umd.edu

1 / 9

Next >>

2. Consent

✱ **1. This survey is a part of a research project being conducted for master's thesis by a graduate student at the University of Maryland. Participation is voluntary and will not in any way include your name. All Maryland elementary general music teachers who are members of MENC are being invited to participate in this survey. To help maintain confidentiality, please close the internet browser after submitting the survey. You may choose to stop participating at any time during the survey. Please acknowledge your consent to participate below.**

◯ I confirm that I am at least 18 years of age and that I am voluntarily completing this survey for a research project through the University of Maryland.

◯ I do not wish to participate in this study, or am not at least 18 years of age.

2 / 9

<< Prev   Next >>

3.

✳ 2. Do you teach elementary general music in the state of Maryland?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

3. How many years have you been teaching elementary general music?

Years teaching: [   ]

4. Please select the date you earned the following degrees. Select N/A for any degrees that have not yet been earned.

	Pre-1994	1994 to present	N/A
Bachelor's Degree	◯	◯	◯
Master's Degree	◯	◯	◯
PhD	◯	◯	◯

5. In what school system do you currently teach?

School System: [▾]

6. How structured is your county/district's elementary general music curriculum?

- ◯ Lessons are scripted for you
- ◯ Must teach certain topics in the manner outlined
- ◯ Broad topics/outcomes should be taught, but when and how is left to teacher's discretion
- ◯ Can teach whatever topics you deem appropriate

7. How many TOTAL MINUTES per WEEK of general music instruction do students in each of the following grades receive? For grades that you do not currently teach, please select N/A.

	Total minutes of music per week
K	[▾]
1	[▾]
2	[▾]
3	[▾]
4	[▾]
5	[▾]

3 / 9 ▐██████████▌

[<< Prev] [Next >>]

7. Choices:

      N/A
      0-5 minutes
      6-30 minutes
      31-45 minutes
      46-60 minutes
      61-90 minutes
      91-120 minutes
      121+ minutes

4.

＊8. How valuable are the following student outcomes to your teaching? Please rank their importance with 1 being the most important, and 4 being the least important

Students will demonstrate...

The ability to perceive, perform, and respond to music	[▾]
An understanding of music as an essential aspect of history and human experience	[▾]
The ability to organize musical ideas and sound creatively	[▾]
The ability to make aesthetic judgments	[▾]

＊9. Please rank the importance of the following student outcomes to you, with 1 being the highest, and 9 being the lowest. Please use each number only once.

Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music	[▾]
Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music	[▾]
Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments	[▾]
Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines	[▾]
Reading and notating music	[▾]
Listening to, analyzing, and describing music	[▾]
Evaluating music and music performances	[▾]
Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts	[▾]
Understanding music in relation to history and culture	[▾]

＊10. In an ideal situation, how frequently do you believe that composition should be present in the elementary general music classroom?

[▾]

4 / 9 ████████████████

[<< Prev] [Next >>]

10. Choices:
>> Daily
>> Weekly
>> Monthly
>> Few times a year
>> Never

5.

11. If composition tasks are included in your classroom, indicate the degree each of the following reasons affects your decision to teach composition.

	Very important	Important	Neutral	Not very important	Not important at all
To assess students	○	○	○	○	○
To encourage original student work	○	○	○	○	○
To apply musical concepts	○	○	○	○	○
To help students learn	○	○	○	○	○
To incorporate the National Standards	○	○	○	○	○
To motivate students	○	○	○	○	○
To provide a fun activity for students	○	○	○	○	○
To differentiate lessons to accommodate student levels/needs	○	○	○	○	○
To allow for student-centered learning	○	○	○	○	○

12. Are there any additional reasons (not listed in question 11) why you believe that composition should be included in your classroom? If so, please list below.

>

13. What factors would better enable you to teach composition? (Please select all that apply.)

☐ Access to available resources (books, websites)

☐ Workshops, specifically on teaching composition at county in-services

☐ Sessions, specifically on teaching composition at music conferences (i.e. MMEA)

☐ Lesson plans shared by colleagues

☐ Courses in composition

☐ Course work in teaching composition

☐ Access to technology/software programs

☐ Access to necessary instruments

☐ Smaller class size

☐ More instructional time with students

☐ Other (please specify)

>

14. If you do NOT use composition as frequently as you would like, indicate the degree to which each of the following factors inhibit you from using composition.

	Not a factor	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Not Very Important	Not Important at all
Takes too much time	○	○	○	○	○	○
Feel under-qualified to teach it	○	○	○	○	○	○
Too many other instructional tasks to accomplish	○	○	○	○	○	○
Large class sizes	○	○	○	○	○	○
Unsure about how to go about it	○	○	○	○	○	○
Difficult to evaluate	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is too noisy	○	○	○	○	○	○
Does not fit in a structured environment	○	○	○	○	○	○
Never considered it	○	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of funds	○	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of resources	○	○	○	○	○	○
Is not appropriate for the age of students that you teach	○	○	○	○	○	○

Other (please specify)

[   ]

5 / 9 ▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓

[<< Prev] [Next >>]

6.

For the purposes of this survey, please use the following definition of composition and/or composition activities:

COMPOSITION: Any task that involves your students creating original music in a manner that is intentional. These compositions need not be notated (either traditionally or invented), although they certainly may be.

✱ 15. Approximately how often are student composition activities currently a part of the lessons that you teach? Please select N/A for any grades that you do not currently teach.

	Composition Frequency
K	[▼]
1	[▼]
2	[▼]
3	[▼]
4	[▼]
5	[▼]

6 / 9 ▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓▓

[<< Prev] [Next >>]

15. Choices: N/A   A few times a class period
Once in each class period   Once every 2 class periods
Once every 4 class periods   Once or twice a month
Once or twice a marking period   A few times a year
Once or twice a year   Never

7.

Recall the sessions you have taught in the past 10 school days. Please answer the following 3 questions based on your teaching during this time period. Please use 'sessions' to refer to each separate class meeting; i.e. if you repeated the same 3rd grade lesson four times (once each with four separate classes), it would count as 1 session.

✱16. How many sessions did you teach?

	Number of lessons
K	▢
1	▢
2	▢
3	▢
4	▢
5	▢

16. Choices: N/A, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

17. Of the sessions listed above, how many included student composition? In the far box, please indicate approximately how many minutes were spent composing. Choose 0 for any grade that did not compose, and N/A for any grade that you do not teach.

	# of sessions with composition	minutes spent composing
K	▢	▢
1	▢	▢
2	▢	▢
3	▢	▢
4	▢	▢
5	▢	▢

17 Choices	# Sessions	Minutes
	N/A	N/A
	0	0
	1	1-5
	2	6-10
	3	11-15
	4	16-20
	5	21-25
	6	26-30
	7	31-35
	8	36-40
	9	41-45
	10	46-50
		51-55
		56-60
		61+

✱ 18. In general (during the past 10 days), what was the nature of the tasks that the students completed? If a grade level did not participate in any composition tasks, please choose "no composition tasks". If you do not teach one or more grade levels listed, please choose N/A.

Composition Focus

K	⬚ ▾
1	⬚ ▾
2	⬚ ▾
3	⬚ ▾
4	⬚ ▾
5	⬚ ▾

18. Choices: Central focus of the lesson
One of the lesson's objectives
Supportive aspect of the lesson
Brief activity, 10 minutes or less
No composition tasks
Part of a project accomplished over multiple lessons
N/A

19. When using composition activities with your students, which type of group structure do you most frequently use?

WHOLE GROUP (entire class works together to compose)
SMALL GROUP (students working in groups of approximately 2-6)
INDIVIDUAL (students work on their own)

	Whole group	Small group	Individual	Do not use composition
K	○	○	○	○
1	○	○	○	○
2	○	○	○	○
3	○	○	○	○
4	○	○	○	○
5	○	○	○	○

20. When using composition activities with your students, what type of task structure do you use most frequently?

HEAVILY STRUCTURED (teacher leads discussion, students answer questions to compose)
MODERATELY STRUCTURED (students allowed more freedom; teacher gives guidelines)
INDEPENDENT STUDENT PROJECTS (teacher encourages students to compose and gives little or no guidelines)

	Heavily structured	Moderately structured	Independent student projects	Do not use composition
K	○	○	○	○
1	○	○	○	○
2	○	○	○	○
3	○	○	○	○
4	○	○	○	○
5	○	○	○	○

7 / 9 ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮

<< Prev   Next >>

8.

21. If undertaken, how successful are composition activities in your classroom at meeting your set objectives?

○ Very successful

○ Successful

○ Neutral

○ Not very successful

○ Not successful at all

○ N/A (Do not use composition)

22. How comfortable are you with using composition activities with your students?

○ Very comfortable

○ Comfortable

○ Neutral

○ Not very comfortable

○ Not comfortable at all

23. Briefly describe a composition activity that you have undertaken with your students. Be sure to include the grade level.

8 / 9

<< Prev   Next >>

Appendix C

Invitation to Pilot Study

Hello Colleagues,

As a part of my Master's degree at the University of Maryland, I am conducting a survey of vocal-general music teachers in the state of Maryland. In order to evaluate my survey, I need to complete a pilot study. If you are willing to assist me by taking the pilot survey, please type the link below into your internet browser. If you prefer, feel free to email me on CLC [collaborative learning community] and I will send you a reply with a clickable link to the survey. The survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. I would appreciate it if you could complete the survey by next Tuesday, November 27. Thank you in advance for your assistance, and feel free to email me any questions.

Survey link:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=ALabN_2fL_2fyjXCix8NgNObkg_3d_3d

Sincerely,
Kerry Phelps
Email: kerry_phelps@hcpss.org
Pointers Run Elementary
Dayton Oaks Elementary

Appendix D

Formal Application and Approval to use MENC Mailing List (2 pages)

The Status of Composition in Maryland's Elementary General Music Classrooms

MENC Request for assistance in contacting subject group

I, Kerry Phelps, am a graduate student at the University of Maryland, College Park and am planning on conducting a survey of Maryland's elementary general music teachers (who are members of MENC). My advisor is Dr. Philip Silvey. I am requesting assistance from MENC in contacting my study group via email. I will compose the body of the email, which will contain a link to my survey. Please find the link along with an abstract below. My plan to implement the survey this January, 2008.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=RUUDYTS5yApFVS0ju6okmA_3d_3d

Abstract

Student composition is an important part of students' comprehensive musical education. Both national music standards and Maryland's state music outcomes list composition as a necessary component. The purpose of this study is to investigate and describe the amount of composition activities in elementary general music classrooms in Maryland. The amount will be determined in overall percentage of time devoted to composition tasks, frequency of composition tasks, and depth of study of composition. This data will be further analyzed to determine if there are any correlations between amount of composition and demographics, classroom activities, and teacher beliefs. Data will be gathered with an online survey, (developed with SurveyMonkey) and administered voluntarily to elementary general music teachers in the state of Maryland.

Nonprofit Research Use of MENC Mailing List

The database of MENC member names and addresses may be used with no fee assessed for nonprofit research purposes. In all cases, the use must meet the following restrictions and criteria:

- The use must be for one time only; the database of names may not be retained after the project is completed nor may the list be used for additional mailings.
- The research must support of the goals of MENC: The National Association for Music Education.
- The results of the research must be shared with MENC: The National Association for Music Education. It is understood that this sharing of results is only for the purpose of keeping the staff and board of MENC supplied with information that could bear on the policy and operational decisions necessary for the effective functioning of the association. The research thus shared will not be distributed beyond MENC staff and National Executive board; first publication rights are still held by the researcher.
- Under no circumstances may additional contact by e-mail or telephone be made with members on the basis of the list, unless express written consent is granted by each member so contacted.

Date of request: November 19, 2007   Date of anticipated use: Jan./Feb. 2008

Name of researcher: Kerry Bowman Phelps

Nature of requested use: An email will be sent containing a link to a survey about composition use. This survey is a part of a thesis for a Master's Degree in Music Education at the University Maryland, College Park.

Segment of list requested: email addresses for Elementary General Music Teachers in the state of Maryland

Format requested: ☐ ASCII, comma delimited   ☒ Excel database

Disposition of request:
☐ Approved, subject to conditions listed above
☐ Denied; does not meet conditions of nonprofit research listed above. Please call MKTG Services at 1-800-677-7959, ext. 3151.
☐ Denied (reason): _____

Signed for MENC: _____   MICHAEL BLAKESLEE

Conditions accepted by researcher (sign): _____

Please fax signed form to SUE RARUS at 703-860-1531.
If approved, list will be supplied within two weeks of return of signed form.

82

Appendix E

Email Invitation to Online Survey

March 3, 2008

Dear MENC Colleague,
Attached is a link to a survey created by an MENC member and graduate student
seeking her Masters in music education at the University of Maryland. The survey
concerns composition in the elementary classroom. This research will hopefully
provide the field of music education with a better understanding of current practices
in elementary music classrooms.
The survey is being sent to Maryland general elementary music educators. Your
participation is entirely voluntary.   The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to
complete. All information collected will remain anonymous and confidential.
If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know. My contact info is below.
The link to this survey, as well as the contact info for the graduate student and her
faculty advisor, is here:

LINK
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=ZH7pLI_2fGwu58kO0jpyOC1A_3d_3d

The deadline for completing this is March 14, 2008.
The student has offered to share her results upon completion of the project.
Thank you very much for your time and consideration of this request.
Sincerely,

Sue Rarus, Director, MENC Research/Info
MENC: The National Association for Music Education
1806 Robert Fulton Drive, Reston, VA 20191
ph: 800-336-3768 xt. 328; www.menc.org

Appendix F

Email Reminder for Online Survey

March 11, 2008

Dear MENC Colleague,
Thank you to those of you who have already taken the time to complete the survey below. If you have not yet taken this survey, please consider doing so.
Below is a link to a survey created by an MENC member and graduate student seeking her Masters in music education at the University of Maryland. The survey concerns composition in the elementary classroom. This research will hopefully provide the field of music education with a better understanding of current practices in elementary music classrooms.
The survey is being sent to Maryland general elementary music educators. Your participation is entirely voluntary. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. All information collected will remain anonymous and confidential.
If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know. My contact info is below.
The link to this survey, as well as the contact info for the graduate student and her faculty advisor, is here:

LINK
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=ZH7pLI_2fGwu58kO0jpyOC1A_3d_3d

The deadline for completing this is FRIDAY March 14, 2008.
The student has offered to share her results upon completion of the project.
Thank you very much for your time and consideration of this request.
Sincerely,

Sue Rarus, Director, MENC Research/Info
MENC: The National Association for Music Education
1806 Robert Fulton Drive, Reston, VA 20191
ph: 800-336-3768 xt. 328; www.menc.org

Glossary

MENC: Music Educators National Conference

MD: Maryland

ELO: Essential Learner Outcome

VSC: Voluntary State Curriculum

REFERENCES

Alreck, P.L. & Settle, R. B. (2004). *The survey research handbook* (3rd ed.). New

    York: McGraw Hill/Irwin.

Balkin, A. (1990). What is creativity? What is it not?. *Music Educators Journal,*

    76(9), 29-32.

Barrett, M. S. (2003). Freedoms and constraints: Constructing musical worlds through

    the dialogue of composition. In M. Hickey (Ed.), *Why and how to teach*

    music composition: A new horizon for music education (pp.3-27). Reston,

    VA: MENC The National Association for Music Education.

Beethoven, J., Brumfield, S., Campbell, P. S., Connors, D. N., Duke, R. A., Jellison,

    J., et al. (2005). *Making music: Grade 4 teacher's edition*. Glenview, IL:

    Pearson Education, Inc.

Bond, J., Boyer, R., Campbell-Holman, M., Crocker, E., Davidson, M. C., de Frece,

    R., et al. (2005). *Spotlight on music: Grade 4 teacher's edition*. New

    York:Macmillan/McGraw-Hill.

Bond, J., Davidson, M. C., Goetze, M., Lawrence, V., Snyder, S., et al. (2000). *Share*

    the music: Grade 4 teacher's edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bowles, C. L. (1998). Music activity preferences of elementary students. *Journal of*

    Research in Music Education, 46(2), 193-207.

Byo, S. J. (1999). Classroom teachers' and music specialists' perceived ability to

    implement the National Standards for music education. *Journal of Research in*

    Music Education, 47(2), 111-123.

Dogani, K (2004). Teachers' understanding of composing in the primary classroom. *Music Education Research, 6*(3), 263-279.

Elliott, D. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Creating minds.* New York: Basic Books.

Hamann, D. L., ed. (1991). *Creativity in the music classroom: The best of MEJ.* Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Hanna, W. (2007). The new Bloom's taxonomy: Implications for music education. *Arts Education Policy Review, 108*(4), 7-16.

Hickey, M. (2001). Creativity in the music classroom. *Music Educators Journal, 88*(1), 17-19.

Hickey, M. (Ed.). (2003). *Why and how to teach music composition: A new horizon for music education.* Reston, VA: MENC The National Association for Music Education.

Kiehn, M. T. (2003). Development of music creativity among elementary school students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*(4), 278-288.

Kratus, J. (1989). A time analysis of the compositional processes used by children ages 7 to 11. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 37*(1), 5-20.

Kratus, J. (1990). Structuring the music curriculum for creative learning. *Music Educators Journal, 76*(9), 33-38.

Lehman, P. R. (1993). Implications of national standards. *Music Educators Journal, 80*(3), 25-29.

Mark, M. L. (2002). A history of music education advocacy. *Music Educators Journal, 89*(1), 44-49.

Maryland Fine Arts Education Instructional Tool Kit. (2006), Maryland State Department of Education. Retrieved December 1, 2007, from http://mfaa.msde.state.md.us/source/MDFAeducation_1c_2.asp

National Standards for Arts Education (1994). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Orman, E. K. (2002). Comparison of the national standards for music education and elementary music specialists' use of class time. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 50*(2), 155-165.

Popham, W. J. (2008). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Reese, S. (2003). Responding to student compositions. In M. Hickey (Ed.), *Why and how to teach music composition: A new horizon for music education* (pp.211-232). Reston, VA: MENC The National Association for Music Education.

Reese, S. (2001). Tools for thinking in sound. *Music Educators Journal, 88*(1), 42-47.

Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education: Advancing the vision* (3rd ed.).Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sample, D. (1992). Frequently cited studies as indicators of music education research interests, 1963-1989. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 40*(2), 153-157.

Schunk, D. H., ed. (2004). *Learning theories: An educational perspective* (4h ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Scott, J. K. (2007). Me? Teach improvisation to children?. *General Music Today, 20*(2), 6-13.

Sherman, R. W. (1971). Creativity and the condition of knowing in music: Part 2. *Music Educators Journal, 58*(3), 59-61.

Strand, K. (2006). Survey of Indiana music teachers on using composition in the classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 54*(2), 154-167.

Strand, K. & Newberry, E. (2007). Teachers share practical advice on classroom composing. *General Music Today 20*(2), 14-19.

Stanton, B., & Stanton, R., et al. (1988). *Music and you: Grade 4 teacher's edition*. New York: Macmillan.

Wang, C. C. & Sogin, D. W. (1997). Self-reported versus observed classroom activities in elementary general music. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*(3), 444-456.

Webster, P. (2003a). Annotated bibliography on music education and creative thinking in music. Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://musicalcreativity.com/?p=4

Webster, P. (2003b). "What do you mean, make my music different"? Encouraging revision and extensions in children's music composition. In M. Hickey (Ed.), *Why and how to teach music composition: A new horizon for music education* (pp.55-68). Reston, VA: MENC The National Association for Music Education.

Webster, P. (2002). Historical perspectives on technology and music. *Music Educators Journal, 89*(1), 38-43, 54.

Webster, P. R. (1990). Creativity as creative thinking. *Music Educators Journal, 76*(9), 22-29.

Wagner, M. J. & Strul, E. P. (1979). Comparisons of beginning versus experienced elementary music educators in the use of teaching time. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 27*(2), 113-125.

Wiggins, J. (1990). *Composition in the classroom: A tool for teaching.* Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.