

MUSICAL INVESTMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD:  
AN EXPLORATION OF PARENT-CHILD PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZED  
EARLY CHILDHOOD MUSICAL ACTIVITIES

by

Adriana Diaz-Donoso

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Lori Custodero, Sponsor  
Professor Aaron Pallas

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date May 22, 2019

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Degree of Doctor Education in  
Teachers College, Columbia University

2019

## ABSTRACT

### MUSICAL INVESTMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD: AN EXPLORATION OF PARENT-CHILD PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZED EARLY CHILDHOOD MUSICAL ACTIVITIES

Adriana Diaz-Donoso

This dissertation examines issues of social class and musical parenting within the context of an early childhood jazz education program. Using administrative and survey data from 469 self-selected families from six cities in the U.S. where this program is offered, I aimed to identify what factors play a role in parental decisions for enrolling in the program and whether those factors were associated with their social class. Considering this early childhood jazz program as an organized activity supports the analysis of music classes as a form of investment in cultural capital fostered by parents. I used current economic models of the family and theories of social and cultural class reproduction to understand families' participation in the program and their musical engagement.

Principal component analysis revealed four components representing possible reasons that drove parents to enroll in the program: Cultural and Educational Enrichment for the Future; Appreciation of Jazz; Socialization and Bonding; and Social Networks. Simple linear regression analysis showed significant associations between socioeconomic status (SES) and two principal components (Cultural and Educational Enrichment for the Future and Social Networks).

Overall, parents showed high scores of both general and musical engagement, and those variables were highly correlated. Additionally, there were no statistically significant associations between parents' previous formal musical experiences and their musical engagement when controlling for musical materials at home and their average value of music education. Parents' engagement with the program activities was positively associated with their music making at home and that association stayed stable and strong after taking into account sociodemographic factors, parents' values of music education and access to musical materials.

Families from lower SES backgrounds used activities and materials from the jazz class at home with more frequency than families from other SES groups. This finding could suggest that when lower SES families are given access, they incorporate new musical tools and ideas from the jazz program as affordances to increase their parenting skills; therefore, the impact of the program might be stronger for those parents than for the other more advantaged groups. Jazz music in this context seems to be working as an equalizer of opportunities by reducing inequalities.

© Copyright Adriana Diaz-Donoso 2019

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

*Para Feli*

*Tu que lograste salir de la pobreza gracias a tu  
fortaleza inquebrantable.*

*Tu que nos enseñaste a siempre luchar por  
nuestros sueños, a ser perseverantes y a educarnos  
en todo en sentido.*

*Pero, sobre todo, a cultivarnos para ser mejores  
personas y poder apreciar el mundo y la vida en  
todo su esplendor.*

*Tu Feli, eres mi máxima inspiración y lo seguirás  
siendo siempre.*

To Feli

You, who found your way out of poverty thanks to your unwavering strength  
You, who taught us to always fight for our dreams, to be perseverant and to educate  
ourselves  
But above all, to cultivate ourselves in order to become better people and to be able to  
appreciate the world and life at its best.  
You Feli, you are my main inspiration and you will always be.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Countless people offered me their unconditional support during these long years of my doctoral journey. I would like to start by thanking the families who willingly participated in this study, without them this study would have not been materialized. Many thanks to my advisor, Dr. Lori Custodero, who guided me academically during these years, and shared all her knowledge and wisdom selflessly. Her vision of music education changed my life completely. She opened academic doors for me in many ways, allowing me to be her teaching assistant, research assistant, and instructor at Teachers College. She also gave me the independence and autonomy to direct an innovative early childhood instrumental program at the university.

Dr. Pallas, my second reader, his wise feedback, advice and support throughout the dissertation process are invaluable. My gratitude also to the rest of my committee, to Dr. Abeles (third member), my professor of research methods in the arts and who also gave opportunities to start my path as a researcher, and Dr. Brooks-Gunn (fourth member), from whom I learned so much about young children's development and parenting.

To my mom, my role model, always calm and wise in moments of intense discouragement, and who against all odds and with many sacrifices found a way to provide me with a high-quality holistic education since I was a very young child. Without her, this dissertation and my graduate studies in the U.S. would have not been possible.

Special thanks to the friends and colleagues I met during my years as a graduate student and who helped me get through this journey, the lovely Nancy my roommate, sister, confidant and inseparable friend; Faye who helped me collect the data and

mentored me during my years as a master student, and Alison Magistrali and Todd Stoll from JALC who provided me with institutional support.

Special thanks to Marisa Morin, who was not only a boss, colleague and officemate but who also helped me greatly in all the steps of this dissertation. Thank you for being an advisor and editor and mainly a wonderful friend.

Thank you, Juan Carlos, for being here with me during these last critical years, for taking care of me and making me remember that there is always light at the end of the tunnel.

Gratitude also goes to my colleagues at Teachers College, Will Pate and Carrie Seavoy, for being amazing research assistants, and Malika, our wonderful academic secretary, for always sharing with me her endless love and caring.

Finally, I would like to thank the Fulbright Commission in Peru and Teachers College for their financial support.

A. D.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page   |
|--|--------|
| Chapter I – INTRODUCTION .....   | 1      |
| Background.....  | 1      |
| Need for the Study .....   | 4      |
| Purpose Statement.....   | 5      |
| Parenting Practices and Investments in Early Childhood Development: Theoretical .... | 6      |
| Frameworks.....  | 6      |
| Plan of Research .....   | 9      |
| Research Questions.....  | 9      |
| Context of the Study: Jazz as a Metaphor for Inclusion in Early Childhood .....      | 10     |
| Overview of Method.....  | 11     |
| Definition of Terms.....   | 11     |
| <br>Chapter II – LITERATURE REVIEW .....   | <br>13 |
| Overview.....  | 13     |
| Parenting During Early Childhood .....   | 14     |
| What Is Parenting?.....  | 14     |
| Parenting knowledge, attitudes and practices .....                                   | 15     |
| Parental engagement .....  | 16     |
| Parents and Child Music-Making .....   | 16     |
| Music-Making in Unstructured Settings.....   | 17     |
| Musical Parenting .....  | 18     |
| Factors influencing musical parenting.....   | 19     |
| Age of the child.....  | 19     |
| Parents’ musical experience.....   | 20     |
| Demographic family characteristics .....   | 21     |
| Frequency and type of musical interactions involved in musical parenting.....        | 21     |
| Music-Making in Organized Activities for Parents and Children .....                  | 24     |
| On Cultural Reproduction: Access to Organized Activities, a Social Class.....        | 28     |
| Characteristic?.....   | 28     |
| Organized Activities .....   | 28     |
| Organized Musical Activities as Parental Investments.....                            | 31     |
| Chapter Summary .....  | 36     |
| <br>Chapter III – METHODOLOGY .....  | <br>38 |
| Overview.....  | 38     |
| Research Design.....   | 39     |
| Researcher Role .....  | 40     |
| Participants.....  | 41     |
| Recruitment.....   | 41     |
| Population and Sample Selection.....   | 42     |
| Instrumentation .....  | 43     |
| Data Analysis .....  | 44     |



|   |    |
|---|----|
| Data cleaning and missing values .....  | 44 |
| Analytic strategy .....   | 46 |
| First analytic phase .....  | 46 |
| Second analytic phase .....   | 51 |
| Dependent variable .....  | 52 |
| Independent variables .....   | 52 |
| Parents' previous formal musical experiences.....                             | 52 |
| Parental engagement in program activities .....                               | 52 |
| Frequency of child's attendance to the music class .....                      | 53 |
| Control variables.....  | 53 |
| Child's age .....   | 53 |
| Child's gender .....  | 53 |
| Parent's age.....   | 53 |
| Parent's gender.....  | 53 |
| Parental race/ethnicity.....  | 53 |
| Parent Hispanic origin.....   | 53 |
| Parental employment status .....  | 54 |
| Parental marital status .....   | 54 |
| Number of people in primary residence.....                                    | 54 |
| Number of children in primary residence .....                                 | 54 |
| Immigration status .....  | 54 |
| Socioeconomic status.....   | 54 |
| Income.....   | 54 |
| Parental education.....   | 54 |
| Number of musical toys .....  | 55 |
| Number of musical instruments .....   | 56 |
| Value of music education.....   | 56 |
| Location .....  | 56 |
| Number of terms .....   | 56 |
| Preparatory OLS regression analysis .....                                     | 56 |
| Main OLS regression analysis .....  | 58 |
| Chapter Summary .....   | 64 |
| <br>  |    |
| Chapter IV – RESULTS .....  | 65 |
| First Phase.....  | 65 |
| Sociodemographic and Musical Characteristics of the Families .....            | 65 |
| Previous Formal Musical Experiences.....                                      | 68 |
| Values of Music Education.....  | 69 |
| Home Environmental Conditions .....   | 70 |
| Musical materials .....   | 70 |
| Number of people in the home.....   | 70 |
| Reasons for Enrolling in the Program.....                                     | 71 |
| Parental Engagement .....   | 77 |
| Second Phase .....  | 80 |
| Sociodemographic Variables Associated with the Independent and Dependent..... | 80 |
| Variables .....   | 80 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Sociodemographic variables associated with parents’ previous formal musical experiences.....       | 80  |
| Sociodemographic variables associated with parents’ engagement in program activities .....         | 82  |
| Sociodemographic variables associated with frequency of child’s attendance to the program .....    | 83  |
| Sociodemographic variables associated with the dependent variable parental musical engagement..... | 84  |
| Independent Variables Associated with Parental Musical Engagement.....                             | 86  |
| Parents’ previous formal musical experiences and musical engagement at home .....                  | 86  |
| Parents’ engagement in program activities and musical engagement at home.....                      | 88  |
| Frequency of child’s attendance to the program and musical engagement at home .....                | 91  |
| Moderation by SES levels.....  | 93  |
| <br>Chapter V – DISCUSSION .....   | 95  |
| Overview.....  | 95  |
| Research Questions.....  | 96  |
| Summary of Results.....  | 97  |
| Understanding Parenting Values, Rationales, Attitudes and Practices.....                           | 98  |
| Rationales, Values, and Attitudes in the Context of an Organized Activity.....                     | 98  |
| Musical Parenting Attitudes and Practices in the Context of an Organized Activity .....            | 100 |
| Previous formal musical experiences.....   | 100 |
| Engagement in program activities .....   | 101 |
| Factors influencing parental musical engagement.....   | 103 |
| Limitations .....  | 108 |
| Conclusions.....   | 109 |
| Implications for Policy and Practice.....  | 111 |
| Recommendations for Further Study.....   | 112 |
| <br>REFERENCES .....   | 115 |
| <br>APPENDICES   |     |
| Appendix A – Survey Questionnaire in English and Spanish .....                                     | 121 |
| Appendix B – Principal Component Analysis Results from Imputations 2-5 .....                       | 161 |
| Appendix C – Associations Between SES and Principal Components 2-3 .....                           | 171 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table   | Page |
|---|------|
| 1 Survey Participant Sample.....  | 43   |
| 2 KMO and Bartlett's Test .....   | 48   |
| 3 Communalities .....   | 48   |
| 4 Total Variance Explained .....  | 50   |
| 5 Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants .....  | 66   |
| 6 Parents' Previous Formal Musical Experiences .....  | 69   |
| 7 Other Parent Formal Musical Experiences .....   | 69   |
| 8 Musical Materials at Home .....   | 70   |
| 9 Number of People in the Household .....   | 71   |
| 10 Rotated Component Matrix .....   | 73   |
| 11 Equation 1: Association Between SES and Culture & Educational Enrichment<br>for the Future ..... | 75   |
| 12 Equation 2: Association Between SES and Culture & Educational Enrichment<br>for the Future.....  | 76   |
| 13 Equation 1: Association Between SES and Social Networks.....                                     | 76   |
| 14 Equation 2: Association Between SES and Social Networks.....                                     | 77   |
| 15 Musical Activities Parents and Children Engage in at Home .....                                  | 78   |
| 16 Activities from the Music Class.....   | 79   |
| 17 Means of Variables Related to the Music Program .....  | 79   |
| 18 Sociodemographic Variables Associated with Parents' Previous Formal<br>Musical Experiences ..... | 81   |
| 19 Sociodemographic Variables Associated with Engagement in Program<br>Activities .....             | 82   |

|    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| 20 | Sociodemographic Variables Associated with Frequency of Child's Attendance to the Program.....          | 83 |
| 21 | Sociodemographic Variables Associated with Parents' Musical Engagement.....                             | 85 |
| 22 | Associations Between Parent's Formal Musical Experiences and Their Musical Engagement at Home.....      | 87 |
| 23 | Associations Between Parent's Engagement in Program Activities and Musical Engagement at Home.....      | 89 |
| 24 | Associations Between Child's Frequency of Attendance to the Program and Musical Engagement at Home..... | 91 |
| 25 | Associations Between the Interaction Term and Parental Musical Engagement at Home.....                  | 93 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure |   | Page |
|--------|---|------|
| 1      | Matrix Utilized to Create the Variable SES..... | 55   |

## Chapter I

### INTRODUCTION

#### **Background**

In recent years, organized activities targeting young children (0-5 years of age) and their primary caregivers have highly increased in popularity and availability in the U.S., as well as in many other western industrialized countries (Vincent & Ball, 2007; Young, 2013). The reasons behind that increase have not been determined yet (Vincent & Maxwell, 2016). One of the reasons could be based on public awareness of research emphasizing the benefits of investing in quality experiences during the first five years of a child's life (Heckman, 2012). Another possibility could be that parents are seeking out social activities as an escape from the frequently reported feelings of loneliness during those first years of parenthood and the idea that meeting other parents could help them cope with those feelings (Hays, 1996, Ilari, 2013).

Unfortunately, since participation in organized activities often depends upon financial resources, time investment, and family support (Cho, 2015; Conger & Conger, 2008; Dai and Shader, 2002; Kaushal, Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2011), the majority of families accessing early childhood enrichment activities and programs – including music classes – usually belong to the middle or upper class (Ilari, 2013, 2016; Vincent & Maxwell, 2016; Wills, 2011; Young, 2013). Therefore, a third potential reason for the popularity of these activities or programs could be specific habits within social-classes

that influence parenting practices (Bourdieu, 1986; Lareau, 2011), in which organized activities are perceived as investments for the future. Under this paradigm, parents engage in a process of concerted cultivation where they introduce their children to the tastes, dispositions, skills and talents that are thought to provide them a position of advantage in a competitive world (Jones, 2015; Lareau, 2011; Vincent & Ball, 2007; Vincent & Maxwell, 2016).

Furthermore, despite the current availability of programs for young children, most of what is known regarding participation in organized activities relates to school-age children (Ilari, 2013, 2016; Mahoney, Larson, Eccles, & Lord, 2005) and adolescents (Linver, Roth, & Brooks-Gunn, 2009). Literature on the topic suggests that participation in organized activities is associated with academic achievement, positive social relationships and behaviors, and increases in self-esteem (Mahoney et al. 2005). A few studies have examined the benefits of participating in organized activities for children aged 0 to 5. Findings from these studies have been mixed regarding children's outcomes (Bilhartz, Bruhn & Olson, 1999; Mehr, Schachner, Katz & Spelke, 2013; Rauscher, 2009). However, since these activities require attendance and active participation from the accompanying adult, qualitative studies examining parental beliefs, involvement and perceptions of those activities suggest an increase in parent-child bonding as well as opportunities for mutual entertainment and enjoyment (Barrett, 2009; Jones, 2015; Vincent & Ball, 2007).

Unfortunately, the few studies to date examining organized activities in the context of early childhood do indicate that since the majority of those activities require financial expenditures, access to those activities may be related to social class

characteristics such as family income, resources and values (Dumais, 2005; Irwin & Elley, 2011; Vincent & Ball, 2007).

In the United States, social class differences were historically overlooked. Many in the country felt more comfortable recognizing the power of individual initiative than recognizing the power of social class (Lareau, 2011). However, the current growth of socioeconomic disparities due to economic changes during the last three decades has increased national interest in the effects of social position on families and the development of their children (Conger & Conger, 2008). As a consequence of those changes, the socioeconomic gap has widened, with the wealthiest families experiencing an increase in their income, access to resources, and material wealth, whereas most families of middle income and low income in the United States have experienced a decline in their financial well-being (Conger & Conger, 2008; Magnuson & Duncan, 2002).

According to Heckman (2011), inequality begins at home, with children growing up in more advantaged families being ahead in their cognitive and socio-emotional development when compared to their low-income counterparts. The links between family background and children's life opportunities are well-known; and a growing body of evidence shows that how parents interact with their children, the quality of those interactions, the degree of parental responsiveness to their children's developmental needs, and what activities the parents provide in and outside the home are all factors usually associated with socioeconomic status (Kalil, Ryan & Corey, 2012).

Equally important, the cultural and emotional dimensions of family life and parenting are of interest to social scientists who are now examining how those factors are related to the reproduction of class inequalities (Irwin & Elley, 2011). Bourdieu (1986)



argues that cultural habits and dispositions, beyond economic factors, create a form of symbolic power that he called cultural capital. For him, economic and material differences are not enough to explain social dynamics, and instead, the transmission of cultural capital is a hidden but important social determinant of educational investment.

Contrary to the fields of sociology and psychology, issues of social class have just now gained attention in the music education arena (Ilari, 2013, 2016; Young, 2016). Up until now music education research has seemingly ignored the possible impact of social class on the availability of opportunities for music learning and development (Green, 2003; Ilari, 2013; Young, 2016). For instance, musical parenting practices in the home or as part of organized musical activities are now beginning to be examined while taking into account social class factors and analyzed through the lens of social and cultural reproductions theories (Jones, 2015). Of the studies that do exist, the majority are qualitative in nature and focus on families with school-age children (Ilari, 2016).

### **Need for the Study**

As noted earlier, disparities in children's experiences during their early years can be reflected in the access families with young children have to organized activities, including music classes. Similar to other western industrialized countries (Ilari, Moura, & Bourscheidt, 2011; Kremer-Sadlik, Izquierdo, & Fatigante, 2010; Reed, 2012; Young, 2013), in the United States, families with greater financial resources are the most frequent participants of early childhood music programs (Kremer-Sadlik, Izquierdo, & Fatigante, 2010). Even though this type of activity seems to be a common practice within middle and upper-class families, in some circumstances – such as partnerships with music

organizations – underserved families have been able to access early childhood music programs (Ureno, Baltazar & Diaz-Donoso, n.d.)

However, there are very few research studies examining the motivations of low-income families for accessing these classes. Moreover, not many studies have compared musical parenting of families from diverse socioeconomic status participating in music classes.

Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a study to explore parents' interests in attending music programs for young children but taking into account the possible influence of the different socioeconomic status that they belong to. Studies from sociology, psychology and economics argue that parenting practices may vary based on social class, but less is known about how those differences may operate when it pertains to musical experiences of parents and their young children. It is possible that music could be an equalizer of opportunities and social change or to the contrary as Bourdieu (1986) suggests an asset to prevent social mobility. Regardless their social class, we still do not really know much about why families enroll their children in early childhood music classes, what are the characteristics of those parents, what other parenting practices they engage in, what previous experiences shape parents' approaches to their parenting, and what are the parents' values for providing organized musical activities for their young children.

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine what reasons drive families' decisions for participating in an early childhood music program. In particular, the context

of this study is an early childhood jazz education program for families with children aged eight months to five years. All the 45-minute music classes require attendance from both the child and parent or caregiver because the classes are structured around child-adult interaction.

Since this program is being offered in different urban cities in the U.S. and for families with different financial resources, I specifically aim to identify what rationales, values, and attitudes are associated with parental musical engagement in the program and at home. I am also interested in exploring whether current economic models of the family and theories of social and cultural class reproduction, specifically the investment model and concerted cultivation would apply to the understanding of parental participation in the program and their musical engagement.

### **Parenting Practices and Investments in Early Childhood Development: Theoretical Frameworks**

Providing children with organized activities is perceived as a parenting practice predominantly of middle-class families (Ilari, 2013, 2016; Vincent & Ball, 2007; Vincent & Maxwell, 2016). Considering musical activities as forms of investments in cultural capital fostered by parents, I will use two theoretical models in this study to examine parenting practices generally and within the context of musical parenting (i.e. how parents provide or not provide such musical enrichment opportunities for children to learn and thrive).

From an economical perspective, the *investment model* proposes that economic resources directly influence the investments of time and money parents offer for their

children's development (Conger & Conger, 2008). Past research suggests that investment matters the most during early childhood (Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997; Conger & Conger, 2008; Morin, Glickman, & Brooks-Gunn, 2015). These investments can involve different dimensions of family support such as learning materials available at home, parent stimulation of learning both directly and through enrollment in enrichment activities (including music classes), and family's residential context, such as residing in safe and friendly neighborhoods. According to Morin et al. (2015), past studies indicated that "each \$10,000 increase in income is associated with a 0.08 standard deviation increase in cognitive stimulation in the home environment" (p. 17), which means that higher economic resources are associated with an increase in the frequency of parents reading books to children, helping children learn numbers, letters, colors, etc., and fostering children engagement in enrichment activities. In short, the investment model argues that families with more money can provide a variety of resources that increase human capital for the developing child, whereas more disadvantaged families are less able to realize those investments, perhaps creating a less safe, stimulating and responsive home environment (Conger & Conger, 2008). In fact, the analysis of two longitudinal datasets, the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CEX) and the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Cohort (ECL-K) from 1997 to 2006, provides evidence suggesting substantial income-related gaps in education-related items and activities (i.e. music and art lessons, children's books and toys, sports equipment and classes and tutoring) and that those investments were associated to children's later outcomes (Kaushal, Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2011).

Families' investment decisions, however, are not just driven by their income but also by parents' preferences and characteristics, as well as children's temperaments and

dispositions (Chin & Phillips 2004; Kaushal et al., 2011; Lareau, 2011). Sociology provides another lens to understand parenting practices, specifically parental provision of organized activities, such as music classes. Influenced by Bourdieu's cultural capital theory, Lareau (2011) argued that middle-class and working-class families followed different cultural logics of parenting for raising their children and that the mechanism by which social class advantage is generated and perpetuated is by means of particular class-based parenting practices. In an ethnographic study of parenting practices in the U.S., she found that middle-class families engage in patterns of "*concerted cultivation*" (p. 32). Concerted cultivation places emphasis on cultivating the child through organized enrichment activities outside the home, fostering language development and reasoning in the home, and an active parental intervention in schooling. By contrast, in lower-class families, Lareau (2011) identified that those families engaged in different parenting patterns that she called "the accomplishment of natural growth" (p. 32). In the accomplishment of natural growth, Lareau (2011) found that parents did care about their children by providing basic needs and love but did not emphasize the concerted development of children's talents and skills through participation in organized activities nor did parents believe that it was their job to foster their children's reasoning and critical thinking strategies at home but rather that those skills would be acquired from formalized schooling.

Even though the construct of concerted cultivation was introduced in a study on parents with school-age children, researchers have been applying this theory to examine how social advantage is reproduced through children's participation in various types of organized activities at all ages (Ilari, 2013; Vincent & Ball 2007). It is probable that the financial demand often associated with organized activities will make utilization of these

activities that could produce valuable cultural repertoires more difficult for some families to access than others. In short, even though all parents may want the best for their children and want them to thrive (which may translate to parental desire to enroll children in organized activities), how effectively parents' desires translate into concrete outcomes seems to depend on where families are positioned economically in society.

## **Plan of Research**

### **Research Questions**

1. When there is access to early childhood jazz education programs what are the characteristics of the families enrolled or participating in those programs, and what are their home environment conditions?
2. What are parents' rationales, values, and attitudes regarding their children's enrollment in an early childhood jazz education program and to what extent are those associated with their social class?
3. What are the levels of general parental engagement and musical engagement within the families who participate in the program and do they differ by social class?
4. Is there an association between:
  - a. Parents' previous formal musical experiences and their parental musical engagement?
  - b. Parental engagement in program activities and parental musical engagement?

- c. Frequency of child's attendance to the class and parental musical engagement?
5. Does social class moderate the association between parental engagement in program activities and parental musical engagement?

### **Context of the Study: Jazz as a Metaphor for Inclusion in Early Childhood**

Jazz has often been seen as an enduring symbol of democracy and inclusiveness. In this musical genre, a diverse group of musicians negotiates to create a collective musical expression that respects their unique personalities, attitudes, and values but at the same time, that musical expression represents their communal voice. Additionally, jazz emerged as a mingling of musical traditions of diverse people who came to the United States for different circumstances from Africa, Europe, Latin American and the Caribbean and during times of segregation included “a pro-integration discourse that mobilized the ideas of democracy, equality, and protest on its behalf” (Monson, 2007, p. 31).

The proposed organized activity is an early childhood jazz program for families with children aged 8mo-5yrs. Classes are 45-minute long and require attendance from both the child and parent/caregiver. The program aims to instill a love of jazz thorough introducing families to jazz in a musically authentic way. It also aims to encourage adults to use music as a parenting tool to not only educate their child, but also to foster their child socio-emotional development and self-expression. It is offered and managed by Jazz at Lincoln Center and the curriculum combines early childhood developmentally appropriate practices and jazz pedagogy based on student-centered improvisational interactions that address the developmental strengths of learners.

The program is organized in 8-week terms, and each class is led by an instructor with the support from a piano accompanist. The curricula incorporate both live and recorded music that provide opportunities to explore jazz through movement, songs, storytelling and playing small percussion instruments. In addition to these activities, professional jazz musicians visit the class twice per term (weeks 4 and 8) to introduce families to a live jazz band, reinforcing the repertoire and concepts learned in class.

Finally, using jazz as a vehicle for inclusion, this early childhood jazz education has expanded nationally offering tuition-based music classes in 6 different states through licensing partnerships; and most importantly the program has been offered via subsidies in two cities and at no cost to low-income families in three cities.

### **Overview of Method**

This dissertation utilized a survey study design that can be categorized as nonexperimental quantitative research. Due to the fact it incorporated families from different cities in the U.S., I utilized a mixed-mode survey for the data collection. The study involved families who were enrolled in the early childhood jazz program at the time of the study and families who were enrolled up to three years ago. The participants who not enrolled at the time of the data collection retrospectively reported their answers when answering my survey.

### **Definition of Terms**

**Values:** Values are stable long-lasting beliefs about what is important to a person. They become standards by which people order their lives and make their choices.



A belief will develop into a value when the person's commitment to the belief grows and they see it as being important (Cambridge Dictionary, 2017)

**Rationales:** The reasons or intentions for a particular set of thoughts or actions (Cambridge Dictionary, 2017)

**Attitudes:** The mental dispositions people have about something or a particular feeling or opinion before making decisions that result in a behavior (Cambridge Dictionary, 2017)

**Organized activities:** Also referred to as enrichment activities or structured activities, organized activities are any activities or programs supervised or led by an adult on a regular basis that is not provided during school hours. (Mahoney, Larson, Eccles, & Lord, 2005). These activities can involve a group of children (e.g. music ensembles, choirs) or only one child (e.g. private lessons).

## Chapter II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### **Overview**

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine what reasons stand behind families' decisions for participating in an early childhood jazz music program, specifically, what rationales, values, and attitudes are associated to their musical engagement in the program and at home. Those variables will be explored through the lens of theories of social and cultural class reproduction and economic models of the family.

Since the scope of this dissertation pertains to families with children under the age of five, in this chapter, I offer an overall definition of parenting during the early childhood years and its role on children's well-being and development, including literature on parents' knowledge and attitudes. Research studies examining musical parenting practices will be reviewed in detail, as well as current studies in music education that look specifically at social class and culture. Due to the scarcity of research literature exploring associations between social class and early childhood music education, I include in this review studies conducted with school-aged children pertaining to music education and their families.

## **Parenting During Early Childhood**

Extensive research in the social sciences provides evidence regarding the powerful influence of parenting and the home environment on child wellbeing (Bornstein, 2002; Brooks-Gunn & Markman, 2005; Morin, Glickman & Brooks-Gunn, 2015; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016). The critical role of parents may even be greater during the earliest years of life when gene-environment interactions operate to influence behavior and affect early brain development and plasticity (National Academies of Sciences, 2016; Siegel, 1999). Therefore, the multiple contexts where children live and grow and the differences in parenting practices influence the trajectory of children's development.

### **What Is Parenting?**

In the most general definition, parenting encompasses the many different activities parents engage with their children and the emotional support parents offer their children. Human development and sociological perspectives consider parenting as the "primary mechanism of socialization" (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016, p. 19) and transmission of cultural values across generations. Through parent-child interactions, parents provide children with the tools to meet the demands of their environment affording children the opportunity to grow and thrive (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016). However, parent-child interactions can vary in quality, with some parents being able to respond

appropriately to their children's needs, while others not having enough tools to provide adequate support.

Parenting can be categorized into patterns of behaviors or practices (Brooks-Gunn & Markam, 2005), but parenting is also multidimensional. Knowledge and attitudes inform parenting practices, with these three components being intertwined and influenced by the multiple contexts families live in (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2016).

**Parenting knowledge, attitudes and practices.** In their latest report, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2016) identified a range of parenting knowledge, attitudes, and practices based on desired child outcomes in the areas of physical health and safety, emotional and behavioral competence, social competence and cognitive competence. Parenting knowledge corresponds to the information and skills relevant to parenting which is often based on experience and education level. Parenting attitudes are the reactions, viewpoints, perspectives, or established ways of thinking about childrearing or child development. Attitudes may also be connected to or reflect a set of cultural beliefs within a cultural group. Parenting practices relate to the different "parenting behaviors or approaches to childrearing that can shape how a child develops" (National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016, p. 48). In short, parenting knowledge is related to parents' cognition, parenting attitudes to their motivation, and parenting practices to ways in which parents engage or behave towards their children.

These three parenting components are not independent, rather they are shaped by each other and by diverse contextual factors such as children's characteristics; parents' own experiences, expectations and practices learned from their family, friends or other

social networks; and also beliefs transferred through cultural and social systems (National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016). It is important to note the bidirectional nature of parent-child interactions, with parent's practices affecting child behaviors and vice versa (Brooks-Gunn & Markman, 2005).

**Parental engagement.** The amount of time a parent spends doing activities with their child on a daily basis is also crucial for healthy development. Parental engagement (also called parental involvement) in young children's learning is associated with improvements in children's literacy, behavior, and socio-emotional well-being (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2016). A positive parental engagement encompasses a wide range of interactions that facilitate children's adaptive learning. During infancy, these activities may range from meeting basic childcare needs to playing and reading with children. Parenting studies indicate that it is not only the type of interactions that parents engage in with their children, but also the frequency and quality of those interactions, that matters for child development (Kalil, Ryan & Corey, 2012; Phillips, 2011).

### **Parents and Child Music-Making**

Music for young children is a primary resource of communication and expression (Bjørkvold, 1992; Malloch & Trevarthen, 2009) by facilitating communication skills, creating opportunities for social interaction, stimulating cognitive development, and providing background for cultural development (Custodero, 2006). On one hand, children frequently express and entertain themselves through spontaneous musical behaviors at home, public spaces and classrooms (Barrett, 2009; Custodero, 2006; Custodero, Cali &

Diaz-Donoso, 2016), and on the other hand, some children are also exposed to organized musical activities provided by general preschool teachers or music specialists (Nardo, Custodero, Perselling & Fox, 2006). Therefore, it can be said that young children's musical life can be described, as a complex array of informal and formal learning experiences influenced by cultural and social contexts, the surrounding adults and peers, community and educational settings.

### **Music-Making in Unstructured Settings**

Studies on children's self-initiated music-making in public spaces, not designed specifically for children such as malls, parks, and the subway have been reported. Custodero, Chen, Lin, & Lee, (2006) examined music making in public places, such as parks, restaurants, and museums in Taipei, Taiwan over a period of 9 hours. Researchers from the United States and Taiwan used an observational protocol to characterize and describe social and physical environments, musical behaviors and materials, and possible functions of the behavior, with room for explanatory notes or questions. Observations were conducted in teams of 2–3 researchers, with each member filling out their own protocol form for each event observed. Later, after the data were collected, observers created narrative descriptions of each episode taken from the notes made on the protocol form. Findings from this short-term observational study shed light on children's music-making in natural settings. Movement was the most frequent musical behavior followed by invented vocal material, and the majority of musical behaviors observed were in a solitary context.

Almost 10 years later, Custodero, Cali, and Diaz Donoso (2016) conducted a similar study in New York City. Data were collected over three weekends on two

subway lines in the city using a modified version of the protocol form used in the 2006 study in Taipei. The modified protocol form indicated musical qualities, sources, and contexts of the musical episode. These categorical descriptors and accompanying field notes were later used to construct more detailed qualitative narratives. A total of 69 musical episodes were collected. Findings showed musical behaviors were influenced by adult interaction and generated by resources in the environment. Over 81% of observed episodes contained vocal behaviors; movement occurred in almost half of observed episodes (48%). Musical materials, such as songs, were mostly invented.

### **Musical Parenting**

As mentioned in the first section of this review, parents are an important mechanism for the transmission of different elements of culture, including music. Through enculturating processes, children acquire sophisticated musical behaviors, which are initiated by the musical exposure provided by parents. Although an environment that stimulates children musically is not necessarily limited to the parent-child dyad but can also encompass grandparents, siblings, extended families and peers, in most cases, parents are the first agents in nurturing children's musical development through early parent-child communication that may be intuitive and primary and not necessarily intended for musical purposes (Custodero, Britto & Brooks-Gunn, 2003; Papousek, 1996).

There is no a single definition of musical parenting but based on the literature, we could say that it usually involves a set of behaviors, activities, and resources parents provide or engage with their children that intentionally or unintentionally contribute to

the children's musical development (Custodero & Jonson-Green 2003, Ilari 2005). For example, different activities such as singing, dancing, playing live instrumental music, bringing children to music classes or concerts, and providing musical instruments, toys, books, audio and video recordings, are all activities and practices that would encompass musical parenting (Gibson, 2009).

**Factors influencing musical parenting.** Even though research in musical parenting is not extensive, studies in the last decade have shed light on several factors that influence musical parenting: age of the child, family setting, culture, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and parental previous musical experiences.

*Age of the child.* Beginning in infancy, parents may engage in musical conversations with their children using spontaneous vocal behaviors that gradually give room to more complex forms of engagement, such as singing learned and invented songs (Custodero, 2006; Trehub, 2002). As the infant grows into toddlerhood and pre-school age, their musical experiences and needs change. Parents who provide developmentally appropriate opportunities for musical exploration for their growing children will provide exposure to instruments, toys, recordings, as well as enrichment activities including music classes. Therefore, the age of the child is a determinant of the type of musical interactions that parent and child engage in.

Infants innately seek out interactive musical experiences with others as they engage in vocal play with caregivers. Parents respond in synchronous phrases or may be the ones initiating those musical conversations. To examine the characteristics of this early musical parenting communication Trevarthen and Malloch (2002) used a computer-based acoustic analysis to measure pitch, timbre and pulse. Their findings suggested that when mother and infant vocalizations presented synchronous rhythmic vocal patterns,



their communication could be considered effective as both mother and child were highly attuned to their vocal and physical gestures. Furthermore, demonstrating this dynamic dyadic relationship, several studies have shown that the infant's own presence elicits certain vocal behaviors from parents. Comparing infant-directed (ID) speech to adult-directed (AD) speech, Fernald (1992) determined that mothers spoke with a higher pitch, longer pauses, shorter utterances, and more prosodic repetitions when compared to adult-directed speech. At this young age, parent and child exist in a dynamic musical relationship with each other. Parents will not exhibit changes in their vocal patterns and speech without the infant's presence. These speech patterns are specific to early parent-child communication. Therefore, the presence of the infant is a necessary elicitor of musical vocal behaviors. Survey studies have shown that intuitive musical communication with infants, such as the early parent-infant communication patterns described above are replaced by a preference for spoken language (Custodero, 2002) or reading books with toddlers (Custodero et al., 2003).

*Parents' musical experience.* Studies examining how parents' musical experiences influence children's musical development imply that parents with a musical background or memories of being parented musically are associated with more opportunities to foster children's musical development in different ways. Yet, this association does not mean that only parents with formalized musical backgrounds can provide musical experiences for their children (Custodero & Johnson-Green, 2003; DeVries, 2006; Ilari, 2005). Custodero and Johnson-Green (2003) investigated the degree of association between parents' previous and current musical experiences and their frequency of singing and playing with their infants within the home. The researchers developed a measurement instrument called *The Parent Use of Music with Infants Survey*

(PUMIS) and surveyed a randomly selected sample of English-speaking parents of infants aged 4-6 months ( $N= 2,250$ ). Even though respondents to the survey represented varied educational level, age, race and income, the sample was not representative of the U.S. population at that time. Most participants were women and white (73%) and more educated as compared to the national average. A high percentage of parents reported playing music (64.5%) and singing (69%) for their infants daily. Findings provide evidence that “experience matters” (p. 189), since parents with musical education experiences or memories of being sung when kids were more likely to sing and play music for their infants.

***Demographic family characteristics.*** Using a representative U.S. sample of families with children under three, Custodero, Britto, and Brooks-Gunn (2003) examined the association between demographic family characteristics and the frequency of parent-child musical interactions. Their findings suggest that parents with higher education (i.e. college and above) were more likely to engage in musical activities. Interestingly, contrary to other studies examining parenting practices such as nurturance, discipline, teaching and language use (Brooks-Gunn & Markman, 2005), in this study income and race/ethnicity were not significantly associated with parents’ frequency of musical engagement. Researchers found mixed results regarding maternal employment, with less singing reported by married, employed mothers only. It is important to note that Custodero et al. (2003) is the only study published to date examining musical parenting with a representative sample within the U.S.

**Frequency and type of musical interactions involved in musical parenting.**

The home has been the setting where musical parenting has been investigated in depth. As a longitudinal expansion of her previous PUMIS study, Custodero (2006) documented the

types and functions of singing practices with a small subset of her initial sample (10 families with 2-year-old children living in New York City). Data was collected using parent interviews, observations of children, parent journals of children's musical activities, and researcher notes from two visits to each home. Findings suggested three themes in the use of music in the home: routines, traditions and play. Parents used singing for transforming routine activities (i.e. bedtime, bathing, meals, etc.) into something enjoyable and special. Less common, some families purposefully dedicated a part of their day for singing together. Other families reported engaging in more spontaneous musical interactions to accompany their daily activities. The use of music to create and maintain traditions was also important for the families in this study. Some parents expressed their desire to sing the songs their own parents used as a way to honor their musical heritage. Other parents were more interested in creating new traditions within their family. Specific to the observed children's musical behaviors, singing was the most frequent behavior, which consisted of learned and spontaneous songs (Custodero, 2006).

Gibson (2009) conducted an ethnographic study to examine how parents create musical environments and the factors that shaped musical parenting practices in families with children from infancy to age four residing in Lakeside Village, Arkansas, a university-owned student apartment complex. At least one parent in the study was enrolled in graduate studies, and approximately half of the participating families relied on the government assistant program called "Women, Infants, and Children" (WIC), which offers nutritional support to low-income families. Therefore, the socioeconomic composite of the members in this community was low to lower-middle class, since many students were living on minimum wage assistantships, as well as students' loans. The

data was collected using questionnaires and follow-up in-person semi-structured interviews (86% percent return rate= 50 participants total), participant observations with 13 mothers and 6 fathers, and an analysis of material culture. According to Gibson (2009), parents created musical environments for their children in a conscious and innate manner. In addition, musical parenting of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers was observed only within the immediate/nuclear family. Parents reported and were observed to value singing as a constant in their interactions with their young children.

Similar to Custodero (2006), the majority of songs that parents drew from emanated from their own childhoods. Categories of songs within the families included lullabies, play songs, (songs with associated playful activities that include actions expressive of the lyrics and game-like qualities), religious songs, family songs (traditional songs transmitted and preserved by parents, and with which families identified as their music), and invented songs (Gibson, 2009). Music was also utilized as parenting tools for amusing their young children and teaching them daily routines and basic skills. Musical resources (i.e. musical instruments, toys and books), live instrumental performances, specialized early childhood music classes, and concerts were some of the varied musical experiences this group of parents provided to their children (Gibson, 2009).

Providing an international perspective, Ilari, Moura and Bourscheidt (2011), examined maternal beliefs and uses of music in mothers with infants and toddlers from Curitiba in Brazil, a city with a large middle-class population, and a “relatively high municipal human development index” (Ilari et al., 2011, p. 54). Using semi-structured interviews and a sample of 43 middle-class mothers, researchers found that musical parenting for this group of mothers was influenced by a need to communicate and bond

with their children. And at the same time their use of music was influenced by scientific findings on cognitive and socio-emotional benefits of music for young children and consumer behaviors that symbolize social status (Ilari et al., 2011). Researchers found that half of all the mothers had children participating in an early childhood music education program, but in most of the cases, other caretakers (i.e. grandmothers or nannies) were the ones bringing the child to music class.

### **Music-Making in Organized Activities for Parents and Children**

Within the last decade, early childhood musical activities and programs that previously mainly targeted 4-5-year-olds have slowly expanded to families with zero to 3-year-old children (Young, 2013). Since these organized musical activities have a clear educational goal, they are perceived as being part of early childhood music education. Most of the time, early childhood organized musical activities can be found in two forms, as part of daycare and preschool centers or in specially designed early childhood music programs for parents and young children. For the majority of children, classroom teachers often provide children with their first *formal music instruction*, yet, the music preparation of these teachers may not always be ideal. On the other hand, music programs for families with young children are facilitated by music specialists and provide opportunities for parents to learn how to support children's musical development within and outside the music programs.

Besides the sometimes diverse and non-consistent musical opportunities that children could have in early childhood centers (Nardo, Custodero, Persellin and Fox, 2006), the availability of music education programs for parents with young children has increased greatly. In fact, psychologists have shed light on the key role that parental

involvement/engagement has on young children's overall development (Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000) and despite the musical approaches used in those programs could vary, parental involvement is expected (Wills, 2011).

With regard to understanding parents' perceptions and expectations of early childhood music programs, a small but valuable qualitative body of research exists. Koops (2011) conducted a qualitative study to examine the perceptions of parents participating in an early childhood music program. Koops (2011) focused on parental involvement and how parents' perception of their children's musical development affects their involvement in the class. She conducted interviews with five parents who had participated in the music class she herself taught at a community music school and coded and analyzed interview transcripts for emergent themes. Several of the parents interviewed indicated satisfaction with their roles within the class and did not desire increased involvement in the class; whereas, others expressed a desire for more information about children's musical development and the teaching method used. The perceptions that seemed to contribute to parents' involvement, both current and desired, were the enjoyment that comes from musical interaction, the recognition of multiple roles of music in children's lives, and the view of acquiring musical skill and knowledge as developmental (Koops, 2011). The author concluded that providing more resources for parents to use outside the classroom could lead to a more integrated early childhood music practice, particularly for musically-inexperienced parents, as well as parents from diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds (Koops, 2011).

In terms of how the home is affected by early childhood music classes, Barrett (2009) used narrative inquiry to identify ways in which the toddler, William, and his family incorporate music into their daily lives. Data for this study were drawn from a

three-year longitudinal investigation that followed a total of 13 families for that period of time. William and his family were recruited from the *Kindermusik* program; a weekly music class that provides varied music experiences for parents and children. According to Barrett (2009), William's mother suffered from post-natal depression, finding the transition from career woman to full-time mother fraught with anxiety. Participation in this music class constituted a turning point for family, through which both she and her husband connected to other families, and learned invaluable musical resources and skills, which were put to use in the family's daily routine. Barrett (2009) concluded that music-making in William's home functioned in a way that fostered unity within the family. Music-making within the home also contributed to William's language development and ability to regulate his behavior and emotional states. Barrett (2009) suggests that these findings warrant further study on the effects of early childhood music instruction on musical parenting and subsequent child outcomes (Barrett, 2009).

Using quantitative methods, Wills (2011) examined the influences of early childhood music programs in the home and how the musical home environment was affected by demographic characteristics and parental musical experience. The population targeted for this study was parents or primary caregivers with children between the ages of 3-5 years who were enrolled in a university-based early childhood music program at the time of study. Participants represented three areas of the United States including New York, Florida, and Ohio. The researcher developed a survey called *Parents' Use of Music with Preschool Students (PUMPS)* and stated that due to a lack of measures for this age group, the survey was based on the research questions of the study as well as "several previously created measures designed for other ages, including Custodero & Johnson-Green (2003)'s *Parent Use of Music With Infants Survey (PUMIS)*, Brand's (1985) *Home*

*Musical Environment Scale (HOMES)*, Zdzinski's (2008) *Parent-Involvement and Home Music Environment Scale (PI-HEM)*" (Wills, 2011, p. 53). The last two were instruments to specifically measure musical home environment and parental involvement in school-age children.

Participants of the three states were surveyed obtaining a total of 103 responses, which represented a 43% response rate. In general, the majority of participants were married mothers between the ages of 30-49 who represented a high SES level (measured by annual income and educational attainment). There were far more Caucasian and Hispanic respondents (83.5%) than African-American or Asian respondents (16.5%). Results indicated a higher frequency of singing, listening to music, and dancing in the home, and a lower frequency of playing instruments, performing music class activities, and composing or reading music. Most of the parents in the study had previous musical experiences but the vast majority of the participants did not engage in musical activities at the time of the study. They did, however, value music and attend musical events (Wills, 2011).

A factor analysis of the PUMPS subsets revealed three factors related to musical home environment (Music Interactions, Musical Materials, and Child Attendance at Musical Events), two factors related to parental music experience (Music Participation and Value of Music). Ordinary Least Squares regression models served to identify several independent variables that significantly predicted musical home environment factors: 1) musical Interactions were associated with adult gender, child age, ethnicity, and parent value of music; 2) musical materials in the home were associated with parental musical participation and ethnicity. Ethnicity, child age, parental musical participation, and musical materials accounted for 37.8% of the variance in composite musical home



environment scores, yielding a medium effect size (Wills, 2011). Although this study provided new quantitative evidence regarding the possible associations between early childhood music programs, parent involvement, and home environment, the homogeneity of the sample utilized necessitates caution regarding generalization of these results.

### **On Cultural Reproduction: Access to Organized Activities, a Social Class Characteristic?**

So far, only two of the studies discussed in this literature review deal briefly with issues of social class (Custodero et al., 2003; Ilari, 2013). Therefore, appreciating that social class impacts child development and well-being (Kaufman, 2005), and one source of inequality could be the access to organized musical experiences (Ilari, 2016), I review studies examining the provision of organized activities for children and their families and their implications in the reproduction of social class. Unfortunately, due to the fact that organized activities are usually provided for school-age children, the studies carried out with young children and their families are few.

#### **Organized Activities**

Researches interested in investigating the association between parenting practices and social class reproduction have used Bourdieu's cultural capital framework (Dumais, 2005; Irwin & Elley, 2011; Vincent & Ball, 2007). Since organized activities demand financial and time investments, and at the same time produce valuable cultural resources,

understanding their processes can give valuable insight on how social class is mobilized or reproduced (Jones, 2015).

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the concept of concerted cultivation was coined by Lareau (2011) and uses Bourdieu's (1986) cultural capital as a theoretical lens. Studies of concerted cultivation in parenting practices have been conducted mainly with middle-class families with school-age children. Some findings indicate that organized activities for children determined the schedule of the entire family, creating a hectic pace of life (Lareau, 2011; Vincent & Ball, 2007). Conversely others found that those hectic schedules were a specific, rather than a general, case because middle class is not homogenous, and that children can have still free time to spend in informal activities (Irwin & Elley, 2011; Perrier, 2013; Vincent & Maxwell, 2016). Based on the current research it is still arguable whether concerted cultivation is a set of practices pertaining specifically to the middle class (Lareau, 2011; Vincent & Ball, 2007) or instead it is a universal ideal for parenting that is limited and available only to families with the enough financial and time resources (Bennett, Lutz & Jayaram, 2012; Irwin & Elley, 2011).

Few studies have used concerted cultivation as a framework to look at organized activities for children under 5. One of those studies was conducted by Vincent and Ball (2007), who aimed to analyze the meaning and purpose of organized activities for young children. Researchers interviewed 59 different middle -class families in two localities in London that “offer an interesting contrast in middle-class population” (Vincent & Ball, 2007, p. 1063). Families reported their children were enrolled in music, dance, French, and structured physical activity. The emphasis upon enrichment activities was shared across the two research localities, but the researchers could not determine the frequency of those activities in the normal weekly routine of the children in the study. However, the

emphasis and range of the activities the children were involved in could indicate that the reason for participation was beyond the simple need for the parent to socialize with other adults (Vincent & Ball, 2007). The activities reported appeared to be enjoyable and “not necessarily closely connected to the advancement of formal learning” (p. 1067). Yet, the activities could be considered as a source of acquisition of cultural skills and knowledge (i.e. particular talent or abilities), that could be utilized as tools for the future.

Interestingly, none of the parents expressed opinions favoring formal learning in children under three, and several mentioned to be against 'pushing' children at too young an age. However, overall, parents expressed interested that their children develop physical, social and intellectual skills, which would get them ready for and translate to future success at school.

Additionally, Kremer-Sadlik, Izquierdo and Fatigante (2010) conducted a cross-cultural study with families from Rome, Italy and Los Angeles, U.S. Although the age of the range of the children was wide (1 to 17 years old), it provides a sample of families with very young children. Researchers examined children’s engagement in organized activities from the perspective of 32 middle-class families and found that the children in both countries engaged in similar after-school routine activities; parents in both cities arranged their children’s lives in very similar ways in terms of type and number of extracurricular activities. Parents’ attitudes toward these activities were often similar, perceiving extracurricular activities as a means for acquiring important skills and traits that will ensure their children’s future professional and personal success. Some differences in parents’ perceptions were also identified. Parents expressed differing views regarding the role these activities play in their children’s lives. On one hand, Roman parents seemed to emphasize the leisure and non-mandatory character of

activities, distancing themselves from the possibility of creating over scheduled children. On the other hand, Roman parents perceived organized activities as tools for future learning and preparation for an adult life. In contrast, L.A. parents seemed to emphasize the need for children to feel committed and to orient their efforts toward accomplished and successful performance. When interpreting these findings following Lareau's argument (2003) that middle-class families purposefully provide enrichment activities for their children's growth, the authors indicated that their study provides evidence that "concerted cultivation" is not a U.S.-exclusive preference of middle-class families; rather, it reflects increasingly shared middle-class values and ideologies pertaining to parenting and the perception of childhood in other parts of the western industrialized world. Yet, authors did find differences in parental perceptions, probably influenced by local issues specific to the particular city's context.

### **Organized Musical Activities as Parental Investments**

Although in a nationally representative sample Custodero et al. (2003) did not find any significant influence of SES on musical parenting at home, access to organized music programs is historically restricted to families with financial resources privileging access to families within the middle and upper classes. Due to the scarcity of studies examining organized early childhood music activities utilizing a concerted cultivation or other social class framework, this final section explores studies that comprised families with school-age children enrolled in formal organized musical activities: private or group lessons. This is a relevant comparison because participation in such formal organized musical activities for school-age children usually requires financial and time investments.

As part of an international qualitative music education research project, Ilari (2013) investigated parental beliefs and attitudes towards children's organized and unstructured musical activities. The 11 participating families belonged to the middle-class of their respective countries and the age of all children was 7. Parents' beliefs and expectations towards organized musical activities varied. Contrary to Dai & Shader (2002), some parents' perceptions of musicality and talent development were present no matter the level of musical training of the children. Their children's development of an enjoyment and love of music, as well as music as an opportunity for doing something special, were other emergent themes (Ilari, 2013).

Regarding parental attitudes, some parents mentioned that they engaged with their children in music from early ages via unstructured musical interactions at home or participated in early childhood music programs when their children were infants and toddlers. However, the rationale for enrolling their children in music programs early was unidentifiable by the researcher. She speculates that some parents may have enrolled their children to develop cultural skills closely associated with later successful school experience later in life, following some parenting practices of concerted cultivation (Ilari, 2013). On the other hand, parents could use enrollment in musical experiences as a way to socialize with other parents with young children since sometimes stay-at-home mothers feel physically confined inside the home during those first years of parenthood (Hays, 1996). Additionally, aspects associated to concerted cultivation were identified in some of the parents' discourses. Parental anxiety and the implicit view that they were not doing enough for children's musical development was acknowledged in some interviews – even though parents reported being highly engaged in providing a diversity of musical experiences, resources, and materials in addition to previous or current music lessons.

The organization of children's time through more than one organized activity was reported by some families, which resulted in "busy children" (p. 191). This aspect is also a characteristic relevant to concerted cultivation in which children's talents and abilities are cultivated because hope that these skills will help children succeed later in life (Ilari, 2013, 2016).

Even though this sample of middle-class parents from 9 different countries exhibited different characteristics of concerted cultivation in their active musical parenting, Ilari expressed caution in interpreting these results and suggest that since parenting is influenced by local contexts, any study on concerted cultivation and musical parenting should take into account "larger contextual issues or the political, cultural, economic, and historical spheres that surrounds children lives," as wells as family structure and characteristics (Ilari, 2013, p. 193).

Also using qualitative methods, Cho (2015) challenges the notion that participation in organized activities, such as music classes, is a privilege of middle-upper-class families or a reproduction of social inequalities. She explored the perceptions and parenting practices of fourteen South Korean parents from an "average SES" (p. 116) -- for this study SES was equated to mothers' income -- and asked questions regarding their children's participation in group music lessons on violin and piano. The average of the participating children was 9.8 years old, ranging from 5 to 15 years of age. Mothers in this study had varied perspectives, but in general they believed that acquisition of musical abilities help enrich their children's lives as well as a source for developing other outcomes such as children's ability to express their emotions, aesthetic thinking, creativity, and cognitive skills. The researcher did not identify signs of parental anxiety or overscheduled children; however, the amounts of time and financial resources to

support their children's involvement in musical activities varied considerably depending on socioeconomic status. Additionally, all mothers considered providing musical opportunities for their children a sign of good parenting, even though some expressed having a tight budget that made them consider sometimes discontinuing their children's activities (Cho, 2015).

Reed (2015) investigated whether or not UK parents' encouragement of their children to participate in instrumental music classes was closely associated with social class. The author conducted a secondary analysis for qualitative data drawn from the Cultural Capital and Social Exclusion (CCSE) research project, which aimed to provide a systematic exploration of cultural tastes and cultural capital in Britain (Reed, 2015). He analyzed 26 interviews that involved parents discussing desires concerning their children playing a musical instrument. The age of children and the type of instrument were not specified. Even though the author did not intend to draw strong inferences or generalizations considering this small sample, his findings highlighted that parents with high cultural capital (i.e. measured using educational attainment) were more active than others in encouraging formal musical opportunities for their children, and in fact, these parents had the financial resources to do so. However, he also found that regardless of social class, parents who did have musical backgrounds were more likely to perceive their children as innately musical, and hence, encourage a sense of musical entitlement in their children.

Dai and Schader (2002) examined parents' expectancy, beliefs and values regarding their children's music training. Middle-class U.S. parents of 231 students, aged 6-18 enrolled in music programs at four music institutions, were surveyed regarding their values and beliefs in the areas of music, academics, and athletics. The 44-item survey

questionnaire was analyzed using factor analysis and the results seemed to suggest that parents had higher expectations and long-term goals for their children's musical development based on their level of music training. Parents with children who were advanced players – approximately 10-12 years of music lessons – showed higher levels of achievement aspirations in music than in academics and athletics. This could imply that parents may initially enroll their children in formal music training not necessarily for “musical talent development per se, but for other general value” and that their value of music education changes throughout time (Dai & Schader, 2002, p. 143). Although this study focused specifically on parental support and encouragement for music talent development and achievement, which are not the aims of the present study, and does not look at social class directly, it is one of the few studies inquiring about parents' values and beliefs regarding formal music education in comparison to other educational areas.

Jones (2015) conducted an ethnography study of a specific music class in an early childhood music program held at a regional conservatory of music in Australia. The author utilized participant observation, video recording, and semi-structured interviews of the class consisting of 9 children aged 2 to 3 and their caregivers (eight moms and one grandmother), which according to the author belong to a middle-upper class for her study. She examined adults' expectations, perceptions, and beliefs regarding music education. Enjoyment was parents' primary reason for the continued involvement in the class, they expressed different levels of enjoyment: by watching their child have fun, by engaging in musical activity as a parent-child dyad, by the joy of spending focused, unhindered time together, and by opportunities for their child to construct their own musical identity (Jones, 2015). Parents' previous musical experiences also influenced the way music played out in the home of these families which was consistent with findings in



previous studies (Custodero & Johnson-Green 2003). Five parents had formally learned an instrument or singing for a period during their childhood, and memories of these experiences ranged from painful to very positive. Moreover, adults both subtly and overtly linked their own musical experiences to the way they conceptualized their child's immediate and future musical education. Additionally, some of Jones (2015) findings' are aligned with the logic of concerted cultivation. On one hand, parents valued the music class for the opportunities it afforded children to develop social skills, cognitive ability and familiarity with a structured, formal classroom context. Further, cultivation and development of a musical awareness from an early age was considered an important resource which would enhance children's future lives: a "well-rounded" child encompassed specific skills (the ability to understand rhythm), personal dispositions (confidence, respect) and orientations towards the world (interested in high-culture music) (Jones, 2015). Contrary, to Lareau's (2011) characterization of middle class parents' lives as highly marked by a hectic pace due to their children's full schedules, parents in this study expressed ambivalence towards pushing their children too hard or overburdening them with too many activities. While they hoped their children would learn a musical instrument or continue their involvement in musical activity they express being against creating busy schedules for their children (Jones, 2015)

### **Chapter Summary**

The current research on young children's musical development reveals a complex tapestry of musical experiences. On the one hand, children frequently express and entertain themselves through spontaneous musical behaviors at home, public spaces and

classrooms; and on the other hand, when socioeconomic opportunities permit, some children are exposed to formal ways of music instruction provided by general preschool teachers or music specialists.

Even though early childhood music education has benefited from an increased general awareness about the importance of early stimulation and development, there is still some room for growth. With the exception of Custodero et al. (2003) and Wills (2011), the majority of studies reviewed in this literature have used qualitative methods to examine musical parenting practices, for instance, quantitative studies inquiring about participation in organized musical activities (i.e. music programs) during early childhood and the role of family social class in that involvement are missing.

Furthermore, contrary to trends in early childhood research, which are focusing now on underserved populations, the majority of the research discussed in this literature review has been conducted with populations who come from middle and high socioeconomic statuses. The underrepresentation of underserved families in music education studies limits our understanding on how musical practices at home or as part of organized activities function for those families. Therefore, studies examining the possible benefits of the access to early childhood music programs for families from diverse populations need to be conducted.

## Chapter III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Overview

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the characteristics of parents who enroll their children in an early childhood jazz music program offered to families residing in different urban areas of the U.S., as well as families from different socioeconomic statuses. I aimed to identify what factors play a role in parental decisions to participate in the program and whether those factors were associated with parental musical engagement at home. Since I intended to incorporate families from different cities, I utilized a mixed-mode survey design in order to collect data from the different locations. The research design included current participating families, as well as families who were enrolled in the program up to three years ago. Participants not enrolled in the program at the time of the study retrospectively reported their answers when answering the survey.

In this chapter, I outline the methodology used to explore the research questions guiding this dissertation. The following areas are explained in detail: a) Research design, b) Participants, c) Sample Selection, d) Instrumentation, e) Data collection and procedures, and f) Data analysis.

## Research Design

The proposed dissertation was conducted using a mixed-mode survey design (web survey and paper questionnaire) and administrative data from six cities where the program is currently being offered (Chicago, IL; New York, NY; Omaha, NE; Orlando, FL; Seattle, WA; St. Louis, MO). Given the fact that participants lived in different cities of the U.S., online surveying was deemed a suitable primary method of data collection for my research purpose. Therefore, the first phase was to distribute a web survey to the entire population of families (participating in the early childhood jazz program at the time of the study N=236) as well as families who were enrolled in the program during the last three years (N= 1096). The data collection lasted approximately 3 months, from July 15, 2018 to the end of September 2018. In addition to the invitation email sent to participants, four reminder emails were sent to participants who had yet to respond to the survey in order to give them another chance to do so.

Literature supports the use of web surveys for collecting data in academic fields, such as the social sciences, medicine, and education (Couper, 2000). Wiersma and Jurs (2009) emphasizes that online surveys are now a viable alternative to mailed surveys. The five primary advantages of using this method include: (1) reduced costs, (2) reduced time, (3) more flexibility in the survey design, (4) wide distribution, and its (5) unobtrusive nature.

Although Shih and Fan (2008) found that the average response rate for a web survey was 34%, about a 10% lower response rate than mailed surveys, Wiersma et al. (2009) state, that there is still no consistent advantage in response rates for mailed questionnaires in comparison to web surveys or vice versa. In order to survey the

families, I contacted each of the program managers of the different sites, who had access to the most up-to-date contact information for the families. Additionally, paper questionnaires were used to survey the families in two particular circumstances. First, I used paper questionnaires during the second follow-up for families from one of the programs offered in Omaha, Nebraska, because, according to the administrators, those families had limited access to internet even though they had provided email addresses. Second, some families who participated in programs located in New York City and Chicago did not have access to internet. Therefore, paper questionnaires were distributed to those families via their program administrators.

The response rate obtained using this mixed-mode design was 35% (N=469), which was under the theoretical expected value of 30-40% (Wiersma et al. (2009).

### **Researcher Role**

During my time working as an instructor in different locations offering this early childhood jazz program – one for middle-income families and another providing free access to the program to low-income families –, I have observed variations in the parent-child interactions and involvement in the music class, but those variations were present regardless of family socioeconomic status. I started wondering what drives parents to provide their children with musical experiences, is it their social class, their education, their previous musical experiences? What motivates them to not only actively engage in musical experiences at home (i.e., singing, moving, listening to recordings, etc.) but rather to go beyond that and actually enroll their children and themselves in organized musical activities (i.e. early childhood music programs). This curiosity drives this dissertation inquiry.

Moreover, even though I may have worked with some of the families at some point, the methodology I used required their responses to be anonymous and confidential, so I was not able to identify the families participating in the dissertation study.

## **Participants**

### **Recruitment**

Participant families in this dissertation were drawn from the same early childhood jazz education program offered in 6 different cities within the U.S. Specifically, the program is offered for families with 8 month-olds to 5 year-olds living in Chicago, Illinois; Manhattan, New York; Omaha, Nebraska; Orlando, Florida; Seattle, Washington; and St. Louis, Missouri. Families were recruited by contacting the program administrators in those locations, who provided the contact information to email out surveys.

All administrators were contacted via email. Once they agreed to participate in the study, they were asked to either a) distribute the electronic survey to all of the current and previous families enrolled in their programs or b) to provide me the email addresses of the families in order to email them directly. Five programs (NYC1, NYC 2, Omaha1, Omaha2, and St. Louis) provided me with a list of participants' names and email addresses, one program (Chicago) requested paper versions of the survey, and two programs (Seattle and Florida) preferred to send the electronic survey themselves along with a note for the parents explaining the dissertation's aims. Four follow-up emails were scheduled and sent to the families who failed to respond in appropriate time intervals in order to help aid in response rates.

## **Population and Sample Selection**

The population targeted in this dissertation was parents with children between the ages of 8 months to 5 years who were previously enrolled the last three years or were currently enrolled in the early childhood jazz education program at the time of the study. This early childhood program was selected for several reasons. First, all of the programs in the different locations around the country are very similar. They follow the same curriculum, which combines early childhood developmentally appropriate practices and jazz pedagogy. In addition, all teachers, regardless of program location, attend the same certification training in order to teach the classes. Second, the general population served in these areas differs greatly providing a more varied demographic to examine. Finally, this program is one of the few early childhood music programs offered at no cost to low income populations in three locations.

Participation in the study was voluntary. Families were provided a small compensation in the form of a \$10 gift card for participating with the exception of one of the programs located in New York City (NYC1). Gender of the parent or child, age of parent, socio-economic status, educational level, race, or ethnicity did not affect the eligibility for participation. Families who were enrolled at the time of the study in any of the program sites and participants who were enrolled within the past three years were eligible.

Based on the administrative data retrieved from the different program locations, 1332 families attended the program from 2015 to September 2018. Table 1 shows the distribution of families per location.

Table 1

*Survey Participant Sample (N=1332, n=469)*

| <u>Program location</u> | <u>Study Population</u> |          | <u>Survey Sample</u> |          |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
|                         | <i>N</i>                | <i>%</i> | <i>n</i>             | <i>%</i> |
| NYC1                    | 1072                    | 80.48    | 367                  | 78.3     |
| NYC2                    | 110                     | 8.26     | 35                   | 7.5      |
| Omaha1                  | 51                      | 3.83     | 28                   | 6.0      |
| St. Louis               | 49                      | 3.68     | 20                   | 4.3      |
| Chicago                 | 10                      | 0.75     | 6                    | 1.3      |
| Omaha2                  | 12                      | 0.9      | 5                    | 1.1      |
| Seattle                 | 20                      | 1.5      | 5                    | 1.1      |
| Orlando                 | 8                       | 0.6      | 3                    | 0.6      |

*Notes: N* = families who attended the program from Sept.2015- Sept.2018. *n* = survey respondent sample size

### **Instrumentation**

The instrument used in this study was a researcher-constructed survey questionnaire (see Appendix A). Due to lack of measures for families with young children participating in organized musical activities, the survey was designed based on three previously created and validated instruments, including items from Custodero et al., (2003) *Parents Use of Music with Infants Survey (PUMIS)*, Wills (2011) *Parents' Use of Music with Preschool Students (PUMPS)*, Reichman, Teitler, Garfinkel, & McLanahan (2001) *Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study* (baseline and year 1), and The National Endowment of the Arts (2012) *Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*. Additionally, I developed new items using themes found in two unpublished qualitative studies I conducted in 2014 and 2016. Both studies explored parents' perceived benefits of this early childhood jazz program. Finally, some items were specifically requested to be included in the questionnaire by the jazz organization running the program. Since this



program is offered to bilingual families in in two locations NYC2 and Omaha2, the questionnaire was translated into Spanish.

The survey questionnaire consisted of 7 sections including: 1) introduction and consent; 2) reasons for participating in the program; 3) sociodemographic information; 4) parents' previous musical experiences; 5) engagement in musical activities in the home with their children; 6) enrollment to other early childhood organized activities; and 7) parents attitudes towards music and other leisure activities. This instrument included multiple choice and Likert-scale items, as well as open-ended items and was administered via Teachers College Qualtrics, an online survey tool available for students and faculty at Teachers College. This online survey tool allowed anyone with the personalized link to complete the survey from a computer or mobile device.

Before launching the survey, I conducted a pilot study in English and Spanish to test the questionnaire for content clarity and time completion. Five families, including two Spanish-speaking families, who had previously attended the program in 2014 participated in the pilot study. Based on these families' responses the time completion of the questionnaire was estimated to 15-20min approximately. No issues with the content were found.

## **Data Analysis**

### **Data cleaning and missing values**

All the data collected for this study was entered into the software program Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences SPSS v.25 for analysis. Data were cleaned

and multiple imputation (MI) was used to address missing data. The maximum amount of missing data was 8% with many items missing only 3-4%.

I utilized MI due to its advantage of producing smaller standard errors and less biased estimates when data are analyzed (Rubin, 1987). Additionally, MI is considered superior to listwise deletion, even in data with less than 5% missing values, because dropping cases may generate a loss of power which is still problematic even with low rates of missingness (Graham, 2009; Weisberg, 2009). My sample size was small enough that deleting families from the analysis could bias the results, even if it would be a small percentage of families; therefore, by using MI I was able to include survey participants who partially answered the survey.

SPSS provides an automatic multiple imputation function, which is considered appropriate for exploratory studies. SPSS scans the data for analysis and uses the monotone method if the data show a monotone pattern of missing values; otherwise, an iterative Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method is used when the pattern of missing data is arbitrary (IBM, 2016). Variables included in the imputation process included all outcomes of interest and the complete set of sociodemographic variables and as well as variables used as covariates in final models. The number of multiple imputations was set to five, because that number is usually recommended when data have a low percentage of missing values (Rubin, 1987; Weisberg, 2005). Therefore, estimated results were averaged across the five imputed datasets and standard errors were reported instead of standard deviations (Rubin, 1987).

Additionally, I used the Missing Imputation Deletion strategy (MID), which consists of imputing the data, but then deleting cases of the variable of interest – dependent variable – with the imputed data before the analysis (vonHippel, 2007).

Therefore, after imputing values for the dependent variable *parental musical engagement*, I dropped the 23 cases that had imputed data and only used the raw values for the analysis.

### **Analytic strategy**

I divided the analysis into two phases. In the first phase, I answered research questions 1-3 by performing descriptive statistics, Pearson's product moment correlation, principal component analysis, content analysis, and simple linear regression. In the second phase, I used ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to examine the potential associations proposed in research questions 4-7.

**First analytic phase.** This phase includes the analysis of research questions 1 to 3.

**RQ1.** *When there is access to early childhood jazz education programs what are the characteristics of the families enrolled or participating in those programs and what are their home environment conditions?*

Parents' characteristics, such as demographics, previous formal musical experiences, and their values of music education were explored by using descriptive statistics including frequency and percentages [items 7, 8, 10,11,12,14,15, 16, 17, 18,19,20, 21,22, 23, 24, 27,28,29,30,31 (see Appendix A)].

Home environmental conditions, such as the number of people living in the home, as well as access to musical toys or instruments were examined using descriptive statistics including means and percentages and frequency counts [items 24, 35, 36 (see Appendix A)].

**RQ2.** *What are parents' rationales, values, and attitudes regarding their children's enrollment in an early childhood jazz education program and to what extent are those associated with social class?*

In order to determine parents' reasons for participating in the music program and their possible association with their social class, I created a two-step analysis. The first step consisted of conducting a principal component analysis (PCA) of the eight Likert-scale items related to this research question. Next, I created component scores to analyze their potential association with socioeconomic status using simple linear regression.

These following 8 items were analyzed using PCA: a) I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre; b) It's an activity that allows me to spend time with my child; c) Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future; d) It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center; e) It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others; f) Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in the program makes me feel more connected to this country; g) I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment; and h) Friends recommended it.

SPSS does not provide pooled results for PCA. Therefore, I conducted a PCA on each imputed data set and assessed whether there was variability in the PCA parameters. In this section, I only present results from imputation 1 (see Appendix B for results of all five imputed datasets).

Inspection of the correlation matrix showed that all variables of interest had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.3. The overall Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was 0.77, classifications of 'middling' according to Kaiser (1974). Bartlett's Test

of Sphericity was statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ). Finally, the communalities were all above 0.3, further confirming that each item shared some common variance with other items. All these indicators confirmed the data was appropriate for this analysis.

Table 2

*KMO and Bartlett's Test<sup>a</sup>*

|  |                    |         |
|--|--------------------|---------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. |                    | .772    |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity                    | Approx. Chi-Square | 477.993 |
|  | df                 | 28      |
|  | Sig.               | .000    |

Note: a. Imputation Number = 1

Table 3

*Communalities<sup>a</sup>*

|  | Initial | Extraction |
|--|---------|------------|
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre  | 1.000   | .830       |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                                   | 1.000   | .763       |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future   | 1.000   | .591       |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                           | 1.000   | .649       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others  | 1.000   | .600       |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in this program makes me feel more connected to this country. | 1.000   | .523       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others  | 1.000   | .602       |
| Friends recommended it   | 1.000   | .898       |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 1

PCA was used to reduce the number of correlated variables (8) and transform them into a set of uncorrelated variables that contain most of the information data to

facilitate interpretation for this study (Jackson, 2005). As shown in Table 4, the initial eigen values indicated that the first three components explained 32%, 12.9% and 12.8% of the variance respectively. The fourth component had eigen values just below one (0.812). However, it explained 10% of the variance, a proportion of variance sometimes recommended as a criterion decision for retaining a component. Solutions for three and four components were first examined using no rotation and then examined using varimax and equimax rotation.

Supported by this analysis and theory underlying creation of the measurement items, the four-component solution with an equimax rotation, which explained 68% of the total variance, was preferred for the following reasons. First, I created those eight questions based on findings from previous unpublished qualitative studies as well as theories of cultural reproduction (Lareau, 2011). Second, the sufficient number of primary loadings in each component and the interpretability of the four-component solution. Third, compared to the unrotated solution, the orthogonal rotation highlighted the items that were most influential for the component by making the loading magnitudes more pronounced, and therefore easy to interpret. Fourth, the orthogonal rotation was chosen instead of oblique rotation because, based on my assumptions, I expected that the information explained by one component would be independent of the information in the other components, and therefore using an orthogonal rotation to keep components uncorrelated was the ideal solution. Finally, there was little difference between the four-component varimax and equamax solutions, but equamax orthogonal rotation was utilized to aid interpretability, and to help provide simple structure for the rotated solution (Corner, 2009; Thurstone, 1947).

Table 4

*Total Variance Explained<sup>a</sup>*

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues |               |              |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
|           | Total               | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.576               | 32.196        | 32.196       |
| 2         | 1.037               | 12.960        | 45.156       |
| 3         | 1.031               | 12.889        | 58.045       |
| 4         | .812                | 10.156        | 68.201       |
| 5         | .709                | 8.859         | 77.060       |
| 6         | .678                | 8.475         | 85.534       |
| 7         | .627                | 7.842         | 93.376       |
| 8         | .530                | 6.624         | 100.000      |

*Note:* Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 1

The second step consisted of creating component scores of the four components and save them as new variables in the five imputed data sets. SPSS calculates these scores automatically (IBM, 2016). Because SPSS does not provide pooled results for a one-way ANOVA analysis, I decided to examine that relationship by performing a simple linear regression with the categorical variable SES as the independent variable and each individual component as the dependent variable. The dummy variables for SES were Low-SES, Middle-SES, and High-SES. I computed the linear regression 2 times per dependent variable in order to have *B* coefficients for the three different SES groups.

Additionally, I performed a content analysis of the open-ended responses to the question “Are there any other reasons why you enrolled your child in the program?” The analysis resulted in a list of 12 codes, which I reexamined to find common themes. The final analysis yielded four main themes that were aligned with the results from the principal component analysis.

**RQ3.** *What are the levels of general parental engagement and musical engagement within the families who participate in the program and do they differ by social class?*

To measure *general parental engagement*, 6 items from the Parental Engagement Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing study's questionnaire were summed and averaged into one composite variable (survey question 38, see Appendix A). These self-report items measure the frequency by which the parent engages in different activities with their children ( $\alpha = 0.674$ ).

The level of parents' musical engagement was measured by averaging the self-reported musical engagement of parents in 4 parent-child activities at home: a) Days per week sing songs or nursery rhymes to your child; b) Days per week play recorded music for your child; c) Days per week play a musical instrument for or with your child; d) Days per week move to music (dance) with your child. Scores range from 1 to 8 (1=zero days, 8=everyday). Those items were adapted from the Parent Use of Music With Infants Survey's questionnaire and similarly were summed and averaged into one composite variable labeled *parental musical engagement at home* ( $\alpha = 0.725$ ).

Those two continuous composite variables (general parental engagement and parental musical engagement) were examined using descriptive statistics, such as standard deviations and means. Additionally, I used Pearson's product moment correlation to examine the relationship between those two composites.

**Second analytic phase.** As mentioned at the beginning of this section, the second large phase of the analysis consisted of answering the last four research questions. OLS regression analysis was the suitable method to explore and assess the associations proposed in those research questions because OLS regression has the power to estimate



beta coefficients that accurately represent associations between independent and dependent variables. The inclusion of important covariates is necessary to control for important sociodemographic factors that if excluded may bias results. Therefore, the first step in my analysis of this second phase of the dissertation was to determine what sociodemographic and baseline variables influence the independent variables of interest (parental engagement in program activities, parents' previous formal musical experience, frequency of attendance to the program), as well as the dependent variable (parental musical engagement at home).

***Dependent variable.*** The dependent variable of interest was the composite variable *parental musical engagement at home*.

***Independent variables.*** There were three independent variables of interest for this analysis that represent parents' previous formal musical experiences, parents' engagement in program activities, and frequency of child's attendance to the music class.

*Parents' previous formal musical experiences.* A sum of reported "yes" on all three previous formal musical experience questions. Parents were asked the following questions indicating yes or no: a) Do you play a musical instrument?; b) Have you ever sung in a choir or participating in other musical group?; c) Have you ever taken music lessons such as piano lessons ( $\alpha = 0.662$ ).

*Parental engagement in program activities.* This variable was measured by averaging the self-reported program engagement in 4 parent-child music activities at home which were specifically related to the music class: a) Days per week sing jazz songs from the class; b) Days per week play or listened to jazz recordings from the class; c) Days per week dance to jazz recordings from the music class; d) Days per week read

books about jazz musicians. Scores range from 1 to 8 (1=zero days, 8=everyday) ( $\alpha = 0.811$ ).

*Frequency of child's attendance to the music class.* This variable was retrieved from administrative data recording child's attendance of two New York City locations where the program was delivered. Program NYC1 offered tuition-based classes and program NYC2 offered classes at no cost for low-income families. This music program is scheduled by thematic terms, which consist of a total of eight weeks. Therefore, scores for this variable range from 1 to 8 (1= one class, 8= total of classes per term).

***Control variables.*** The proposed study utilized 12 separate covariates that represent parent and child sociodemographic factors and 5 separate covariates that represent musical materials at home, values of music education, location of the program and number of terms attended.

*Child's age.* Current age of child

*Child's gender.* Parents reported their child gender. Two dummy variables were used to indicate child gender: a) female b) male (reference).

*Parent's age.* Current age of parent (the person who answered the questionnaire)

*Parent's gender.* Two dummy variables were used to indicate parents' gender: a) female b) male (reference).

*Parental race/ethnicity.* Five dummy variables were utilized to indicate parent's race/ethnicity: a) White (reference); b) Asian; c) Black; d) Multiracial, e) other race, including American Indian.

*Parent Hispanic origin.* Parents reported whether or not they considered themselves of Hispanic origin: a) Hispanic; b) Non-Hispanic (reference).

*Parental employment status.* Parents self-report their current employment status. Four dummy variables were created to indicate parent's employment status: a) full-time (reference); b) part-time; c) not employed; d) other type of employment.

*Parental marital status.* Four dummy variables were used to indicate the parents' marital status: a) married (reference); b) cohabiting; c) divorced/separated/widow; d) single never married.

*Number of people in primary residence.* Parent self-report of the number of people living in child's house.

*Number of children in primary residence.* Parent self-report of the number of children under the age of 18 residing in the child's house.

*Immigration status.* Parents self-report whether they were born in the U.S. or not. Two dummy variables: a) Born in the U.S. (reference), b) Not born in the U.S.

*Socioeconomic status:* For the purpose of this dissertation, I conceptualized the socioeconomic status (SES) variable based on previous literature which recognizes measurements of two forms of capital as dimensions of socioeconomic status (Dumais, 2005): parents' income (economic capital) and educational attainment (institutionalized cultural capital). Therefore, this categorical variable was created by combining two other categorical variables representing Income and Education as described below:

*Income.* Parents self-report of their household income before taxes in five possible categories a) Less than \$25,000; b) \$25,000 to \$50,000; c) \$50,000 to \$75,000; d) \$75,000 to \$100,000; e) \$100,000 or more.

*Parental education.* Self-report of parents' educational attainment: a) graduate degree; b) bachelor's degree; c) associate degree; d) technical training, e) some college credit; f) high school, g) some high school.

Due to the negatively skewed distribution of the sample, I first transformed the income and parental education variables by reducing each of them to three categories. The categorical variable Education3 comprised: a) Less than bachelor's degree; b) Bachelor's degree, c) Graduate degree; and the categorical variable Income 3 was comprised of the following three levels of income: a) Less than \$50,000; b) \$50,000 to < \$100,000; c) more than \$100,000.

Furthermore, I computed three levels of SES using the matrix below and then created three dummy variables Low SES, Middle SES, High SES (reference):

**Low SES = Edu1Income1, Edu1Income2, Edu2Income1**

**Middle SES = Edu3Income1, Edu2Income2, Edu1Income3**

**High SES = Edu3Income2, Edu2Income3, Edu3Income3**

|                       |                              | Income<br>3 levels  |                                |                      |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|
|                       |                              | Income1=<br>< \$50K | Income 2=<br>< \$50K, \$100K > | Income3=<br>> \$100K |
| Education<br>3 levels | Edu1 = < Bachelor's          | Edu1Income1         | Edu1Income2                    | Edu1Income3          |
|                       | Edu 2 = Bachelor's<br>degree | Edu2Income1         | Edu2Income2                    | Edu2Income3          |
|                       | Edu 3 = > Bachelor's         | Edu3Income1         | Edu3Income2                    | Edu3Income3          |

Figure 1. Matrix Utilized to Create the Variable SES

*Number of musical toys.* A musical variable of control for the OLS regression analysis. Parent self-report of the number of musical toys they have available at home.

*Number of musical instruments.* A musical variable of control for the OLS regression analysis. Parent self-report of the number of musical instruments they have available at home.

*Value of music education.* A musical variable of control for the OLS regression analysis, because previous studies have found that parental value of music was a predictor of parent-child interactions at home (Wills, 2011). This variable was measured by parents' rating on a scale from 0 to 4 how important music education was for them.

*Location.* Two dummy variables were used to indicate the two programs in New York City: a) NY1 (reference); b) Other program sites.

*Number of terms.* Variable retrieved from administrative data. It measured the number of program terms a child had participated.

***Preparatory OLS regression analysis.*** As mentioned above, before performing the regression analysis using the main models of interest, I conducted a preparatory analysis to understand what sociodemographic variables predict the three independent variables under study (previous formal musical experience, parents' engagement in program activities, frequency of child's attendance to the class) by fitting the following prediction models:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Y_1 (\text{parent's prev. formal musical exp.}) = & b_0 + b_1 (\text{age of parent}) + b_2 (\text{age of} \\
 & \text{child}) + b_3 (\text{parent female}) + b_4 (\text{child female}) + b_5 (\text{cohabitating}) + b_6 \\
 & (\text{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_7 (\text{single}) + b_8 (\text{non-US born}) + b_9 (\text{Asian}) + b_{10} \\
 & (\text{Black}) + b_{11} (\text{Multiracial}) + b_{12} (\text{race\_other}) + b_{13} (\text{Hispanic}) + b_{14} (\text{part-time}) + \\
 & b_{15} (\text{not employed}) + b_{16} (\text{other employment}) + b_{17} (\text{middle SES}) + b_{18} (\text{low} \\
 & \text{SES}) + b_{19} (\text{number of people in primary residence}) + b_{20} (\text{number of children})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$Y_2 (\textit{engagement in program activities}) = b_0 + b_1 (\textit{age of parent}) + b_2 (\textit{age of child}) + b_3 (\textit{parent female}) + b_4 (\textit{child female}) + b_5 (\textit{cohabitating}) + b_6 (\textit{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_7 (\textit{single}) + b_8 (\textit{non-US born}) + b_9 (\textit{Asian}) + b_{10} (\textit{Black}) + b_{11} (\textit{Multiracial}) + b_{12} (\textit{race\_other}) + b_{13} (\textit{Hispanic}) + b_{14} (\textit{part-time}) + b_{15} (\textit{not employed}) + b_{16} (\textit{other employment}) + b_{17} (\textit{middle SES}) + b_{18} (\textit{low SES}) + b_{19} (\textit{number of people in primary residence}) + b_{20} (\textit{number of children}) + b_{21} (\textit{general parental engagement})$$

$$Y_3 (\textit{frequency of child's attendance}) = b_0 + b_1 (\textit{age of parent}) + b_2 (\textit{age of child}) + b_3 (\textit{parent female}) + b_4 (\textit{child female}) + b_5 (\textit{cohabitating}) + b_6 (\textit{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_7 (\textit{single}) + b_8 (\textit{non-US born}) + b_9 (\textit{Asian}) + b_{10} (\textit{Black}) + b_{11} (\textit{Multiracial}) + b_{12} (\textit{race\_other}) + b_{13} (\textit{Hispanic}) + b_{14} (\textit{part-time}) + b_{15} (\textit{not employed}) + b_{16} (\textit{other employment}) + b_{17} (\textit{middle SES}) + b_{18} (\textit{low SES}) + b_{19} (\textit{number of people in primary residence}) + b_{20} (\textit{number of children}) + b_{21} (\textit{general parental engagement}) + b_{22} (\textit{number of terms attended}) + b_{23} (\textit{program location}).$$

In the above models, the reference categories for the sociodemographic variables (omitted from the model) are parent male, child male, married, born in the U.S., White, Non-Hispanic, full-time employment, high SES. For  $Y_2$  and  $Y_3$ , in addition to sociodemographic variables I included general parental engagement as a baseline variable. For  $Y_3$  only, I also added number of terms and program location.

During this preparatory analysis, I also examined what sociodemographic and baseline variables predict the dependent variable of interest *parental musical*

*engagement*. In the model below the reference categories for the sociodemographic variables (omitted from the model) are parent male, child male, married, born in the U.S., White, Non-Hispanic, full-time employment, high SES, and I also included general parental engagement as a control variable because it was highly correlated with parental musical engagement.

$$Y_1(\text{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1(\text{age of parent}) + b_2(\text{age of child}) + b_3(\text{parent female}) + b_4(\text{child female}) + b_5(\text{cohabitating}) + b_6(\text{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_7(\text{single}) + b_8(\text{non-US born}) + b_9(\text{Asian}) + b_{10}(\text{Black}) + b_{11}(\text{Multiracial}) + b_{12}(\text{race\_other}) + b_{13}(\text{Hispanic}) + b_{14}(\text{part-time}) + b_{15}(\text{not employed}) + b_{16}(\text{other employment}) + b_{17}(\text{middle SES}) + b_{18}(\text{low SES}) + b_{19}(\text{number of people in primary residence}) + b_{20}(\text{number of children}) + b_{21}(\text{general parental engagement}).$$

**Main OLS regression analysis.** In this part of the analysis, I assessed the research questions using following additive regression models

**RQ4A.** *Is there an association between parents' previous formal musical experiences and parental musical engagement?*

Model 1

$$Y(\text{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1(\text{parent's prev. musical exp.}) + b_2(\text{age of parent}) + b_3(\text{age of child}) + b_4(\text{parent female}) + b_5(\text{child female}) + b_6(\text{cohabitating}) + b_7(\text{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_8(\text{single}) + b_9(\text{non-US born}) + b_{10}(\text{Asian}) + b_{11}(\text{Black}) + b_{12}(\text{Multiracial}) + b_{13}(\text{race\_other}) + b_{14}(\text{Hispanic}) + b_{15}(\text{part-time}) + b_{16}(\text{not employed}) + b_{17}(\text{other employment}) + b_{18}(\text{middle SES}) + b_{19}(\text{low SES}) + b_{20}(\text{number of people in primary residence}) + b_{21}(\text{number of children}) + b_{22}(\text{general parental engagement}).$$

In the first model (shown above), the reference categories for the sociodemographic variables (omitted from the model) are parent male, child male, married, born in the U.S., White, Non-Hispanic, full-time employment, high SES. General parental engagement was also included because it is highly correlated with the dependent variable. In the following Model 2, I introduced additional controls for musical materials at home and parents' values of music education.

#### Model 2

$$Y(\textit{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1 (\textit{parent's prev. musical exp.}) + b_2 (\textit{age of parent}) + b_3 (\textit{age of child}) + b_4 (\textit{parent female}) + b_5 (\textit{child female}) + b_6 (\textit{cohabitating}) + b_7 (\textit{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_8 (\textit{single}) + b_9 (\textit{non-US born}) + b_{10} (\textit{Asian}) + b_{11} (\textit{Black}) + b_{12} (\textit{Multiracial}) + b_{13} (\textit{race\_other}) + b_{14} (\textit{Hispanic}) + b_{15} (\textit{part-time}) + b_{16} (\textit{not employed}) + b_{17} (\textit{other employment}) + b_{18} (\textit{middle SES}) + b_{19} (\textit{low SES}) + b_{20} (\textit{number of people in primary residence}) + b_{21} (\textit{number of children}) + b_{22} (\textit{general parental engagement}) + b_{23} (\textit{number of musical toys}) + b_{24} (\textit{number of musical instruments}) + b_{25} (\textit{values of music education})$$

**RQ4B.** *Is there an association between parents' engagement in program activities and parental musical engagement?*

#### Model 1

$$Y(\textit{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1 (\textit{engagement program}) + b_2 (\textit{age of parent}) + b_3 (\textit{age of child}) + b_4 (\textit{parent female}) + b_5 (\textit{child female}) + b_6 (\textit{cohabitating}) + b_7 (\textit{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_8 (\textit{single}) + b_9 (\textit{non-US born}) + b_{10} (\textit{Asian}) + b_{11} (\textit{Black}) + b_{12} (\textit{Multiracial}) + b_{13} (\textit{race\_other}) + b_{14} (\textit{Hispanic}) + b_{15} (\textit{part-time}) + b_{16} (\textit{not employed}) + b_{17} (\textit{other employment}) + b_{18}$$



(middle SES) + b<sub>19</sub> (low SES) + b<sub>20</sub> (number of people in primary residence) + b<sub>21</sub> (number of children) + b<sub>22</sub> (general parental engagement)

In Model 1 (shown above), the reference categories for the sociodemographic variables (omitted from the model) are parent male, child male, married, born in the U.S., White, Non-Hispanic, full-time employment, high SES. General parental engagement was also included.

#### Model 2

$$Y(\textit{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1 (\textit{engagement program}) + b_2 (\textit{age of parent}) + b_3 (\textit{age of child}) + b_4 (\textit{parent female}) + b_5 (\textit{child female}) + b_6 (\textit{cohabitating}) + b_7 (\textit{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_8 (\textit{single}) + b_9 (\textit{non-US born}) + b_{10} (\textit{Asian}) + b_{11} (\textit{Black}) + b_{12} (\textit{Multiracial}) + b_{13} (\textit{race\_other}) + b_{14} (\textit{Hispanic}) + b_{15} (\textit{part-time}) + b_{16} (\textit{not employed}) + b_{17} (\textit{other employment}) + b_{18} (\textit{middle SES}) + b_{19} (\textit{low SES}) + b_{20} (\textit{number of people in primary residence}) + b_{21} (\textit{number of children}) + b_{22} (\textit{general parental engagement}) + b_{23} (\textit{number of musical toys}) + b_{24} (\textit{number of musical instruments}) + b_{25} (\textit{values of music education})$$

#### Model 3

$$Y(\textit{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1 (\textit{engagement program}) + b_2 (\textit{age of parent}) + b_3 (\textit{age of child}) + b_4 (\textit{parent female}) + b_5 (\textit{child female}) + b_6 (\textit{cohabitating}) + b_7 (\textit{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_8 (\textit{single}) + b_9 (\textit{non-US born}) + b_{10} (\textit{Asian}) + b_{11} (\textit{Black}) + b_{12} (\textit{Multiracial}) + b_{13} (\textit{race\_other}) + b_{14} (\textit{Hispanic}) + b_{15} (\textit{part-time}) + b_{16} (\textit{not employed}) + b_{17} (\textit{other employment}) + b_{18} (\textit{middle SES}) + b_{19} (\textit{low SES}) + b_{20} (\textit{number of people in primary residence}) + b_{21} (\textit{number of children}) + b_{22} (\textit{general parental engagement}) + b_{23} (\textit{number of musical$$

toys ) +  $b_{24}$  (number of musical instruments) +  $b_{25}$  (values of music education) +  $b_{26}$  (program location)

In the above Models 2 and 3, I introduced additional controls for musical materials at home and parents' values of music education (Model 2) as well as a control for the location of the program (Model 3).

**RQ4C.** *Is there an association between frequency of child's attendance to the class and parental musical engagement?*

Model 1

$$Y(\text{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1 (\text{frequency of child's attendance to class}) + b_2 (\text{age of parent}) + b_3 (\text{age of child}) + b_4 (\text{parent female}) + b_5 (\text{child female}) + b_6 (\text{cohabitating}) + b_7 (\text{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_8 (\text{single}) + b_9 (\text{non-US born}) + b_{10} (\text{Asian}) + b_{11} (\text{Black}) + b_{12} (\text{Multiracial}) + b_{13} (\text{race\_other}) + b_{14} (\text{Hispanic}) + b_{15} (\text{part-time}) + b_{16} (\text{not employed}) + b_{17} (\text{other employment}) + b_{18} (\text{middle SES}) + b_{19} (\text{low SES}) + b_{20} (\text{number of people in primary residence}) + b_{21} (\text{number of children}) + b_{22} (\text{general parental engagement})$$

In the first model (shown above), the reference categories for the sociodemographic variables (omitted from the model) are parent male, child male, married, born in the U.S., White, Non-Hispanic, full-time employment, high SES. General parental engagement was also included. Model 2 (shown below) supplies additional control variables for musical materials at home and parents' values of music education.

Model 2

$$Y(\text{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1 (\text{frequency of child's attendance to class}) + b_2 (\text{age of parent}) + b_3 (\text{age of child}) + b_4 (\text{parent female}) + b_5 (\text{child female}) + b_6 (\text{cohabitating}) + b_7 (\text{widow\_separated\_divorce}) + b_8$$

(single) + b<sub>9</sub> ( non-US born ) + b<sub>10</sub> (Asian) + b<sub>11</sub> (Black) + b<sub>12</sub> (Multiracial)+ b<sub>13</sub> (race\_other) + b<sub>14</sub> (Hispanic) + b<sub>15</sub> (part-time) + b<sub>16</sub> (not employed) + b<sub>17</sub> (other employment) + b<sub>18</sub> (middle SES) + b<sub>19</sub> (low SES) + b<sub>20</sub> (number of people in primary residence) + b<sub>21</sub> (number of children) + b<sub>22</sub> (general parental engagement) + b<sub>24</sub> (number of musical instruments) + b<sub>25</sub> (values of music education)

### Model 3

$Y(\text{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1$  (frequency of child's attendance to class) + b<sub>2</sub> (age of parent) + b<sub>3</sub> (age of child) + b<sub>4</sub> (parent female) + b<sub>5</sub> (child female) + b<sub>6</sub> (cohabitating) + b<sub>7</sub> (widow\_separated\_divorce) + b<sub>8</sub> (single) + b<sub>9</sub> ( non-US born ) + b<sub>10</sub> (Asian) + b<sub>11</sub> (Black) + b<sub>12</sub> (Multiracial)+ b<sub>13</sub> (race\_other) + b<sub>14</sub> (Hispanic) + b<sub>15</sub> (part-time) + b<sub>16</sub> (not employed) + b<sub>17</sub> (other employment) + b<sub>18</sub> (middle SES) + b<sub>19</sub> (low SES) + b<sub>20</sub> (number of people in primary residence) + b<sub>21</sub> (number of children) + b<sub>22</sub> (general parental engagement) + b<sub>24</sub> (number of musical instruments) + b<sub>25</sub> (values of music education) + b<sub>26</sub> (program location) + b<sub>27</sub> (number of terms)

In Model 3 above, I incorporated control variables for program location and the number of terms families attended the program.

**RQ5.** *Does social class moderate the association between engagement in program activities and parental musical engagement?*

### Model 1

$Y(\text{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1$  (engagement program) + b<sub>2</sub> (age of parent) + b<sub>3</sub> (age of child) + b<sub>4</sub> (parent female) + b<sub>5</sub> (child female) + b<sub>6</sub> (cohabitating) + b<sub>7</sub> (widow\_separated\_divorce) + b<sub>8</sub> (single) + b<sub>9</sub> ( non-US born ) + b<sub>10</sub> (Asian) + b<sub>11</sub> (Black) + b<sub>12</sub> (Multiracial)+ b<sub>13</sub> (race\_other) + b<sub>14</sub>

(Hispanic) +  $b_{15}$  (part-time) +  $b_{16}$  (not employed) +  $b_{17}$  (other employment) +  $b_{18}$  (middle SES) +  $b_{19}$  (low SES) +  $b_{20}$  (number of people in primary residence) +  $b_{21}$  (number of children) +  $b_{22}$  (general parental engagement) +  $b_{23}$  (number of musical toys) +  $b_{24}$  (number of musical instruments) +  $b_{25}$  (values of music education) +  $b_{26}$  (program location)

In the first moderation model (shown above), the reference categories for the sociodemographic variables (omitted from the model) are parent male, child male, married, born in the U.S., White, Non-Hispanic, full-time employment, high SES. General parental engagement was also included. For the second moderation model (shown below), I added an interaction between engagement in the program activities and SES.

#### Model 2

$Y(\text{parental musical engagement at home}) = b_0 + b_1$  (engagement program) +  $b_2$  (age of parent) +  $b_3$  (age of child) +  $b_4$  (parent female) +  $b_5$  (child female) +  $b_6$  (cohabitating) +  $b_7$  (widow\_separated\_divorce) +  $b_8$  (single) +  $b_9$  (non-US born) +  $b_{10}$  (Asian) +  $b_{11}$  (Black) +  $b_{12}$  (Multiracial) +  $b_{13}$  (race\_other) +  $b_{14}$  (Hispanic) +  $b_{15}$  (part-time) +  $b_{16}$  (not employed) +  $b_{17}$  (other employment) +  $b_{18}$  (middle SES) +  $b_{19}$  (low SES) +  $b_{20}$  (number of people in primary residence) +  $b_{21}$  (number of children) +  $b_{22}$  (general parental engagement) +  $b_{23}$  (number of musical toys) +  $b_{24}$  (number of musical instruments) +  $b_{25}$  (values of music education) +  $b_{26}$  (program location) +  $b_{26}$  (engagement program X Middle SES) +  $b_{27}$  (engagement program X Low SES).

## Chapter Summary

In order to explore parents' values and rationales for attending an early childhood jazz music program and socioeconomic factors that could influence that attendance, as well as attitudes and practices that are associated with the musical engagement with their children, a cross-sectional mixed-mode survey design was utilized. Study participants were 469 families from different cities in the United States who are currently enrolled or who attended the same early childhood jazz education program up to three years ago. Since some families only speak Spanish, a survey pilot was conducted in English and Spanish to check for language and content errors. After approval from the Teachers College Institutional Review Board, administrators of the different locations where the program is offered were contacted formally with a letter of invitation to participate in the study. Surveys were sent out to families and data was collected from July-September 2018. The analytic strategy consisted of two large phases where different quantitative methods were used.

## Chapter IV

### RESULTS

#### **First Phase**

##### **Sociodemographic and Musical Characteristics of the Families**

The first research question of this exploratory study aimed to identify parents' sociodemographic characteristics and previous formal musical experiences as well as the home environment conditions of the families who enrolled in a national jazz program for young children between 2015- September 2018. All results reflect imputed data.

Table 5 shows that the majority of program participants who responded to this survey were parents (97%) and mostly mothers (83.4%). Few were grandparents (2.3%) and reported themselves as a relative or other caregiver (0.6%). By and large, respondents were female (85.3%). The age of the sample ranged from 25 to 73 years old with the majority between the ages of 36-45 (66.3%). Most participants were married (85.9%), but a small percentage of participants reported that they were cohabiting with a partner (4.3%) or were single (5.3%). Participants described themselves as White (55.7%), Asian (14.9%), Black (9.8%), Multiracial (8.5%), American Indian (0.1%) and Other race/ethnicity (8.5%). Additionally, most of the sample reported being non-Hispanic (80.6%) and born in the United States (70.6%).

The majority of participants were highly educated, having obtained graduate (59.3%) or bachelor's (27.1%) degrees and reported their annual family income in 2017 being \$100,000 or more (71.2%). Fewer participants reported attaining less than a bachelor's degree (13.6%) or an annual income between \$75,000-\$100,000 (9.4%) or \$25,000-\$50,000 (8.7%) (See Table 5 for detailed educational attainment and income distributions).

Regarding their employment status, half of the participants were employed full-time (58.8%). Fewer reported working part-time (14.4%) or having other types of employment arrangements (4.7%). A fifth of the sample participants reported being a stay-at-home parent (20.9%).

Lastly, the majority of participants reported having one (47.5%) or two (39.7%) children, and there was an approximately even distribution of male (56.7%) and female (43.3%) children who are currently participating or participated previously in the program.

Table 5

*Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants (N=469)*

| Characteristic                         | <i>n</i> | %    |
|--|----------|------|
| <u>Relationship to Child</u>           |          |      |
| Mother                                 | 391      | 83.4 |
| Father                                 | 64       | 13.6 |
| Grandmother/father                     | 11       | 2.3  |
| Other Relative                         | 1        | 0.2  |
| Other                                  | 2        | 0.4  |
| <u>Adult Gender</u>                    |          |      |
| Female                                 | 400      | 85.3 |
| Male                                   | 69       | 14.7 |
| <u>Age of Parent/Survey Respondent</u> |          |      |
| 36-45                                  | 311      | 66.3 |
| 25-35                                  | 95       | 20.3 |
| 46-54                                  | 53       | 11.3 |
| 55-73                                  | 10       | 2.1  |

Table 5 (continued)

| Characteristic                          | <i>n</i> | %    |
|---|----------|------|
| <u>Marital Status</u>                   |          |      |
| Married                                 | 403      | 85.9 |
| Single (Never Married)                  | 25       | 5.3  |
| Cohabiting                              | 20       | 4.3  |
| Divorced                                | 8        | 1.7  |
| Separated                               | 8        | 1.7  |
| Widowed                                 | 5        | 1.1  |
| <u>Child Age Categories</u>             |          |      |
| 3-5 years old                           | 194      | 41.4 |
| 2-3 years old                           | 138      | 29.4 |
| 5-7 years old                           | 93       | 19.8 |
| 8 months-1 year old                     | 28       | 6    |
| 7-10 years old                          | 16       | 3.4  |
| <u>Child Gender</u>                     |          |      |
| Male                                    | 266      | 56.7 |
| Female                                  | 203      | 43.3 |
| <u>Number of Children in the Family</u> |          |      |
| 1                                       | 223      | 47.5 |
| 2                                       | 186      | 39.7 |
| 3                                       | 55       | 11.7 |
| 4                                       | 4        | 0.9  |
| More than 4                             | 1        | 0.2  |
| <u>Annual Family Income</u>             |          |      |
| \$100,000 or more                       | 334      | 71.2 |
| \$75,000-\$100,000                      | 44       | 9.4  |
| \$25,000-\$50,000                       | 41       | 8.7  |
| Less than \$25,000                      | 26       | 5.5  |
| \$50,000-\$75,000                       | 24       | 5.1  |
| <u>Race</u>                             |          |      |
| White                                   | 261      | 55.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander               | 70       | 14.9 |
| Other                                   | 47       | 10.0 |
| Black/African American                  | 46       | 9.8  |
| Multiracial                             | 40       | 8.5  |
| American Indian, Eskimo, Leut           | 5        | 1.1  |
| <u>Hispanic or Latino Origin</u>        |          |      |
| No                                      | 378      | 80.6 |
| Yes                                     | 91       | 19.4 |
| <u>Immigration Status</u>               |          |      |
| I was born in the U.S.                  | 331      | 70.6 |
| I came here to live as an adult         | 101      | 21.5 |
| I came here to live when I was a child  | 37       | 7.9  |



Table 5 (continued)

| Characteristic                                   | <i>n</i> | %    |
|--|----------|------|
| <u>Educational Attainment</u>                    |          |      |
| Graduate degree (e.g. MA, MD, DDS, MS, PhD, EdD) | 278      | 59.3 |
| Bachelor's degree (e.g. BA, BS)                  | 127      | 27.1 |
| Some college credit, no degree                   | 26       | 5.5  |
| High school degree or equivalent (e.g. GED)      | 14       | 3.0  |
| Associate's degree (e.g. AA, AS)                 | 12       | 2.6  |
| Some high school, no diploma                     | 7        | 1.5  |
| Trade/technical/vocational training              | 5        | 1.1  |
| <u>Employment Status</u>                         |          |      |
| Full-time  | 276      | 58.8 |
| Non-employed                                     | 98       | 20.9 |
| Part-time  | 67       | 14.4 |
| Other  | 22       | 4.7  |
| Student  | 3        | 0.6  |
| Retired  | 3        | 0.6  |
| <u>Program Location</u>                          |          |      |
| NYC1   | 367      | 78.3 |
| NYC2   | 35       | 7.5  |
| Omaha1   | 28       | 6.0  |
| St. Louis  | 20       | 4.3  |
| Chicago  | 6        | 1.3  |
| Omaha2   | 5        | 1.1  |
| Seattle  | 5        | 1.1  |
| Orlando  | 3        | 0.6  |

*Note:* Results reflect imputed data.

### Previous Formal Musical Experiences

Participants were asked three yes/no questions to determine whether they had taken instrumental music lessons or sung in a choir/ensemble at some point in their life, and whether they currently play a musical instrument. Overall, half of the participants reported being exposed to formal musical experiences. Three quarters of the participants took instrumental lessons in the past but only half reported that they currently played a musical instrument. In addition, 189 participants reported that they had participated in a choir or ensemble group in the past.

Table 6

| Variables                                | n   | % Yes |
|--|-----|-------|
| Taken instrumental lessons               | 357 | 76    |
| Play a musical instrument                | 239 | 51    |
| Participated in a choir of musical group | 189 | 40.3  |

*Note:*  $N = 469$ . Combined frequencies do not total 100%

These three items were summed ( $\alpha = 0.662$ ) to create the variable *Previous Formal Musical Experience*, which resulted in a 0 to 3-point scale with an average score of  $M = 1.84$  ( $SD = 1.09$ ).

Moreover, regardless their marital status survey participants were also asked two yes/no questions to report about the other parent previous musical experiences. More than half of the participants reported that the child's other parent had taken music lessons in the past and one third reported that the other parent had participated in choirs or musical groups.

Table 7

| Variable                                 | n   | %Yes |
|--|-----|------|
| Taken instrumental lessons               | 267 | 56.9 |
| Participated in a choir or musical group | 167 | 35.6 |

*Note:*  $N = 469$ . Combined frequencies do not total 100%

### Values of Music Education

Survey participants also reported how important music education was for them. Based on their responses on the 5-likert scale item (1 =not at all important to 5=extremely important) it seemed that for this group, music education is considered of great value

( $M = 4.58$ ,  $SD = 0.64$ ), which was expected based on the fact that they were currently or had participated in the early childhood jazz program under study.

### Home Environmental Conditions

**Musical materials.** The majority of participants reported having five or more musical toys at home (64%), and between one (38.4%) or two (22.8%) musical instruments. Results are shown in Table 8.

**Number of people in the home.** Table 9 shows the distribution of reported number of people living in the participant's household. Most of the families reported living in households with 3 to 5 members (85.7%). Few participants reported living in a larger household size (6.8%) or in households comprised of 1-2 members (7.5%).

Table 8

#### *Musical Materials at Home*

| N of materials | Musical Toys |       | Instruments |       |
|----------------|--------------|-------|-------------|-------|
|                | <i>n</i>     | %     | <i>n</i>    | %     |
| 0              | 11           | 2.3   | 37          | 7.9   |
| 1              | 13           | 2.8   | 180         | 38.4  |
| 2              | 43           | 9.2   | 107         | 22.8  |
| 3              | 53           | 11.3  | 49          | 10.4  |
| 4              | 49           | 10.4  | 20          | 4.3   |
| 5 or more      | 300          | 64.0  | 76          | 16.2  |
| Total          | 469          | 100.0 | 469         | 100.0 |

Table 9

*Number of People in the Household*

|                   | <i>n</i> | %     |
|-------------------|----------|-------|
| 1-2 per household | 35       | 7.5   |
| 3-5 per household | 402      | 85.7  |
| 6-8 per household | 32       | 6.8   |
| Total             | 469      | 100.0 |

**Reasons for Enrolling in the Program**

In order to examine families' values, rationales and attitudes for participation in the early childhood jazz program, survey participants were asked to rate the level of agreement with the following eight statements related to their reasons for enrolling: a) I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre; b) It's an activity that allows me to spend time with my child; c) Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future; d) It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center; e) It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others; f) Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in the program makes me feel more connected to this country; g) I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment; and h) Friends recommended it.

As explained in the methods section, I conducted a principal component analysis (PCA) of those 8 items to explore their reasons to enroll in the early childhood jazz program. Results of the final rotated component matrix are presented in Table 10.

The component labels proposed are the following: Cultural and Educational Enrichment for the Future (Component 1); Appreciation of Jazz (Component 2); Socialization and Bonding (Component 3); and 4) Social Networks (Component 4).

All items that met the minimum criteria of having a primary factor loading of 0.5 or above were considered meaningful loadings (Stevens, 1986). Therefore, as Table 10 shows, in the first principal component, *Cultural and Educational Enrichment for the Future*, the eigenvector loadings on indicators capturing parents' valuation of the music class as an aid for academic success in the future (0.734, imputation 1), the provision of arts education as a source for cultural enrichment (0.728, imputation 1), and the access to important cultural institutions such as Jazz at Lincoln Center (0.632, imputation 1) are all positive and substantial in size. The second component, *Appreciation of Jazz*, appears to be mainly concerned with parents' passion about Jazz music and their interest to expose their children to that genre (0.906, imputation 1), as well as parents valuing this genre as a way to connect with American culture and its history (0.561, imputation 1). In the third principal component, *Socialization and Bonding*, the eigenvector loading on parents using the music class as an opportunity to spend time with their child is substantial in size (0.855, imputation 1), as well as the item related to parents considering the music class as an activity for the child to socialize with others (0.579, imputation 1). Finally, as theorized when I created this questionnaire matrix, the fourth component, *Social Networks*, shows a strong loading on parents motivated in participating in the music class because friends recommended it (0.940, imputation 1).

Table 10

*Rotated Component Matrix*<sup>a,b</sup>

|   | Component   |             |             |             |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | 1           | 2           | 3           | 4           |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future  | <b>.734</b> |             |             |             |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                              | <b>.728</b> |             |             |             |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                      | <b>.632</b> | .394        |             |             |
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre   |             | <b>.906</b> |             |             |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in program makes me feel more connected to this country. |             | <b>.561</b> | .379        |             |
| It's an activity that allows me to spend time with my child   |             |             | <b>.855</b> |             |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | .411        |             | <b>.579</b> | .305        |
| Friends recommended it  |             |             |             | <b>.940</b> |

*Note:* Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Equamax with Kaiser Normalization.

<sup>a</sup>. Imputation Number = 1 <sup>b</sup>. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Furthermore, these four components were also supported by some participants' open-ended responses. As part of the survey questionnaire, participants had the option to report about other possible reasons for enrolling in the program. Hence, 169 parents (36%) responded "yes" and wrote an open-ended response. The following quotes are examples of parents' responses that were aligned to the four principal components obtained as part of the PCA analysis.

Parents' quotes aligned with the first principal component *Cultural and*

*Educational Enrichment for the Future:*

Escribí a mi niño al programa de música porque le ayuda aprender nuevas cosas y le ayudó a desarrollar su aprendizaje. (I enrolled my child in the music program because it helps him to learn new things as well as acquiring knowledge).

Musical education strengthens portions of the brain associated with mathematics and linguistics, and all three areas are important and enjoyed then and now by our child.

Developing a musical ear at an earlier age and learning to appreciate the arts via music is critical for us.

I believe it's beneficial for my child to have access to music enrichment. While I like and appreciate music and JLCO, I do not know how to play an instrument or understand music theory well and wanted to give my son that opportunity.

Parents' quotes aligned with the second principal component *Appreciation of Jazz* are shown below:

We thought it would be fun for her and give us her parents a little more info about the Jazz we love.

We enrolled in these classes so they can have a connection to their ancestors who were Jazz musicians.

It provided a cultural and historical context of jazz musicianship in our country. It did this in an age appropriate way. It also gave her access to live musicians each week. Not every music class provides that.

Parents' quotes aligned with the third principal component *Socialization and*

*Bonding:*

Porque ayudó a mi niño en su desarrollo y lo ayudó a ser mas independiente y amistoso con las demás personas en su entorno, por lo cual recomendaría este tipo de actividades. (Because it helped my child in his development and to be more independent and friendlier with other people around him, which is why I would recommend these type of activities).

First year at Pre-School and she wasn't connecting well or doing very good in class. Her teacher recommended this program to help her connect with her peers and make friends. First three appointments she made friends and came out of her shell.

Finally, parents included some comments that were aligned with the fourth principal component *Social Networks:*

A family member recommended it and encouraged me to place our child in the program.

El programa de Head Start de Columbia me lo recomendó. (The Head Start program at Columbia University recommended it).

I organized so that a bunch of my friends could bring their kids the same day.

Research question 2, inquires not only about the reasons why these families were interested in enrolling in the program but also about whether or not their rationales and attitudes regarding their participation may be associated with their social class.

Table 11 and 12 show pooled results from the linear regressions of the five imputed data sets for the component *Cultural & Educational Enrichment for the Future* (see Appendix C for all regressions). There was a statistically significant average difference in loadings of component 1 between low-SES and high-SES families. ( $B=.358$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Table 11

*Equation 1: Association Between SES and Cultural & Educational Enrichment for the Future*

|                | Unstandardized Coefficients |           | 95 % CI       |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|                | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE</i> |               |
| Middle SES new | .307                        | .169      | [-.029, .642] |
| Low SES new    | .358**                      | .145      | [.074, .642]  |
| Intercept      | -.076                       | .053      | [-.180, .027] |

*Note:* Ref. group High SES. Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients, SE, and CI. Results reflect imputed data. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$



Table 12

*Equation 2: Association Between SES and Cultural & Educational Enrichment for the Future*

|                | Unstandardized Coefficients |           | 95 % CI        |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------|
|                | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE</i> |                |
| Middle SES new | -.051                       | .203      | [-.451, .348]  |
| High SES new   | -.358                       | .145      | [-.642, -.074] |
| Intercept      | -.076                       | .053      | [.019, .544]   |

*Note:* Ref. group Low SES. Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients, SE, and CI. Results reflect imputed data. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Similarly, Tables 13 and 14 show a statistically significant average difference in loadings for component 4 between low-SES and high-SES ( $B = .439, p < 0.01$ ), as well as low-SES and middle-SES families ( $B = .744, p < 0.01$ ).

Table 13

*Equation 1: Association Between SES and Social Networks*

|                | Unstandardized Coefficients |           | 95 % CI       |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|                | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE</i> |               |
| Middle SES new | -.306                       | .161      | [-.624, .012] |
| Low SES new    | .439**                      | .149      | [.144, .733]  |
| Intercept      | -.021                       | .052      | [-.124, .082] |

*Note:* Ref. group High SES. Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients, SE, and CI. Results reflect imputed data. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Table 14

*Equation 2: Association Between SES and Social Networks*

|                | Unstandardized Coefficients |           |                 |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|
|                | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE</i> | 95 % CI         |
| Middle SES new | -.744**                     | .216      | [-1.174, -.315] |
| High SES new   | -.439**                     | .149      | [-.733, -.144]  |
| Intercept      | .418                        | .139      | [.145, .690]    |

*Note:* Ref. group Low SES. Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients, SE, and CI. Results reflect imputed data. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

No statistically significant association between components two or three and SES were found (see Appendix C).

### Parental Engagement

One of the goals of this dissertation was to examine the level of general and musical engagement for parents who currently or formerly participated in an early childhood music program. General parental engagement was measured using 6 items from the Parental Engagement Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing study's questionnaire ( $\alpha = 0.674$ ). Survey participants who were not parents ( $n = 14$ ) were excluded from this analysis. Parents ( $n = 455$ ) reported how many days a week (scale from 1-8) they engage in different activities at home with their child (see Appendix A for the list of activities). Their responses were summed and averaged into a composite variable. Scores range from 2 to 8 ( $M = 6.72$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ).

Additionally, parents reported the frequency (scale from 1-8) and type of musical activities they engaged in with their children at home. Descriptive statistics of the four

items are shown in Table 15. Results suggest that parents were highly engaged in singing songs ( $M = 6.22$ ) and playing recorded music with their children ( $M = 6.62$ ).

Table 15

*Musical Activities Parents and Children Engage in at Home*

|  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | Skewness |
|--|----------|-----------|----------|
| Play recorded music for your child               | 6.62     | 2.003     | -1.274   |
| Play a musical instrument for or with your child | 3.79     | 2.551     | .523     |
| Sing songs or nursery rhymes to your child       | 6.22     | 2.373     | -.976    |
| Move to music (dance) with your child            | 5.61     | 2.170     | -.362    |

*Note:* Results reflect imputed data. Total parents  $n = 438$

Similarly, to general engagement score, these four items were summed and averaged ( $\alpha = 0.725$ ) to create the parental musical engagement at home score. Since this variable was the outcome of interest for the OLS regression analysis, the reported result reflects the raw ( $n = 438$ ) value rather than the imputed value ( $n = 455$ ). Items from this scale were summed and averaged to a composite variable. Scores range from 1.5 to 8 ( $M = 5.57$ ,  $SD = 1.681$ ).

Additionally, results from Pearson's product moment correlation between these two composite scores show a statistically significant strong positive correlation between parents' general and musical engagement,  $r = 0.64$ ,  $p < 0.001$ .

Finally, parents were asked to report how many days a week they engaged in activities from the music class at home (scale 1-8). Results from specific music activities related to the program are shown in Table 16. Overall, parents reported to engage at least once a week in each of the activities from the music class. These items were also summed and averaged to create the engagement in program activities score ( $\alpha = 0.811$ ).

Table 16

| <i>Activities from the Music Class</i>     |          |           |
|--|----------|-----------|
|  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Sang songs from the jazz class             | 3.62     | 2.137     |
| Listened to recordings from the jazz class | 2.71     | 1.923     |
| Dance to recordings from the jazz class    | 2.63     | 1.917     |
| Read books about jazz musicians            | 2.51     | 1.746     |

*Note:* Results reflect imputed data. Total parents  $n = 455$

Table 17 shows descriptive statistics of the variables, engagement in program activities and frequency of child's attendance to the program. Parents reported engaging less in musical activities specifically related to the music class ( $M = 2.88$ ,  $SD = 1.55$ ) compared to their level of musical engagement at home ( $M = 5.57$ ,  $SD = 1.68$ ).

The variable frequency of the child's attendance was created using administrative data obtained only from two programs located in New York City ( $n = 351$ ). In one program, music classes are tuition based and in the other one, classes are offered free of cost to families enrolled in a local Early Head Start program. The frequency of child's attendance to the program is a variable indicating the number of classes in a term a child attended (scale from 1-8). Results indicated that, on average, families had a moderate attendance to the music class ( $M = 5.76$ ,  $SD = 1.57$ ).

Table 17

| <i>Means of Variables Related to the Music Program</i> |          |          |           |
|--|----------|----------|-----------|
|  | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Engagement in program activities                       | 455      | 2.877    | 1.547     |
| Frequency of child's attendance to the program         | 351      | 5.759    | 1.568     |

*Note:* Results reflect imputed data only for engagement in program activities ( $n = 455$ ).

## Second Phase

As mentioned in the analysis section, the second phase of this dissertation consisted of using OLS regression to analyze 1) possible associations between parents' previous formal musical experiences and their musical engagement, 2) parents' engagement in program activities and their musical engagement at home, 3) the frequency of child's attendance to the music class and parent's musical engagement at home; and 4) whether social class moderates the association between parents' engagement in program activities and their musical engagement at home.

### **Sociodemographic Variables Associated with the Independent and Dependent Variables**

By performing a separate analysis of the sociodemographic variables associated with the independent (e.g. previous musical experiences, engagement in program activities, frequency of class attendance,) and dependent variables of interest (e.g. musical engagement at home), I intended to explore and understand the composition of those variables before conducting the main regression analysis.

**Sociodemographic variables associated with parents' previous formal musical experiences.** Table 18 below shows OLS regression results for sociodemographic covariates associated with parents' formal musical experiences. Three statistically significant associations were found. Parent who reported not being born in the U.S. reported less previous formal musical experiences ( $B = -.347, p > .01$ ) compared to the ones born in the U.S. Similarly, parents who considered themselves Hispanic,

regardless of their race, reported having less previous formal musical experience on average compared to the non-Hispanic parents ( $B = -.707, p > .001$ ). Contrary, parents who considered themselves Asians reported having a higher amount previous formal musical experience on average ( $B = .390, p > .01$ ) compared to their White counterparts

Table 18

*Sociodemographic Variables Associated with Parents' Previous Formal Musical Experiences (n=455)*

|                                      | Unstandardized Coefficients |             |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
|                                      | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE B</i> |
| Parent Gender Female                 | .112                        | .142        |
| Child Gender Female                  | -.020                       | .107        |
| Age Parent                           | .005                        | .010        |
| Child Age                            | -.022                       | .029        |
| Marital Status (ref: married)        |                             |             |
| Cohabiting                           | -.059                       | .246        |
| Widow/Separated/Divorce              | -.275                       | .279        |
| Single                               | -.397                       | .253        |
| Not born in the US                   | -.347**                     | .121        |
| Race (ref: White)                    |                             |             |
| Asian or Pacific                     | .390**                      | .149        |
| African American/Black               | .154                        | .174        |
| Multiracial                          | .178                        | .187        |
| Other race                           | .203                        | .193        |
| Hispanic_Yes                         | -.707***                    | .164        |
| Employment status (ref: full-time)   |                             |             |
| Part-Time                            | -.064                       | .148        |
| Not Employed                         | -.159                       | .129        |
| Other type of employment             | .149                        | .238        |
| Socioeconomic Status (ref: high-SES) |                             |             |
| Middle SES                           | -.320                       | .175        |
| Low SES                              | -.258                       | .190        |
| Number of children                   | -.134                       | .071        |
| Number of people household           | -.134                       | .165        |
| Intercept                            | 2.402                       | .554        |
| <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>                | .203                        |             |

Note: Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients and standard errors. Results reflect imputed data.

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

**Sociodemographic variables associated with parents' engagement in program activities.** OLS regression results presented in Table 19 below show statistically significant associations between three sociodemographic covariates and parent's engagement in program activities (measured as the composite of the frequency of days per week parents engage with their children in specific musical activities related to the program). Parents from lower-SES backgrounds were more likely to engage with their children in activities related to the music class ( $B = .606, p > .05$ ) compared to high-SES parents. Likewise, the level of general parental engagement was associated with parents' engagement in program activities ( $B = .342, p < .001$ ).

Table 19

*Sociodemographic Variables Associated with Engagement in Program Activities (n=455)*

|                                      | Unstandardized Coefficients |             |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
|                                      | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE B</i> |
| Parent Gender Female                 | .108                        | .220        |
| Child Gender Female                  | -.130                       | .157        |
| Age Parent                           | .013                        | .016        |
| Child Age                            | .089                        | .047        |
| Marital Status (ref: married)        |                             |             |
| Cohabiting                           | .426                        | .360        |
| Widow/Separated/Divorce              | -.222                       | .414        |
| Single                               | -.330                       | .388        |
| Not born in the US                   | .115                        | .182        |
| Race (ref: White)                    |                             |             |
| Asian or Pacific                     | .007                        | .229        |
| African American/Black               | .175                        | .263        |
| Multiracial                          | .282                        | .283        |
| Other race                           | .479                        | .293        |
| Hispanic_Yes                         | -.219                       | .260        |
| Employment status (ref: full-time)   |                             |             |
| Part-Time                            | .431                        | .223        |
| Not Employed                         | .058                        | .198        |
| Other type of employment             | .573                        | .371        |
| Socioeconomic Status (ref: high-SES) |                             |             |
| Middle SES                           | .301                        | .268        |
| Low SES                              | .606*                       | .302        |
| Number of children                   | .010                        | .092        |

Table 19 (continued)

|                            | Unstandardized Coefficients |             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
|                            | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE B</i> |
| Number of people household | .045                        | .273        |
| General Engagement Parent  | .342***                     | .075        |
| Intercept                  | -.774                       | 1.073       |
| <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>      | .120                        |             |

Note: Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients and standard errors. Results reflect imputed data. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

### Sociodemographic variables associated with frequency of child's attendance

to the program. As shown in Table 20, there was a statistically significant association between employment status and frequency of child's attendance to the program. Children with parents' who reported not being employed were more like to have less attendance to the music class compared to children of parents who worked full-time ( $B = -.502$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

Table 20

### *Sociodemographic Variables Associated with Frequency of Child's Attendance (n=351)*

|                               | Unstandardized Coefficients |             |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
|                               | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE B</i> |
| Parent Gender Female          | -.339                       | .262        |
| Child Gender Female           | .305                        | .184        |
| Age Parent                    | .013                        | .020        |
| Child Age                     | -.094                       | .057        |
| Marital Status (ref: married) |                             |             |
| Cohabiting                    | -.094                       | .441        |
| Widow/Separated/Divorce       | -.919                       | .549        |
| Single                        | .555                        | .426        |
| Not born in the US            | .291                        | .221        |
| Race (ref: White)             |                             |             |
| Asian or Pacific              | .059                        | .271        |
| African American/Black        | -.277                       | .317        |
| Multiracial                   | -.178                       | .331        |
| Other race                    | .289                        | .357        |



Table 20 (continued)

|                                      | Unstandardized Coefficients |             |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
|                                      | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE B</i> |
| Hispanic_Yes                         | -.106                       | .317        |
| Employment status (ref: full-time)   |                             |             |
| Part-Time                            | -.405                       | .275        |
| Not Employed                         | -.502*                      | .231        |
| Other type of employment             | -.031                       | .439        |
| Socioeconomic Status (ref: high-SES) |                             |             |
| Middle SES                           | -.231                       | .378        |
| Low SES                              | -.132                       | .501        |
| Number of children                   | -.029                       | .138        |
| Number of people household           | -.187                       | .336        |
| General Engagement Parent            | -.068                       | .090        |
| Number of terms                      | -.085                       | .060        |
| Location of program                  | -.170                       | .571        |
| Intercept                            | 7.285                       | 1.831       |
| <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>                | .099                        |             |

*Note:* Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients and standard errors. Results reflect imputed data for covariates only. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

**Sociodemographic variables associated with the dependent variable parental musical engagement.** OLS regression results presented in Table 21 shows that 48.3% of the variance in parent's musical engagement is explained by sociodemographic covariates and parents' general engagement ( $R^2 = 0.483$ ). As expected based on results from the correlation analysis, parents' general engagement was statistically significant associated ( $B = .875, p < .001$ ) with the parents' musical engagement score, when holding constant all sociodemographic variables. Marital status was also associated with parents' musical engagement. Single parents were less likely to engage with their children in musical activities compared to married parents ( $B = -.851, p < .01$ ). Contrary, parents who live with a partner but are not married were more likely to make music with their children compared to married parents ( $B = .848, p < .01$ ). Additionally, parents who reported having a non-traditional employment arrangement (e.g. self-employed, freelance, artist)

reported to engage more in music activities at home with their children compared to parents working full-time ( $B = .747, p < .05$ ). Parents who reported not being born in the U.S. were less likely to engage in music activities compared to the ones born in U.S. born ( $B = -.431, p < 0.01$ ). Finally, child age was negatively associated with parents' musical engagement ( $B = -.139, p < .001$ ).

Table 21

*Sociodemographic Variables Associated with Parents' Musical Engagement (n=438)*

|                                      | Unstandardized Coefficients |             |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
|                                      | <i>B</i>                    | <i>SE B</i> |
| Parent Gender Female                 | .243                        | .183        |
| Child Gender Female                  | .105                        | .134        |
| Age Parent                           | .003                        | .014        |
| Child Age                            | -.139*                      | .039        |
| Marital Status (ref: married)        |                             |             |
| Cohabiting                           | .848*                       | .317        |
| Widow/Separated/Divorce              | -.385                       | .365        |
| Single                               | -.851*                      | .312        |
| Not born in the US                   | -.431**                     | .150        |
| Race (ref: White)                    |                             |             |
| Asian or Pacific                     | -.066                       | .191        |
| African American/Black               | -.001                       | .218        |
| Multiracial                          | .436                        | .231        |
| Other race                           | .342                        | .241        |
| Hispanic_Yes                         | -.114                       | .202        |
| Employment status (ref: full-time)   |                             |             |
| Part-Time                            | .321                        | .188        |
| Not Employed                         | -.111                       | .165        |
| Other type of employment             | .747*                       | .307        |
| Socioeconomic Status (ref: high-SES) |                             |             |
| Middle SES                           | .124                        | .227        |
| Low SES                              | .013                        | .240        |
| Number of children                   | -.090                       | .092        |
| Number of people household           | .187                        | .222        |
| General Engagement Parent            | .875***                     | .063        |
| Intercept                            | -.284                       | .904        |
| $R^2$                                | 0.483                       |             |

*Note:* Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients and standard errors. Results reflect imputed data for covariates only. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## Independent Variables Associated with Parental Musical Engagement

Associations between three independent variables and parents' musical engagement were examined. The following sections present findings from the main OLS regression analysis.

**Parents' previous formal musical experiences and musical engagement at home.** Table 22 below reports the two additive OLS regression models utilized. Model 1 contains sociodemographic covariates and the inclusion of the first independent variable of interest, parent's previous musical experiences. This model explains 49.3% of the variance in parent's musical engagement score, with previous' musical experience by itself explaining only 1% of the variance. Parents previous formal musical experience was statistically associated with an increase in parental musical engagement at home ( $B = .173, p < .01$ ). In Model 2, the three musical control variables are added, number of musical toys at home, number of musical instruments at home, and parents' values of music education, which increases the variance explained from 49.3% to 54.2%. Additionally, in Model 2, after taking into account those musical control variables, the association between parents' previous formal musical experiences and their musical engagement at home is no longer statistically significant ( $B = .041, p > .05$ ). Despite the non-statistically significant association between the previous musical experiences and the independent variable of interest, two of the musical control variables show positive associations with parents' musical engagement. The number of musical toys at home was significantly associated with parents' engaging in musical activities with their children at home ( $B = .167, p > .01$ ). Similarly, the number of musical instruments available at home was associated with an increase in parents' musical engagement ( $B = .183, p > .001$ ).

Table 22

*Associations Between Parent's Formal Musical Experiences and Their Musical Engagement at Home*

|                                    | Musical Engagement at Home ( <i>n</i> =438) |                    |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
|                                    | Model 1                                     | Model 2            |
| Parent formal musical experience   | .173**<br>(.060)                            | .041<br>(.061)     |
| <i>Sociodemographic Controls</i>   |   |                    |
| Parent_Female                      | .226<br>(.181)                              | .251<br>(.174)     |
| Child_Female                       | .101<br>(.133)                              | .098<br>(.124)     |
| Age Parent                         | .002<br>(.013)                              | .001<br>(.013)     |
| Child age                          | -.137***<br>(.038)                          | -.136***<br>(.037) |
| Marital Status (ref: married)      |   |                    |
| Cohabiting                         | .862**<br>(.313)                            | .697*<br>(.291)    |
| Widow/ Separated/Divorce           | -.323<br>(.358)                             | -.159<br>(.331)    |
| Single                             | -.786*<br>(.310)                            | -.617*<br>(.298)   |
| Not born in the US                 | -.372*<br>(.150)                            | -.354*<br>(.143)   |
| Race (ref: White)                  |   |                    |
| Asian or Pacific                   | -.133<br>(.191)                             | -.083<br>(.184)    |
| African American/Black             | -.026<br>(.215)                             | .056<br>(.206)     |
| Multiracial                        | .405<br>(.229)                              | .446*<br>(.220)    |
| Other race                         | .311<br>(.238)                              | .258<br>(.228)     |
| Hispanic_Yes                       | .010<br>(.206)                              | .029<br>(.201)     |
| Employment status (ref: full-time) |   |                    |
| Part-Time                          | .337<br>(.186)                              | .310<br>(.178)     |
| Not Employed                       | -.078<br>(.164)                             | -.109<br>(.157)    |
| Other type of employment           | .722*<br>(.304)                             | .540<br>(.294)     |

Table 22 (continued)

|                                      | Model 1           | Model 2           |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Socioeconomic Status (ref: high-SES) |                   |                   |
| Middle SES                           | .183<br>(.222)    | .158<br>(.210)    |
| Low SES                              | .054<br>(.239)    | .298<br>(.240)    |
| N children                           | -.064<br>(.091)   | -.095<br>(.087)   |
| N of people household                | .205<br>(.211)    | .261<br>(.211)    |
| General Engagement Parent            | .869***<br>(.062) | .823***<br>(.061) |
| <i>Musical Controls</i>              |                   |                   |
| N musical toys at home               |                   | .167**<br>(.057)  |
| N musical instruments at home        |                   | .183***<br>(.040) |
| Values of music education            |                   | .184<br>(.102)    |
| Intercept                            | -.653<br>(.903)   | -2.126<br>(.948)  |
| R2                                   | 0.493             | 0.542.            |
| R2 change                            |                   | 0.049             |

Note: Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients (Se). Results reflect imputed data for covariates only. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

### Parents' engagement in program activities and musical engagement at home.

Table 23 below shows results from the OLS regression analysis exploring the association between parent's engagement in program activities and musical engagement at home.

Model 1 includes sociodemographic covariates and the added independent variable of interest is parents' engagement in program activities. This model explains 54.8% of the variance in parent's musical engagement score. Engagement in program activities by itself explains 6.5% of the variance. Model 2 incorporates the musical control variables musical toys, musical instruments at home and parents' values of music education and explains 59.6% of the variance in parent's engagement in program activities. Model 3

supplies one additional variable to control for program location and this model explains 60.4% of the variance. This variable was added as a control because the independent variable of interest (engagement in program activities) could be affected by the location of the program these families attend. Furthermore, parents' engagement in program activities was significantly associated with an increase in their musical engagement at home in Model 1 ( $B = .271, p < .001$ ). The identified association remain stable once controlling for musical toys, musical instruments at home and parents' values of music education in Model 2 ( $B = .233, p < .001$ ), as well as location of the program in Model 3 ( $B = .236, p < .001$ ).

Table 23

*Associations Between Parent's Engagement in Program Activities and Musical Engagement at Home*

|                                  | Musical Engagement at Home ( $n=438$ ) |                    |                    |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
|                                  | Model 1                                | Model 2            | Model 3            |
| Engagement in program activities | .271***<br>(.040)                      | .233***<br>(.039)  | .236***<br>(.037)  |
| <i>Sociodemographic Controls</i> |  |                    |                    |
| Parent_Female                    | .287<br>(.175)                         | .289<br>(.167)     | .302<br>(.166)     |
| Child_Female                     | .147<br>(.135)                         | .137<br>(.123)     | .147<br>(.124)     |
| Age Parent                       | .001<br>(.013)                         | -.002<br>(.012)    | -.008<br>(.013)    |
| Child age                        | -.193***<br>(.038)                     | -.186***<br>(.036) | -.177***<br>(.036) |
| Marital Status (ref: married)    |  |                    |                    |
| Cohabiting                       | .793**<br>(.296)                       | .664*<br>(.273)    | .668*<br>(.271)    |
| Widow/ Separated/Divorce         | -.334<br>(.338)                        | -.149<br>(.310)    | -.150<br>(.310)    |
| Single                           | -.825**<br>(.295)                      | -.636*<br>(.281)   | -.696*<br>(.281)   |
| Not born in the US               | -.501**<br>(.145)                      | -.435**<br>(.137)  | -.465**<br>(.137)  |

Table 23 (continued)

|                                      | Model 1           | Model 2           | Model 3           |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Race (ref: White)                    |                   |                   |                   |
| Asian or Pacific                     | .022<br>(.182)    | .018<br>(.174)    | -.021<br>(.174)   |
| African American/Black               | -.078<br>(.211)   | .010<br>(.199)    | .004<br>(.198)    |
| Multiracial                          | .424*<br>(.219)   | .454*<br>(.208)   | .429*<br>(.206)   |
| Other race                           | .286<br>(.227)    | .226<br>(.216)    | .265<br>(.215)    |
| Hispanic_Yes                         | -.038<br>(.193)   | .067<br>(.185)    | .067<br>(.184)    |
| Employment status (ref: full-time)   |                   |                   |                   |
| Part-Time                            | .200<br>(.178)    | .228<br>(.169)    | .187<br>(.168)    |
| Not Employed                         | -.149<br>(.157)   | -.153<br>(.149)   | -.158<br>(.149)   |
| Other type of employment             | .626*<br>(.295)   | .458<br>(.284)    | .460<br>(.284)    |
| Socioeconomic Status (ref: high-SES) |                   |                   |                   |
| Middle SES                           | .079<br>(.210)    | .108<br>(.193)    | .189<br>(.194)    |
| Low SES                              | -.136<br>(.234)   | .166<br>(.236)    | .392<br>(.246)    |
| N children                           | -.102<br>(.088)   | -.115<br>(.084)   | -.092<br>(.084)   |
| N of people household                | .001<br>(.217)    | .056<br>(.206)    | .094<br>(.206)    |
| General Engagement Parent            | .768***<br>(.061) | .783***<br>(.059) | .726***<br>(.058) |
| <i>Musical Controls</i>              |                   |                   |                   |
| N musical toys at home               |                   | .158**<br>(.049)  | .139**<br>(.049)  |
| N musical instruments at home        |                   | .180***<br>(.038) | .186***<br>(.038) |
| Values of music education            |                   | .163<br>(.095)    | .196*<br>(.095)   |
| Location program                     |                   |                   | .446**<br>(.167)  |
| Intercept                            | .362<br>(.865)    | -1.262<br>(.916)  | -1.986<br>(.951)  |
| R2                                   | .548              | .596              | .604              |
| R2 change                            |                   | .048              | .008              |

Note: Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients (SE). Results reflect imputed data for covariates only. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

**Frequency of child's attendance to the program and musical engagement at home.** The OLS regression analysis failed to detect any statistically significant association between the frequency of child's attendance to the class and parents' musical engagement. Results are shown in Table 24 below.

Table 24

*Associations Between Child's Frequency of Attendance to the Program and Musical Engagement at Home*

|                                  | Musical Engagement at Home ( <i>n</i> =351) |                  |                  |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|
|                                  | Model 1                                     | Model 2          | Model 3          |
| Frequency of attendance          | -.057<br>(.046)                             | -.060<br>(.044)  | -.057<br>(.043)  |
| <i>Sociodemographic Controls</i> |   |                  |                  |
| Parent_Female                    | .348<br>(.212)                              | .333<br>(.201)   | .313<br>(.200)   |
| Child_Female                     | .164<br>(.150)                              | .156<br>(.142)   | .155<br>(.141)   |
| Age Parent                       | -.003<br>(.017)                             | -.004<br>(.016)  | -.008<br>(.016)  |
| Child age                        | -.113<br>(.047)                             | -.116<br>(.044)  | -.108<br>(.044)  |
| Marital Status (ref: married)    |   |                  |                  |
| Cohabiting                       | .888*<br>(.347)                             | .675*<br>(.318)  | .767*<br>(.320)  |
| Widow/ Separated/Divorce         | -.472<br>(.411)                             | -.323<br>(.375)  | -.268<br>(.377)  |
| Single                           | -.765*<br>(.345)                            | -.597<br>(.331)  | -.619<br>(.332)  |
| Not born in the US               | -.515*<br>(.175)                            | -.426*<br>(.166) | -.380*<br>(.166) |
| Race (ref: White)                |   |                  |                  |
| Asian or Pacific                 | -.087<br>(.216)                             | -.103<br>(.207)  | -.084<br>(.206)  |
| African American/Black           | -.232<br>(.256)                             | -.139<br>(.244)  | -.130<br>(.243)  |
| Multiracial                      | .333<br>(.263)                              | .371<br>(.251)   | .426<br>(.250)   |
| Other race                       | .212<br>(.276)                              | .140<br>(.261)   | .349<br>(.273)   |
| Hispanic_Yes                     | -.186<br>(.238)                             | -.080<br>(.230)  | -.001<br>(.229)  |



Table 24 (continued)

|                                      | Model 1           | Model 2           | Model 3           |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Employment status (ref: full-time)   |                   |                   |                   |
| Part-Time                            | .125<br>(.222)    | .088<br>(.211)    | .088<br>(.1211)   |
| Not Employed                         | -.244<br>(.187)   | -.230<br>(.178)   | -.182<br>(.178)   |
| Other type of employment             | .737<br>(.367)    | .429<br>(.356)    | .378<br>(.357)    |
| Socioeconomic Status (ref: high-SES) |                   |                   |                   |
| Middle SES                           | .294<br>(.288)    | .276<br>(.263)    | .412<br>(.267)    |
| Low SES                              | .197*<br>(.313)   | .430<br>(.310)    | .986<br>(.389)    |
| N children                           | -.129<br>(.113)   | -.127<br>(.106)   | -.072<br>(.108)   |
| N of people household                | .350<br>(.275)    | .388<br>(.265)    | .424<br>(.267)    |
| General Engagement Parent            | .840***<br>(.072) | .804***<br>(.069) | .796***<br>(.069) |
| N of terms                           | -.015<br>(.049)   | -.001<br>(.047)   | .006<br>(.046)    |
| N musical toys at home               |                   | .156<br>(.066)    | .132<br>(.067)    |
| N musical instruments at home        |                   | .199***<br>(.049) | .193***<br>(.048) |
| Values of music education            |                   | .191<br>(.117)    | .236<br>(.118)    |
| Location program                     |                   |                   | 1.108*<br>(.446)  |
| Intercept                            | .210<br>(1.180)   | -1.618<br>(1.230) | -3.972<br>(1.526) |
| R2                                   | .485              | .542              | .551              |
| R2 change                            |                   | .057              | .009              |

Note: Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients (SE). Results reflect imputed data for covariates only. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

**Moderation by SES levels.** Finally, Table 25 shows results from the OLS regression models with added interaction terms. The two models failed to detect statistically significant associations between the interaction of SES and parent's engagement in program activities.

Table 25

*Associations Between the Interaction Term and Parental Musical Engagement at Home*

|                                  | Musical Engagement at Home ( <i>n</i> =438) |                    |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------------|
|                                  | Model 1                                     | Model 2            |
| Engagement in program activities | .236***<br>(.038)                           | .239***<br>(.045)  |
| <i>Sociodemographic Controls</i> |   |                    |
| Parent_Female                    | .302<br>(.166)                              | .314<br>(.168)     |
| Child_Female                     | .147<br>(.124)                              | .147<br>(.123)     |
| Age Parent                       | -.008<br>(.013)                             | -.009<br>(.013)    |
| Child age                        | -.177***<br>(.036)                          | -.178***<br>(.036) |
| Marital Status (ref: married)    |   |                    |
| Cohabiting                       | .668*<br>(.271)                             | .667*<br>(.275)    |
| Widow/ Separated/Divorce         | -.150<br>(.310)                             | -.159<br>(.312)    |
| Single                           | -.696*<br>(.281)                            | -.685*<br>(.282)   |
| Not born in the US               | -.465**<br>(.137)                           | -.470**<br>(.138)  |
| Race (ref: White)                |   |                    |
| Asian or Pacific                 | -.021<br>(.174)                             | -.017<br>(.174)    |
| African American/Black           | .004<br>(.198)                              | .017<br>(.200)     |
| Multiracial                      | .429*<br>(.206)                             | .425*<br>(.207)    |
| Other race                       | .265<br>(.215)                              | .248<br>(.216)     |
| Hispanic_Yes                     | .067<br>(.184)                              | .071<br>(.185)     |

Table 25 (continued)

|   | Model 1           | Model 2           |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| Employment status<br>(ref: full-time)   |                   |                   |
| Part-Time                               | .187<br>(.168)    | .185<br>(.169)    |
| Not Employed                            | -.158<br>(.149)   | -.152<br>(.149)   |
| Other type of employment                | .460<br>(.283)    | .467<br>(.284)    |
| Socioeconomic Status<br>(ref: high-SES) |                   |                   |
| Middle SES                              | .189<br>(.194)    | .406<br>(.438)    |
| Low SES                                 | .392<br>(.246)    | .239<br>(.430)    |
| N children                              | -.092<br>(.084)   | -.095<br>(.085)   |
| N of people household                   | .094<br>(.206)    | .093<br>(.209)    |
| General Engagement Parent               | .726***<br>(.058) | .719***<br>(.059) |
| <i>Musical Controls</i>                 |                   |                   |
| N musical toys at home                  | .139**<br>(.053)  | .143*<br>(.053)   |
| N musical instruments at home           | .186***<br>(.038) | .186***<br>(.038) |
| Values of music education               | .196*<br>(.095)   | .193*<br>(.096)   |
| Location program                        | .446*<br>(.167)   | .442*<br>(.168)   |
| Engagement prog. activ. x Middle SES    |                   | -.073<br>(.127)   |
| Engagement prog. activ. x Low SES       |                   | .046<br>(.105)    |
| Intercept                               | -1.986<br>(.951)  | -1.940<br>(.966)  |
| R2                                      | .604              | .604              |
| R2 change                               |                   | .0008             |

Note: Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients (SE). Results reflect imputed data for covariates only. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

## Chapter V

### DISCUSSION

#### **Overview**

The purpose of this research was to explore attitudes, values, and rationales of parents interested in enrolling their young children in early childhood music classes using a sample of parents attending a specific early childhood jazz education program. I was interested in gaining a better understanding of whether parents' previous formal musical experiences, engagement in the jazz program activities, as well as child's frequency of attendance in the music class were associated with parents' musical engagement at home. Second, using the concerted cultivation and investment model as my theoretical frameworks, I specifically wanted to examine whether musical parenting practices, as well as parents' values and rationales for attending these organized musical activities, may vary based on social class. Lastly, social class differences have been sometimes neglected in music education research, therefore the third aim of this research is to contribute scholarship that could help inform the profession about cultural and musical interests of disparate communities in the United States, specifically those interested in attending early childhood organized activities.

An important point to highlight before discussing the findings of this dissertation is the financial accessibility of the program under study. As mentioned in the method section, these music classes can be accessed in different forms depending on the location

of the program. Some locations offer tuition-based classes with no sliding-scale option (NYC1, Orlando, Omaha1), others sliding-scale tuition system upon request (Seattle, St. Louis) and in other locations classes are offered at no cost only for low-income families (NYC2, Omaha2, Chicago). This heterogeneity of access allows the program to reach out to families from a diverse SES in the United States.

### **Research Questions**

1. When there is access to early childhood jazz education programs what are the characteristics of the families enrolled or participating in those programs, and what are their home environment conditions?
2. What are parents' rationales, values, and attitudes regarding their children's enrollment in an early childhood jazz education program and to what extent are those associated with their social class?
3. What are the levels of general parental engagement and musical engagement within the families who participate in the program and do they differ by social class?
4. Is there an association between:
  - a. Parents' previous formal musical experiences and their parental musical engagement?
  - b. Parental engagement in program activities and parental musical engagement?
  - c. Frequency of child's attendance to the class and parental musical engagement?

5. Does social class moderate the association between parental engagement in program activities and parental musical engagement?

### **Summary of Results**

The majority of participants reported that they were the participating child's parents and having attended music program with the child. Most of them were mothers and worked full-time. As expected, based on the distribution of the survey population, administrative data, and the current availability and access to the program, three-quarters of the participants were upper-class families with the rest of the sample representing middle and lower socioeconomic groups. Regarding their previous formal musical experiences, the majority of parents reported being exposed to either choral or instrumental experiences or both and provided their children with high availability of musical materials at home, such as toys and musical instruments. Additionally, the principal component analysis revealed four components representing possible reasons that drove these parents to enroll in the program. Parents seemed to be interested in providing their very young children with opportunities for cultural and educational enrichment, as well as the development of socioemotional skills. Their appreciation of jazz as an important musical genre rooted in American culture functioned as another rationale for enrolling in the program. These parents also valued the music class as an opportunity to bond with their children. Likewise, recommendations from parents' social networks about the program influence their decisions to enroll. Simple linear regression analysis showed significant associations between SES and the component accounting for parents' valuation of these music classes for cultural and educational reasons (first principal component). Likewise, SES was associated with the component underlying

parents' rationales for enrolling based on social networks influences. Alternatively, no significant associations between socioeconomic status (SES) and parents' valuation of the music classes as opportunities to increase their children's appreciation and knowledge of jazz (second principal component) were found. Similarly, there were no statistically significant association between SES and parents' use of these classes for relationship building or socioemotional goals (third principal component).

Overall, parents show high scores of general, as well as musical, engagement and those variables were highly correlated. Additionally, there were no statistically significant associations between parents' previous formal musical experiences and their musical engagement when controlling for musical materials at home, as well as their average value of music education. On the other hand, there was an association identified between parents' engagement in program activities and their musical engagement at home, and that association remained statistically significant after controlling for sociodemographic characteristics, musical materials at home, and parents' values of music education. The frequency of attendance to the program was not associated with parents' musical engagement. Moderation analysis failed to detect a statistically significant association between the interaction of parents' engagement in program activities and SES.

### **Understanding Parenting Values, Rationales, Attitudes and Practices**

#### **Rationales, Values, and Attitudes in the Context of an Organized Activity**

This dissertation provides new evidence to understand parents' reasons for enrolling in organized activities targeting very young children. Similar to reports from

previous research examining the meaning and purpose of enrichment activities for children under five (Vincent & Ball, 2007; Wills, 2011), all these parents expressed interest in using these classes to enrich their children's cultural and educational worlds, as well as to develop their socioemotional skills, which are indeed characteristics under the parenting logic characterized by concerted cultivation (Lareau, 2011).

Nevertheless, contrary to studies supporting theories of cultural reproduction (Bourdieu, 1986; Lareau, 2011; Reed, 2015), these findings showed no statistically significant differences between the SES groups in two of the components representing values and rationales for enrolling (e.g. *Appreciation of Jazz, Socialization and Bonding*). It could be that in the context of these early childhood classes, jazz is functioning as a vehicle for inclusion and bonding across SES groups. However, more research is needed to further clarify those findings. Furthermore, following Bourdieu's argument (1986), it was expected that higher-SES parents would value the cultural outcomes of their participation in the program more so than lower SES parents value them. Results showing statistically significant difference in the component *Cultural and Educational Enrichment for the Future* between low-SES and high-SES parents may suggest that parents from lower-SES backgrounds value these music classes more than their socially advantaged counterparts in terms of being opportunities to provide their children with educational and cultural experiences that may help them academically in the future.

Similarly to other quantitative (DiMaggio, 1982; Dumais, 2005) and qualitative (Chin & Phillips, 2004) studies conducted in the U.S. to examine associations between parenting practices and social class, findings from this dissertation seem more in line with theories of cultural mobility (DiMaggio, 1982) than with Lareau's concerted cultivation,



a concept influenced by Bourdieu's theory of cultural reproduction. Concerted cultivation is by definition a cultural logic of parenting prevalent in middle and upper class families, however, parents from low-SES backgrounds seem to also display traits of concerted cultivation in their parenting practices.

Additionally, families from lower SES backgrounds appear to be influenced by and may use their social networks as resources to access these classes or to become aware of this program's availability. It could be that for this group of parents, friends, neighbors, or acquaintances, serve as substitutes for the lack of financial resources (Chin & Phillips, 2004). All these parents, regardless their position within the social structure, seem to have a similar orientation to the world and may value these musical activities for the same reasons. Nevertheless, it is probably the lack of access to programs like this and not necessarily their socioeconomic status which prevents disadvantaged families to fulfill those desires.

### **Musical Parenting Attitudes and Practices in the Context of an Organized Activity**

**Previous formal musical experiences.** As explained earlier, another goal of this dissertation was to examine parental musical engagement and its association with three independent variables. The exploratory nature of this study led to conduct a preparatory analysis of sociodemographic covariates related to the three independent (e.g. parents' previous musical experiences, engagement in program activities, and frequency of child's attendance to the program) and dependent (e.g. parents' musical engagement) variables under investigation. Overall, results showed parents to have a moderate amount of *previous formal musical experience* ( $M = 1.84$ ,  $SD = 1.09$ ), however being Asian compared to White was associated with a higher level of previous *formal* musical

experience ( $B = .390, p < .01$ ). This finding is aligned with anecdotal reports documenting about the crucial role that music education plays for most Asian and Asian-American families (Chua, 2011). On the contrary, parents who considered themselves Hispanics reported having less previous musical experiences compared to the non-Hispanics parents ( $B = -.707, p < .001$ ). There is little research related to Hispanics in the U.S and their previous formal musical experiences, for that reason more investigation is recommended. Similarly, parents in this study who reported not being born in the U.S. compared to the ones born in the U.S. seem to have been less exposed to formal music education opportunities ( $B = -.347, p < .01$ ). The association between previous musical experience and nationality is another variable not reported in the current literature available.

**Engagement in program activities.** Moreover, three demographic covariates were associated with the independent variable *engagement in program activities*, which represents an average daily frequency of parent and child engaging in musical activities from this early childhood jazz program. First, even though parents on average reported low scores on their engagement in program activities ( $M = 2.88, SD = 1.55$ ), it seemed that general parental engagement ( $M = 6.72, SD = 1.07$ ) influenced directly the amount of time parent's engaged at home in activities from the music class ( $B = .342, p < .001$ ).

Nevertheless, literature on general education and child development suggest that limited resources represented by low levels of education and financial resources negatively influence parenting practices (Brooks-Gunn et al., 1999; Morin et al., 2015; Phillips 2010). In fact, previous research on the direct relationship between maternal education and time use has provided strong evidence to support that highly educated mothers not only spend more time with their children but also, they spend time engaging

in high quality activities (Kalil et al. 2012). Although I did not directly analyze the association between education and parents' engagement in activities of the music program, results showed that families with lower-SES, a measure including education, reported greater levels of engagement in program activities compared to parents from higher-SES backgrounds ( $B = .606, p < .05$ ). The fact that all these families, including families from low SES backgrounds, self-selected to enroll in this early childhood jazz program could suggest that overall these families represent a very specific group of parents with similar overall characteristics regardless of their SES. Therefore, families from lower-SES backgrounds in this dissertation could represent a very highly motivated and engaged group of parents which might be different from the low-SES population of families examined in previous studies looking at SES and parenting practices. These findings shed new light in terms of literature on parents' time spent in parenting activities.

Regarding music studies specifically investigating the use of music class materials or activities at home in the U.S., little prior research is available. The one study available, reviewed in Chapter 2, only reported descriptive statistics with respect to parent-child engaging together in musical activities from the music class and did not provide any information regarding associations with social class (Wills, 2011).

The fact that families from low-SES backgrounds are actively using the materials provided in the musical class to invest in their children's development suggests that the program for this group of parents is functioning as a catalyzer of their parenting skills. It could also be possible that since this group of parents consider these music classes of greater value – in terms of opportunities for cultural and educational enrichment – than the more socially advantaged families, parents with lower-SES may be more driven to

replicate at home some of the activities from the class. However, further investigation is needed in this area.

**Factors influencing parental musical engagement.** General parental engagement has been associated with children's healthy development and wellbeing (Bornstein, 2002; Brooks-Gunn & Markman, 2005; Morin, Glickman & Brooks-Gunn, 2015; National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016), particularly during the earliest years of life. Findings regarding general parental engagement ( $M = 6.72$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ) and musical engagement at home ( $M = 5.57$ ,  $SD = 1.68$ ) suggest that families participating in this music program spend a great amount of time doing a variety of activities – including music – at home with their children on a daily basis. In addition to being highly correlated with each other ( $r = .64$ ,  $p < .001$ ), the OLS regression analysis showed a statistically significant association between general parental engagement and musical engagement ( $B = .875$ ,  $p < .001$ ) when controlling for all demographic and musical control variables. These findings suggest that, in general, parents motivated to enroll in this early childhood jazz class are overall highly invested in their children's wellbeing and development, regardless of their 1) demographic characteristics; 2) musical materials available at home or 3) values of music education. The fact that these families self-selected into this program, could mean in that it is their strong motivation to invest in their children's development (represented by their general parental engagement) that drives to enroll in the program and to be musically engaged at home.

Regarding the type of musical activities, playing recorded music at home ( $M=6.62$ ,  $SD= 2.00$ ) and singing songs ( $M=6.22$ ,  $SD= 2.37$ ) were the most frequent musical activities families engaged in on a weekly basis. These findings are aligned with

Wills (2011), who also found that parents who participated in an early childhood classes with children aged 3-5 years old reported high frequencies of singing and playing music at home.

Associations between race or ethnicity and musical engagement at home within U.S. families are limited and contradictory. Research to date has shown no association between race and musical engagement (Custodero et al., 2003) and some recent studies have provided evidence of a negative association for Asian compared to White parents (Wills, 2011). Similarly to Custodero et al. (2003), no association between race and parental musical engagement at home was found in this dissertation.

Additionally, marital status may affect how parents spend time with their young children (Phillips, 2011). Yet, studies investigating musical engagement and sociodemographic factors did not report any significant results (Custodero et al., 2003). In this dissertation single compared to married parents seemed to engage in less musical activities at home ( $B = -.851, p < .01$ ). These findings are aligned with studies examining general parenting behaviors, which suggest that single mothers spend less time interacting with their children than married mothers (Belsky, 1979; Waldfogel et al., 2010). In this particular sample, cohabiting parents were more likely to engage in musical activities at home compared to married couples ( $B = .848, p < .01$ ). Those findings contradict previous research suggesting that cohabitating mothers would score less in parenting quality measures than their married counterparts (Morin et al., 2015). However, to date no study in music education has included that marital status category in a study investigating musical parenting practices.

No association was found in previous research between employment status and musical engagement (Custodero et al., 2003). Findings from this dissertation suggest that

parents who reported having another type of employment arrangement (e.g. self-employed, artists, freelance) were more likely to engage in musical activities at home than parents employed full-time ( $B = .747, p < .05$ ). Again, there is no literature on associations between those types of employment arrangements and musical activities. Custodero et al. (2003) study used a national U.S. sample and their questionnaire did not include an alternative option beyond full time, part time and not working, when parents self-reported their employment status. Therefore, methodological differences could create the aforementioned discrepancy in results. Based on the findings from this dissertation, it could also be hypothesized that self-employed parents have more flexibility in their work, which allows them to spend more time in musical activities at home with their children compared to parents working full-time outside of the home, but that is an assumption that needs to be examined with future studies.

Child age is also a sociodemographic factor that several studies in the early childhood field have found to be associated with the types of activities parents engage in with their children. In terms of musical interactions, findings from this dissertation support previous findings (Custodero et al., 2003; Wills, 2011) that demonstrated a negative association between child age and parental musical engagement ( $B = -.139, p < .001$ ). Even though music is ubiquitous to children's spontaneous expression and creativity (Custodero et al., 2016), it could be that as the child ages, music is replaced at home with other types of activities, possibly more focused on literary or school readiness.

Sociodemographic characteristics not significantly associated with parents' musical engagement in this OLS multiple regression analysis included SES and gender of the parent. Current literature on musical parenting, although still limited, suggest that mothers engage more frequently compared to fathers in singing and playing music

activities (Custodero et al. 2003; Custodero & Johnson-Green, 2003; Trehub et al., 1997; Wills, 2011) and that parents with more than high school education are more likely to engage in those musical activities (Custodero et al. 2003). Methodological differences such as sample size, measurements tools, and mainly the population under study (self-selected group of parents enrolled in this music program) could explain the discrepancies in those findings.

Nationality and its association with parents' musical engagement at home has not been reported in any of the studies reviewed above. In this study, parents who were not born in the U.S. reported less frequency of musical engagement at home compared to parent born in the U.S. ( $B = -.431, p < .01$ ). Therefore more research is recommended.

Research examining music education has provided contradictory findings in terms of parental previous musical experiences and its influence on the frequency of musical practices at home. As mentioned in the review of literature in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, some studies found that parents with musical experiences, such as participating in choirs, musical groups or taking music lessons (Custodero & Johnson-Green, 2003) provided their infants with more musical interactions at home. In contrast, other studies found neither a correlation between parents' musical background and the frequency of singing or playing activities with their young children (Ilari, 2002) nor a statistically significant effect of parental music experiences on parent-child musical interactions at home (Wills, 2011). Findings from this dissertation are aligned with the latter. Previous formal musical experiences of this group of parents seemed associated with musical engagement when only sociodemographic covariates were included in the model ( $B = .173, p < .01$ ). However, when controlling for other musical covariates such as musical materials and parental values of music, the identified association is no longer

statistically significant. It is possible that this group of parents is driven to engage in musical behaviors at home by their high levels of general parental engagement, rather than by their previous formal musical experiences. Analyses of this sample show that general parental engagement and sociodemographic covariates explain 48.3% of the variance in parental musical engagement at home (see Table 21) and that finding could be considered as data supporting the aforementioned hypothesis. Additionally, general parental engagement and their interest in investing in their children's cultural and educational enrichment may be what also influences this group of parents to enroll in the program as well as to provide musical materials at home. These findings could also be interpreted in terms of the investment model which emphasizes the opportunities created by economic advantage. According to this model, family income affects the types of investments parents make in their children's development and wellbeing. Musical toys ( $B = .167, p < .01$ ) and instruments ( $B = .183, p < .001$ ) can be seen as material investments at home that directly affect the amount of musical interactions parent and child engage and in the long-term could increase children's later outcomes (Kaushal, Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2011). However, the investment model "proposes that social and economic events and conditions play a causal role in the course of human lives" (Conger & Conger, 2008, p. 77) and does not take into account parents' dispositions or individual characteristics which, as evidenced in this dissertation, can actually affect parenting practices across SES.

Moreover, this dissertation provides evidence of a strong and positive association between parents' engagement in program activities and their musical engagement at home when controlling for sociodemographic variables (Model 1), musical covariates (Model 2) and location (Model 3). That association stayed stable in the three models



analyzed (see Table 23). These findings shed light on the possible benefits of participating in this early childhood jazz program for increasing musical engagement at home.

On the other hand, the variable frequency of the child's attendance to the class did not show any significant association with parents' musical engagement. As mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation, the frequency of attendance was obtained through administrative data and only for the New York locations ( $N= 339$ ). Therefore, the lack of significance could be due to a measurement error.

### **Limitations**

Due to the exploratory nature of this dissertation, findings and implications should be interpreted with caution for the following reasons. First, there could be a potential bias of those who completed the surveys. Even though the whole population under study had participated at some point in this music program, parents who have a stronger interest in music could have been more inclined to complete the surveys as opposed to those who disregarded it. Second, results cannot be generalized to all families with young children attending early childhood music programs. Participants in this study represent a population of self-selected families attending (or who have attended) this specific early childhood education jazz program. Given the opportunity, families could choose whether or not to access the program; therefore, their participation is not randomly determined. Third, this dissertation relies on participants' retrospective self-reports. For families who were not currently attending the program at the time of the study, it is possible that as time went by some participants did not have an accurate recall of their frequency of activities. If this possibility resulted in a systematic measurement error regarding

parenting practices, then my results reflect only a partial picture of this group of participants. Finally, findings from this dissertation offers a good preliminary data to start the conversation on social class and musical parenting practices, however because the SES variable in this sample of families showed a negatively-skewed distribution, results need to be replicated with an even more diverse group of families.

## **Conclusions**

This dissertation provides new evidence regarding musical parenting practices and social class. Despite their socioeconomic status, there seems to be traces of concerted cultivation patterns in all parents participating in this music program. Apparently, at least in terms of musical practices, concerted cultivation might not only be a cultural logic of parenting pertaining to middle or upper class families. It is instead, a parenting logic present in parents who are motivated and engaged in investing in their children's development. In this line, it is important to note that when Lareau (2011) conducted her ethnographies, she sampled African American and white families from a small midwestern town as well as a large northeastern city. She included neither families from Latino/Hispanic nor Asian origins as I did in this dissertation. Many low SES families participating in this jazz program are first or second-generation immigrants. It could be that families from low-SES in this dissertation, especially those from immigrant backgrounds, are more interested in cultivating their children than were low-SES non-immigrant families represented in Lareau's study.

Furthermore, these findings can also be interpreted through the lens of the investment model. In this particular case, parental investment is materialized through paying for attending these early childhood jazz classes or providing musical materials at

home (financial investment) as well as spending quality time with their children in different musical activities at home (time investment). Similar to the concerted cultivation framework, the investment model lacks a comprehensive explanation of these musical parenting practices. As mentioned earlier, dispositions and personal characteristics of parents seem to account for absence of associations between musical parenting practices and SES found in this dissertation.

Overall, the majority of parents appeared to have some kind of previous formal musical experiences, however those experiences did not influence the frequency of their musical engagement at home when taken into account their values of music education as well as the availability of toys or musical instruments at home. Families from lower SES backgrounds – who accessed the program via subsidies – used activities and materials from the class at home with more frequency than families from other SES groups. Although an evaluation of the program impact was out of the scope of this study, this finding could suggest that when lower SES families are given access to this program, they incorporate new musical tools and ideas from the jazz program as affordances to increase their parenting skills; therefore, the impact of the program might be stronger for those parents than for the other more advantaged groups. Jazz music in this context seems to be working as an equalizer of opportunities by reducing inequalities.

Parents' engagement with the program activities was positively associated with their parental musical engagement at home and that association stayed stable and strong after taken into account sociodemographic factors, parents' values of music education and access to musical materials. It seems that one of the benefits of the program to all participating families was an overall increase in their parent-child musical interactions at home.

Different reasons seem to influence parents to invest their time and/or financial resources in enrolling in this early childhood jazz program and those were represented by four principal components: *Cultural and Educational Enrichment for the Future, Appreciation of Jazz, Socialization and Bonding, Social Networks*. SES was associated with both parent's valuation of these music classes for cultural and educational reason as well as parents' following recommendations from friends or acquaintances for enrolling in the program. Alternatively, there seems to be no association between SES and parents' valuation of the music classes as opportunities to increase their children's appreciation and knowledge of jazz or parents' use of these classes for relationship building or socioemotional goals.

### **Implications for Policy and Practice**

Future research in music education needs to be conducted to increase our understanding in regards to issues of social class and musical parenting practices. Based on these findings, it seems that, regardless of their SES, families who are highly motivated in their children's development are interested in investing in early childhood organized musical activities. However, an increase in access is key to level the field and reduce inequalities in early childhood practices. This jazz program is a good example of democracy and inclusion in music education by providing access to early childhood musical activities that include parent-child interactions to a diverse group of families.

Access to this program has been increased not only by providing scholarships based on need but also by a sliding-scale system in place. In that way, families who can pay a portion of the tuition but not the full amount are still able to attend. Furthermore, the different organizations offering the program are trying to consolidate partnerships

with public schools to offer musical experiences to families from different SES background.

For instance, in order to create such opportunities, Jazz at Lincoln Center and Omaha Performing Arts have established partnerships with local Head Starts and public elementary schools offering Pre-K so they could reach out to underserved families. Additionally, Seattle JazzED and Jazz St. Louis offer this early childhood jazz program via a sliding-scale tuition system upon request in order to make this program financially accessible to as many families as possible.

Even though this program is designed as a caregiver/parent-child experience, the public school in Chicago, Illinois is piloting a variation of the program to make it accessible to their early childhood population. It is offered as an after-school program and led by the school's music teacher. If a parent is not able to attend the class with their child, classroom teachers or other parents are allowed to accompany the child to support the learning experience, and the music teacher is frequently communicating with parents about the materials and activities in order to foster the musical experience at home. All these strategies might be worth replicating by other early childhood music programs or non-profit organizations interested in creating access for a diverse community of parents with young children.

### **Recommendations for Further Study**

This dissertation was exploratory in nature and focused on a particular self-selected sample of families attending or having attended the same early childhood jazz program; therefore, the findings are preliminary and further investigation is recommended to confirm generalizability.

Families from mid- and- high SES backgrounds have consistently shown higher rates of participation in early childhood organized activities – such as music classes – than their less advantaged counterparts, and that panorama might not change too much in future years. For that reason, it is recommended to replicate this dissertation using an oversampling strategy. Therefore, underrepresented groups participating in these classes can make up a larger share of the survey sample. That methodology can allow for a strong within-and-between-group comparison and will increase the transferability of findings.

Findings from this dissertation shed light on possible relationships between two non-SES based variables (e.g. nationality and employment status) and musical parenting practices. However, there is no literature supporting those findings. Studies in music education need to start examining sociodemographic characteristics influencing parental musical engagement more in depth to help close the current research gap.

Parenting values and practices are influenced by a large number of contextual and cultural factors. Thus, combining findings from this dissertation with qualitative data on parents' perceptions of their experience would help provide a complete picture of the role of class and culture in their lives. For instance, through interview methods it will be possible to capture parents' own definitions of their musical experiences in the program and at home as well as their perceived benefits of participating in this early childhood jazz program.

Lastly, indirect measures, such as the analysis of secondary data sets, of children' participation in cultural activities have shown evidence of its benefits for disadvantaged children, in terms of elementary school grades (DiMaggio, 1992; Dumais, 2005).

Although not directly related with the scope of this study, conducting a quasi-

experimental study with a nonequivalent comparison group (e.g. using propensity score matching or time series design) to directly measure the program impact will help increase knowledge on the direct benefits of early-childhood music education programs.

## REFERENCES

- Attitude. (n.d.). In *Cambridge Dictionary online*. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/attitude?q=attitudes>
- Barrett, M. S. (2009). Sounding lives in and through music: a narrative inquiry of the 'everyday' musical engagement of a young child. *Journal of Early Childhood Research, 7*(2), 115-134.
- Bennett, P. R., Lutz, A. C., & Jayaram, L. (2012). Beyond the schoolyard: The role of parenting logics, financial resources, and social institutions in the social class gap in structured activity participation. *Sociology of Education, 85*(2), 131-157.
- Bilhartz, T. D., Bruhn, R. A., & Olson, J. E. (1999). The effect of early music training on child cognitive development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20*(4), 615-636.
- Bjørkvold, J. R. (1992). *The muse within: Creativity and communication, song and play from childhood through maturity*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Bornstein, M. H. (Ed.). (2005). *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 4. Social conditions and applied parenting*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J.G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., & Duncan, G. J. (1997). The effects of poverty on children. *The Future of Children, 7*(2), 55-71.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., & Markman, L. B. (2005). The contribution of parenting to ethnic and racial gaps in school readiness. *The Future of Children, 15*(1), 139-168.
- Chin, T., & Phillips, M. (2004). Social reproduction and child-rearing practices: Social class, children's agency, and the summer activity gap. *Sociology of Education, 77*(3), 185-210.
- Cho, E. (2015). What do mothers say? Korean mothers' perceptions of children's participation in extra-curricular musical activities. *Music Education Research, 17*(2), 162-178.
- Chua, A. (2011). *Battle hymn of the tiger mother*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Conger, R.D. & Conger, K.J., (2008). Understanding the process through which economic hardship influences families and children. In D.R. Crane, & T.B. Heaton (Eds.), *Handbook of families and poverty* (pp. 64-81). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications



- Corner, S. (2009). Choosing the right type of rotation in PCA and EFA. *JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter*, 13(3), 20-25.
- Couper, M. P. (2000). Web surveys: A review of issues and approaches. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64(4), 464-494.
- Custodero, L. A. (2002). The musical lives of young children: Inviting, seeking, and initiating. *Journal of Zero to Three*, 23(1), 4-9.
- Custodero, L. A. (2006). Singing practices in 10 families with young children. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 54(1), 37-56.
- Custodero, L. A., Britto, P. R., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). Musical lives: A collective portrait of American parents and their young children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 24(5), 553-572.
- Custodero, L. A., Cali, C., & Diaz-Donoso, A. (2016). Music as transitional object and practice: Children's spontaneous musical behaviors in the subway. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 38(1), 55-74.
- Custodero, L. A., Chen, J. J., Lin, Y. C., & Lee, K. (2006). One day in Taipei: In touch with children's spontaneous music making. In *Proceedings of the International Society for Music Education Early Childhood Commission Seminar, "Touched by Discovery"* (pp. 84-91).
- Custodero, L. A., & Johnson-Green, E. A. (2003). Passing the cultural torch: Musical experience and musical parenting of infants. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(2), 102-114.
- Custodero, L. A., & Johnson-Green, E. A. (2008). Caregiving in counterpoint: Reciprocal influences in the musical parenting of younger and older infants. *Early Child Development and Care*, 178(1), 15-39.
- Dai, D. Y., & Schader, R. M. (2002). Decisions regarding music training: Parental beliefs and values. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 46(2), 135-144.
- De Vries, P. (2007). The use of music CDs and DVDs in the home with the under-fives: What the parents say. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 32(4), 18-21.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: the tailored design method*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- DiMaggio, P.M.J., (1982). Cultural capital and school success: the impact of status culture participation on the grades of U.S. high school students. *American Sociological Review* 47, 89-201.
- Dumais, S. A. (2005). Early childhood cultural capital, parental habitus, and teachers' perceptions. *Poetics*, 34(2), 83-107.

- Fernald, A. (1992). Meaningful melodies in mothers' speech to infants. In H. Papoušek, V. Jürgens, & M. Papoušek (Eds.), *Nonverbal vocal communication: Comparative and developmental aspects* (pp. 262–282). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibson, R. E. (2009). *Musical parenting: An ethnographic account of musical interactions of parents and young children* (Order No. 3377340). Available from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; Social Science Database. (305015781).
- Graham, J. W. (2009). Missing data analysis: Making it work in the real world. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 549-576.
- Hays, S. (1996). *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- IBM Corp. Released 2016. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.
- Ilari, B. (2002, April). *Mother's beliefs and uses of music in the nursery*. Paper presented at the National Biennial In-Service Conference of Music Educators National Conference, Nashville, TN.
- Ilari, B. (2005). On musical parenting of young children: Musical beliefs and behaviors of mothers and infants. *Early Child Development and Care*, 175(7-8), 647-660.
- Ilari, B. (2013). Concerted cultivation and music learning: Global issues and local variations. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 35(2), 179-196.
- Ilari, B. (2016). Middle-class musical childhood: Autonomy, concerted cultivation, and consumer culture. In B. Ilari, & S. Young (Eds.), *Children's home musical experiences across the world* (pp. 93-105). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press,
- Ilari, B., Moura, A., & Bourscheidt, L. (2011). Between interactions and commodities: Musical parenting of infants and toddlers in Brazil. *Music Education Research*, 13(1), 51-67.
- Irwin, S. & Elley, S. (2011). Concerted cultivation? Parenting values, education and class diversity. *Sociology*, 45(3), 480–495
- Jackson, J. E. (2005). *A user's guide to principal components*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Jones, M. (2015). Adults' Constructions of an Early Childhood Music Class: Lived Experience and Cultural Reproduction (Master's thesis). Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.14/1071945>

- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36.
- Kalil, A., Ryan, R., & Corey, M. (2012). Diverging destinies: Maternal education and the developmental gradient in time with children. *Demography*, 49(4), 1361-1383.
- Kaufman, P. (2005, June). Middle-class social reproduction: The activation and negotiation of structural advantages. *Sociological Forum*, 20, (2), 245-270.
- Kaushal, N., Magnuson, K., & Waldfogel, J. (2011). How is family income related to investments in children's learning? In G. Duncan, & R. Murnane (Eds.), *Whither opportunity?: Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances* (pp. 187-206). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Koops, L. H. (2011). Parental perceptions of current and desired involvement in early childhood music instruction. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 17.
- Kremer-Sadlik, T., Izquierdo, C., & Fatigante, M. (2010). Making meaning of everyday practices: Parents' attitudes toward children's extracurricular activities in the United States and in Italy. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 41(1), 35-54.
- Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lee Nardo, R., Custodero, L. A., Persellin, D. C., & Fox, D. B. (2006). Looking back, looking forward: A report on early childhood music education in accredited American preschools. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 54(4), 278-292.
- Linver, M. R., Roth, J. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2009). Patterns of adolescents' participation in organized activities: are sports best when combined with other activities? *Developmental psychology*, 45(2), 354.
- Mahoney, J. L., Larson, R. W., Eccles, J. S., & Lord, H. (2005). Organized activities as developmental contexts for children and adolescents. In J. L. Mahoney, R. W. Larson, & J.S. Eccles (Eds.) *Organized activities as contexts of development: Extracurricular activities, after-school and community programs* (pp. 3-22). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Malloch, S., & Trevarthen, C. (Eds.). (2009). *Communicative musicality: Exploring the basis of human companionship*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Mehr, S. A., Schachner, A., Katz, R. C., & Spelke, E. S. (2013). Two randomized trials provide no consistent evidence for nonmusical cognitive benefits of brief preschool music enrichment. *PloS one*, 8(12), e82007.
- Monson, I. (2007). *Freedom sounds: Civil rights call out to jazz and Africa*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Morin, M., Glickman, J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2015). Parenting and the Home Environment. In A. Farrell, S. L. Kagan & K.M. Tisdall (Eds.) *Handbook of early childhood research*. London, UK: Sage Press.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, & Medicine (2016). *Parenting Matters: Supporting Parents of Children Ages 0-8*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/21868>.
- Papousek, H. (1996). Musicality in infancy research: biological and cultural origins of early musicality. In I. Deliège & J. Sloboda (Eds.), *Musical beginnings: Origins and development of musical competence* (pp. 37-55). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, M. (2011). Parenting, Time Use, and Disparities in Academic Outcomes. In G. Duncan, & R. Murnane (Eds.), *Whither opportunity?: Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances* (pp. 207-228). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Rationale. (n.d.). In *Cambridge Dictionary online*. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/rationale>
- Rauscher, F. H. (2009). The impact of music instruction on other skills. In S. Hallam, I. Cross, & M. Thaut (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music psychology*, (pp. 244-252). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Reeves, A. (2015). 'Music's a family thing': Cultural socialisation and parental transference. *Cultural Sociology*, 9(4), 493-514.
- Rubin, D. B. (1987). *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Shih, T. H., & Fan, X. (2008). Comparing response rates from web and mail surveys: A meta-analysis. *Field methods*, 20(3), 249-271.
- Shonkoff, J. P., & Phillips, D. A. (Eds.). (2000). *From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Stevens, J. (1986). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Thurstone, L. L. (1947). *Multiple factor analysis: A development and expansion of vectors of the mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago
- Trehub, S. E., Unyk, A. M., Kamenetsky, S. B., Hill, D. S., Trainor, L. J., Henderson, J. L., & Saraza, M. (1997). Mothers' and fathers' singing to infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(3), 500.

- Trehub, S. E. (2002). Mothers are musical mentors. *Zero to Three*, 23(1), 19-22.
- Trevarthen, C., & Malloch, S. (2002). Musicality and music before three: Human vitality and invention shared with pride. *Zero to three*, 23(1), 10-18.
- Ureno, M., Baltazar, J., & Diaz-Donoso, A. (n.d). *Community Assessment 2013*. Unpublished Manuscript. Columbia University Head Start. New York.
- Values. (n.d.). In *Cambridge Dictionary online*. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/value>
- Vincent, C., & Ball, S. J. (2007). Making up ‘the middle-class child: families, activities and class dispositions. *Sociology*, 41(6), 1061-1077.
- Vincent, C., & Maxwell, C. (2016). Parenting priorities and pressures: Furthering understanding of ‘concerted cultivation’. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 37(2), 269-281.
- Von Hippel, P. T. (2007). Regression with missing Ys: An improved strategy for analyzing multiply imputed data. *Sociological Methodology*, 37, 83–117.
- Weisberg, H. F. (2009). *The total survey error approach: A guide to the new science of survey research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. (2009). *Research methods in education: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Wills, A. (2011). Relationships among musical home environment, parental involvement, demographic characteristics, and early childhood music participation *Open Access Theses. Paper 243*. [http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa\\_theses/243/](http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_theses/243/)
- Young, S. (2013). Musical childhoods: A survey of contemporary research In O. N. Saracho, & B. Spodek (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of young children* (pp. 250-264). London, UK: Routledge.
- Young, S. (2016). Musical Childhoods: Theoretical Background and New Directions. In B. Ilari, & S. Young (Eds.), *Children’s home musical experiences across the world* (pp. 29-42). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Appendix A

Survey Questionnaire in English and Spanish

S

## Start of Block: Intro

*Display This Question:**If Incentives = 0*

Intro 1 Dear parent,

My name is Adriana Diaz-Donoso, a doctoral candidate in the Music Education program at Teachers College, Columbia University. As part of a dissertation study, I am conducting a survey to examine what reasons drive families' decisions for participating in early childhood music programs as well as other early childhood activities. Since you are a current or former WeBop parent your participation will provide useful insight into parents' musical practices. Your response is very important to the success of this study. The information you provide will help us to understand better the population interested in early childhood music programs and the role that music plays in their lives. Completing the questionnaire should require no more than 10-15 minutes of your time. We very much appreciate your participation.

The results of the study will be used for educational and academic purposes only. Your responses to the survey will be strictly confidential. An identification number will be used instead of your name when collecting your data. The results of any research or analysis using the data will be used in aggregate form and presented in a way such that individual respondents cannot be identified. Please, feel free to contact me if you have any questions, email me at [ad2903@tc.columbia.edu](mailto:ad2903@tc.columbia.edu) or call me at 347-751-4338

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is the human research ethics committee that oversees human research protection for Teachers College, Columbia University. Contact IRB at 212-678-4105 or email at [IRB@tc.edu](mailto:IRB@tc.edu).

*Display This Question:**If Incentives = 1*

Intro 2 Dear parent,

My name is Adriana Diaz-Donoso, a doctoral candidate in the Music Education program at Teachers College, Columbia University. As part of a dissertation study, I am conducting a survey to examine what reasons drive families' decisions for participating in early childhood music programs as well as other early childhood activities. Since you are a current or former WeBop parent your participation will provide useful insight into parents' musical practices. Your response is very important to the success of this study. The information you provide will help us to understand better the population interested in early childhood music programs and the role that music plays in their lives. Completing the questionnaire should require no more than 10-15 minutes of your time. I very much appreciate your help, and as a small token of appreciation for your participation in this survey, you will receive a \$10 Amazon gift card. However, if you choose to withdraw from the study at any time, you will not be required to return the incentive.

The results of the study will be used for educational and academic purposes only. Your responses to the survey will be strictly confidential. An identification number will be used instead of your name when collecting your data. The results of any research or analysis using the data will be used in aggregate form and presented in a way such that individual respondents cannot be identified. Please, feel free to contact me if you have any questions, email me [ad2903@tc.columbia.edu](mailto:ad2903@tc.columbia.edu) or call me at 347-751-4338

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is the human research ethics committee that oversees human research protection for Teachers College, Columbia University. Contact IRB at 212-678-4105 or email [IRB@tc.edu](mailto:IRB@tc.edu).

Consent

Participant Consent form

**In order to complete this survey, we need your consent and would ask that you acknowledge the following statement.**

*I confirm that I have read and have understood the description of the study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information provided, if asked questions those were answered satisfactorily. I understand that I will not be identified or identifiable in any report subsequently produced by the researcher.*

I agree with the statement above

Display This Question:

If Incentives = 1



What email is the best to receive your Amazon gift card? Please, write the email address you prefer I use below:

---

End of Block: Intro

Start of Block: About the Program and Attendance

Q1 Choose all terms and respective years when you and your child were enrolled in WeBop

|        | 2018                     | 2017                     | 2016                     | 2015                     |
|--------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Winter | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Spring | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Summer | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Fall   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



Q2 To what extent do the following statements relate to the reasons why you enrolled your child in the WeBop program?  
Mark all that apply

|   | Strongly Agree        | Agree                 | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree              | Strongly disagree     |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| It's an activity that allows me to spend time with my child   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in the program makes me feel more connected to this country. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Friends recommended it  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q3A Are there any other reasons why you enrolled your child in the program?

Yes

No

*Display This Question:*

*If Are there any other reasons why you enrolled your child in the program? = Yes*

Q3B Please specify those other reasons

---

Q4A Were you the adult attending the class with your child?

Yes

No

*Display This Question:*

*If Were you the adult attending the class with your child? = No*

Q4B Who was attending the class with your child?

Other parent

Grandparent

Other relative

Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Q5 What did you like the most about the program?

---

---

---

Q6 What did you like the least about the program?

---

---

---

---

---

## End of Block: About the Program and Attendance

## Start of Block: Demographics

Q7 What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Rather not say
- 

Q8 How old are you ?

\_\_\_\_\_

---

Q9A What is your child's age ?

\_\_\_\_\_

---

Q9B What is your child's gender?

- Female
- Male
- Rather not say
- 

Q10 What is your relationship to the child who attended the program?

- Mother
- Father
- Grandmother/father
- Other relative
- Other
-

*Display This Question:*

*If What is your relationship to the child who attended the program? = Mother  
Or What is your relationship to the child who attended the program? = Father*

Q11 How many children do you have?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- More than 4

*Display This Question:*

*If What is your relationship to the child who attended the program? = Mother  
Or What is your relationship to the child who attended the program? = Father*

*And If*

*How many children do you have? != 1*

Q12 Is the child who participated in the program your...

- First child
- Second child
- Third child
- Forth child
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

*Display This Question:*

*If How many children do you have? != 1*

Q13 Have you participated in the program with another child previously?

- Yes
- No

Q14 In what location (city) was the WeBop program that you attended?

---

Q15 Are you currently?

- Married
- Living with a partner but not married
- Divorced
- Separated
- Single (never married)
- Widowed
- Prefer not to answer

Q16 Which of the following best describes you?

- I was born in the US
- I came here to live when I was a child
- I came here to live as an adult

Q17 Which of the following best describes you?

- Asian or Pacific Islander
  - American Indian, Eskimo, Leut
  - Black/African American
  - White
  - Multiracial
  - Other
- 

Q18 Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin?

- Yes
  - No
  - Prefer not to answer
- 

Q19 What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

- Some high school, no diploma
  - High school degree or equivalent (e.g. GED)
  - Some college credit, no degree
  - Trade/technical/vocational training
  - Associate's degree (e.g. AA, AS)
  - Bachelor's degree (e.g. BA, BS)
  - Graduate degree (e.g. MA,MD, DDS, MS, PhD, EdD)
-

Q20 Are you currently employed?

- Full-time
- Part-time
- Not at all
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently employed? != Not at all*

Q21 What is your current job?

\_\_\_\_\_

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Married*

Q22A Is your spouse employed?

- Full-time
- Part-time
- Not at all
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Living with a partner but not married*

Q22B Is your partner employed?

- Full-time
- Part-time
- Not at all
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
-

*Display This Question:*

- If Are you currently? = Divorced*
- Or Are you currently? = Separated*
- Or Are you currently? = Single (never married)*
- Or Are you currently? = Widowed*
- Or Are you currently? = Prefer not to answer*

Q22C Is the child's other parent employed?

- Full-time
  - Part-time
  - Not at all
  - Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 

Q23 Last year, (that is in 2017), what was your total family income from all sources before taxes?

- Less than \$25,000
  - \$25,000 to \$50,000
  - \$50,000 to \$75,000
  - \$75,000 to \$100,000
  - \$100,000 or more
- 

Q24 Including yourself, how many people live in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_

---

*Display This Question:*

- If Are you currently? = Married*

Q25A Is your child currently being cared for by someone other than you or your spouse on a regular basis? By regular, let's say at least once a week for the past month.

- Yes
- No



---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Living with a partner but not married*

Q25B Is your child currently being cared for by someone other than you or your partner on a regular basis? By regular, let's say at least once a week for the past month.

Yes

No

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Divorced*

*Or Are you currently? = Separated*

*Or Are you currently? = Single (never married)*

*Or Are you currently? = Widowed*

*Or Are you currently? = Prefer not to answer*

Q25C Is your child currently being cared for by someone other than you on a regular basis? By regular, let's say at least once a week for the past month.

Yes

No

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Is your child currently being cared for by someone other than you or your spouse on a regular bas... = Yes*

*Or Is your child currently being cared for by someone other than you or your partner on a regular ba... = Yes*

*Or Is your child currently being cared for by someone other than you on a regular basis? By regular,... = Yes*

Q26 Did the person caring for your child attend the WeBop class?

Yes

No

Sometimes

---

End of Block: Demographics

Start of Block: Musical Experiences

Q27 Do you play a musical instrument?

- Yes
- No
- Sometimes
- 

Q28 Have you ever sung in a choir or participated in a different musical group?

- Yes
- No
- 

Q29 Have you ever taken music lessons (excluding WeBop). For example piano or guitar lessons

- Yes
- No
- 

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Married*

Q30A Has your spouse sung in a choir or participated in a different musical group?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know
- 

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Living with a partner but not married*

Q30B Has your partner sung in a choir or participated in a different musical group?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

---

*Display This Question:*

- If Are you currently? = Divorced*
- Or Are you currently? = Separated*
- Or Are you currently? = Single (never married)*
- Or Are you currently? = Widowed*
- Or Are you currently? = Prefer not to answer*

Q30C Has the other parent sung in a choir or participated in a different musical group?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

---

*Display This Question:*

- If Are you currently? = Married*

Q31A Has your spouse taken music lessons?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

---

*Display This Question:*

- If Are you currently? = Living with a partner but not married*

Q31B Has your partner taken music lessons?

- Yes
  - No
  - I don't know
-

Display This Question:

- If Are you currently? = Divorced*
- Or Are you currently? = Separated*
- Or Are you currently? = Single (never married)*
- Or Are you currently? = Widowed*
- Or Are you currently? = Prefer not to answer*

Q31C Has the other parent taken music lessons?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

End of Block: Musical Experiences

---

Start of Block: Other organized music, educational, home environment and parent engagement

Q32 Does your child attend music classes other than WeBop?

- Yes
  - No
- 

Q33 Is your child enrolled in other classes (not music classes) For example, art classes, swimming, dance, etc.

- Yes
  - No
- 

Q34 How many concerts have you attended with your child within the last year?

- I have never attended a concert with my child
- 1-2
- 3-5
- 6-8
- 9 or more

---

Q35 How many musical toys does your child have at home? For example: toy xylophones, shakers, tambourines, etc.

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more

---

Q36 How many musical instruments do you have in your house? For example: keyboard/piano, guitar, violin, etc.

- 0
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5 or more
-

Q37 In a month, how many times do you and your child attend or visit...

|                        | 0                     | 1                     | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | 5 or more             |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Museums                | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Parks                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Libraries              | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Children's<br>concerts | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Plays or shows         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

---

Q38 Regarding spending time with you child, how many days a week you do this in a typical week?

|   | 0                     | 1                     | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | 5                     | 6                     | 7                     |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Play games like "peek-a-boo" or "gotcha"                      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Sing songs or nursery rhymes to your child                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Read stories  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Tell stories to your child                                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Play recorded music for your child                            | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Play inside with toys such as blocks or legos with your child | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Play a musical instrument for or with your child              | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Move to music (dance) with your child                         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Hug or show physical affection to your child                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Put your child to bed   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

End of Block: Other organized music, educational, home environment and parent engagement

Start of Block: Parental Values and Attitudes towards music and other activities





Q41 For personal leisure you engage in the following activities...

|   | Never                 | Once a year           | Once a month          | Every week            | Daily                 |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Read books                                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Go out to the movies or to see a film         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Go to any amateur or professional sports      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Attend music concerts                         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Attend art exhibitions                        | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Participate in any sports or outdoor activity | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q42 On a scale of 0-4, how important is music education for you?

- 0= Not at all important
- 1
- 2= Somewhat important
- 3
- 4= Extremely Important

Q43 Please explain why \_\_\_\_\_

End of Block: Parental Values and Attitudes towards music and other activities

Start of Block: Additional

Q44 Is there anything else you would like to add or share?

End of Block: Additional

## Spanish Version

---

### Start of Block: Intro

*Display This Question:*

*If Incentives = 0*

Intro 1 Querido padre o madre,

Mi nombre es Adriana Diaz-Donoso, actualmente soy candidata a doctorado en el programa de Educación Musical en la Universidad de Columbia en Nueva York. Como parte de mi tesis , estoy llevando a cabo una encuesta para identificar qué razones impulsan a las familias a participar en programas de música orientados a la primera infancia, así como otras actividades durante esos años. Como usted asiste actualmente o asistió a las clases de WeBop su participación en este estudio proporcionará información útil sobre las prácticas musicales de los padres. Su respuesta es muy importante para el éxito de este estudio. La información que usted proporcione ayudará a comprender mejor a la población interesada en los programas de música para niños pequeños, así como también entender más sobre el rol que la música desempeña en sus vidas. Completar el cuestionario le debería tomar no más de 15 minutos. ¡Su participación será muy apreciada! Los resultados del estudio se utilizarán sólo con fines educativos y académicos. Sus respuestas a la encuesta serán estrictamente confidenciales. Se usará un número de identificación en lugar de su nombre durante la recopilación de datos. Además, el análisis de los datos se realizará de forma agregada de tal manera que los encuestados individuales no puedan ser identificados. Por favor, siéntase libre de contactarme si tiene alguna pregunta, correo electrónico: ad2903@tc.columbia.edu, teléfono: 347-751-4338. Si tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como participante del estudio de investigación, debe contactarse con el Comité de Revisión Institucional con siglas en inglés IRB (el comité de ética para investigaciones humanas) al 212-678-4105 o a correo electrónico IRB@tc.edu. El IRB es el comité que supervisa la protección de investigaciones con seres humanos de Teachers College en la Universidad de Columbia.

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Incentives = 1*

Intro 2 Querido padre o madre,

Mi nombre es Adriana Diaz-Donoso, actualmente soy candidata a doctorado en el programa de Educación Musical en la Universidad de Columbia en Nueva York. Como parte de mi tesis , estoy llevando a cabo una encuesta para identificar qué razones impulsan a las familias a participar en programas de música orientados a la primera infancia, así como otras actividades durante esos años. Como usted asiste actualmente o asistió a las clases de WeBop su participación en este estudio proporcionará información útil sobre las prácticas musicales de los padres. Su respuesta es muy importante para el éxito de este estudio. La información que usted proporcione ayudará a comprender mejor a la población interesada en los programas de música para niños pequeños, así como también entender más sobre el rol que la música desempeña en sus vidas. Completar el cuestionario le debería tomar no más de 15 minutos. ¡Su participación será muy apreciada! Y por ello le estaré enviando una tarjeta de Amazon por el valor de \$10 como un detalle de agradecimiento. Sin embargo, si usted decide que quiere retirarse del estudio puede hacerlo en cualquier momento y no tiene que devolver la tarjeta. Los resultados del estudio se utilizarán sólo con fines educativos y académicos. Sus respuestas a la encuesta serán estrictamente confidenciales. Se usará un número de identificación en lugar de su nombre durante la recopilación de datos. Además, el análisis de los datos se realizará de forma agregada de tal manera que los encuestados individuales no puedan ser identificados. Por favor, siéntase libre de contactarme si tiene alguna pregunta, correo electrónico: ad2903@tc.columbia.edu, teléfono: 347-751-4338. Si tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como participante del estudio de investigación, debe contactarse con el Comité de Revisión Institucional con siglas en inglés IRB (el comité de ética para investigaciones humanas) al 212-678-4105 o a correo electrónico IRB@tc.edu. El IRB es el comité que supervisa la protección de investigaciones con seres humanos de Teachers College en la Universidad de Columbia.

---

Consent

Formulario de consentimiento del participante

Para completar esta encuesta, necesitamos su consentimiento y le pedimos que confirme la siguiente declaración.

*Confirmando que he leído y comprendido la descripción del estudio. He tenido la oportunidad de considerar la información; si tuve preguntas, estas fueron respondidas satisfactoriamente. Entiendo que no seré identificado ni mi nombre aparecerá en*

ningún informe producido posteriormente por el investigador.

Estoy de acuerdo con la declaración anterior

*Display This Question:*

*If Incentives = 1*



¿Qué correo electrónico es el mejor para recibir su tarjeta de regalo de Amazon? Por favor, escriba su dirección de correo electrónico que a continuación:

End of Block: Intro

Start of Block: About the Program and Attendance

Q1 Elija todos los semestres y años respectivos en los cuales usted y su hijo o hija se inscribieron en WeBop

|           | 2018                     | 2017                     | 2016                     | 2015                     |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Invierno  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Primavera | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Verano    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Otoño     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q2 ¿En qué medida las siguientes afirmaciones se relacionan con las razones por las cuales inscribió a su hijo/hija en el programa WeBop?

|  | Totalmente de acuerdo | De acuerdo            | Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo | En desacuerdo         | Completamente en desacuerdo |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Soy un apasionado del jazz y quería exponer a mi hijo a ese género musical                                     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>       |
| Es una actividad en la que puedo pasar tiempo con mi niño/niña   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>       |
| Participar en una clase de música ayudará a mi niño/niña académicamente en el futuro                           | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>       |
| Es importante que mi niño/niña tenga acceso a instituciones culturales importantes como Jazz at Lincoln Center | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>       |
| Es una actividad en la que mi niño/niña puede pasar tiempo con otras personas                                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>       |
| El jazz es la música de los Estados Unidos y participar en WeBop me hace sentir más conectado con este país    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>       |
| Creo que la educación en las artes provee de enriquecimiento cultural  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>       |
| Amigos me recomendaron las clases  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>       |

Q3A ¿Hay alguna otra razón por la que inscribió a su niño/niña en el programa?

Sí

No

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are there any other reasons why you enrolled your child in the program? = Si*

Q3B Por favor especifique esos otros motivos

---

---

Q4A ¿Es usted quien asistió a la clase de música con su hijo/hija?

Sí

No

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Were you the adult attending the class with your child? = No*

Q4B ¿Quién asistió a la clase con su hijo/hija?

Su mamá/papá

Abuelo

Otro pariente

Otra persona (especificar) \_\_\_\_\_

---

Q5 ¿Qué es lo que más le gustó del programa?

---

---

---

---

---

---

Q6 ¿Qué es lo que menos le gustó del programa?

---

---

---

---

---

End of Block: About the Program and Attendance

---

Start of Block: Demographics

Q7 ¿Cuál es su género?

- Femenino
- Masculino
- Prefiero no decirlo
- 

Q8 ¿Cuántos años tiene ?

---

---

Q9A ¿Cuál es la edad de su hijo/hija actualmente?

---

---

Q9B ¿Cuál es el género de su hijo/hija?

- Femenino
- Masculino
- Prefiero no decirlo
-

Q10 ¿Cuál es su relación con el niño/niña que asiste al programa?

- Madre
- Padre
- Abuela/ abuelo
- Otro pariente
- Otro

---

*Display This Question:*

*If What is your relationship to the child who attended the program? = Madre  
Or What is your relationship to the child who attended the program? = Padre*

Q11 ¿Cuántos hijos tiene?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- Más de 4

---

*Display This Question:*

*If What is your relationship to the child who attended the program? = Madre  
Or What is your relationship to the child who attended the program? = Padre  
And If  
How many children do you have? != 1*

Q12 Es el niño/niña que participó en el programa su...

- Primer hijo
- Segundo hijo
- Tercer niño
- Cuarto hijo
- Otro \_\_\_\_\_

*Display This Question:*

*If How many children do you have? != 1*

Q13 ¿Ha participado anteriormente en el programa con otro de sus hijos/hijas?

- Sí
- No

Q14 ¿En qué ubicación (ciudad) esta el programa WeBop al que asistió?

\_\_\_\_\_

Q15 ¿Esta actualmente?

- Casado(a)
- Viviendo con un(a) compañero(a) pero no casado(a)
- Divorciado(a)
- Separado(a)
- Soltero(a)
- Viudo(a)
- Prefiero no responder



Q16 ¿Con cuál de estas categorías se identifica?

- Nací en los Estados Unidos
  - Vine aquí a vivir cuando era un niño/niña
  - Vine aquí a vivir siendo ya adulto/adulta
- 

Q17 ¿Con cuál de estas categorías se identifica?

- Asiático o de las Islas del Pacífico
  - Indio americano, esquimal, Leut
  - Afrodescendiente
  - Blanco
  - Multiracial
  - Otro
- 

Q18 ¿Es usted de origen hispano o latino?

- Sí
  - No
  - Prefiero no responder
-

Q19 ¿Cuál es el grado o nivel educativo más alto que usted ha completado?

- Un poco de la escuela secundaria, sin diploma
  - Graduado de la escuela secundaria, diploma o equivalente (por ejemplo: GED)
  - Algunos créditos universitarios, sin título
  - Capacitación comercial / técnica / vocacional
  - Grado asociado
  - Bachillerato universitario
  - Posgrado (por ejemplo, MA, MD, DDS, MS, PhD, EdD)
- 

Q20 ¿Está trabajando actualmente?

- Tiempo completo
  - Medio tiempo
  - No por el momento
  - Otra (especificar) \_\_\_\_\_
- 

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently employed? != No por el momento*

Q21 ¿Cual es su trabajo actual?

\_\_\_\_\_

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Casado(a)*

Q22A ¿Está su esposo/esposa trabajando actualmente?

- Tiempo completo
- Medio tiempo
- No trabaja
- Otra (especificar) \_\_\_\_\_

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Viviendo con un(a) compañero(a) pero no casado(a)*

Q22B ¿Está su pareja trabajando actualmente?

- Tiempo completo
- Medio tiempo
- No trabaja
- Otra (especificar) \_\_\_\_\_

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Divorciado(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Separado(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Soltero(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Viudo(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Prefiero no responder*

Q22C ¿Está el otro padre o madre del niño/niña trabajando actualmente?

- Tiempo completo
- Medio tiempo
- No trabaja
- Otra (especificar) \_\_\_\_\_

Q23 El año pasado (es decir, en 2017), ¿cuál fue el ingreso familiar total aproximado antes de deducir impuestos?

- Menos de \$ 25,000
- \$ 25,000 a \$ 50,000
- \$ 50,000 a \$ 75,000
- \$ 75,000 a \$ 100,000
- \$ 100,000 o más

Q24 Includyéndose a usted mismo, ¿cuántas personas viven en su casa?

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Casado(a)*

Q25A ¿Actualmente su hijo/hija está siendo cuidado por alguien que no sea usted o su esposo/esposa regularmente? Por regular, me refiero por ejemplo, a al menos una vez a la semana durante el mes pasado.

- Sí
- No

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Viviendo con un(a) compañero(a) pero no casado(a)*

Q25B ¿Actualmente su hijo/hija está siendo cuidado por alguien que no sea usted o su pareja regularmente? Por regular, me refiero por ejemplo, a al menos una vez a la semana durante el mes pasado.

- Sí
- No

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Divorciado(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Separado(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Soltero(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Viudo(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Prefiero no responder*

Q25C ¿Actualmente su hijo/hija está siendo cuidado por alguien que no sea usted regularmente? Por regular, me refiero por ejemplo, a al menos una vez a la semana durante el mes pasado.

Sí

No

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Is your child currently being cared for by someone other than you or your spouse on a regular bas... = Sí*

*Or Is your child currently being cared for by someone other than you or your partner on a regular ba... = Sí*

*Or Is your child currently being cared for by someone other than you on a regular basis? By regular,... = Sí*

Q26 ¿La persona que cuida a su hijo/hija es quien asiste a la clase de WeBop?

Sí

No

A veces

End of Block: Demographics

---

Start of Block: Musical Experiences

Q27 ¿Toca usted algún instrumento musical?

Sí

No

A veces

---

Q28 ¿Alguna vez ha cantado en un coro o participado en algún otro grupo musical?

Sí

No

---

Q29 ¿Alguna vez ha tomado lecciones de música (excluyendo WeBop), por ejemplo lecciones de piano de otro instrumento?

- Sí
- No

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Casado(a)*

Q30A ¿Ha cantado su esposo/esposa en un coro o participado en algún otro grupo musical?

- Sí
- No
- No lo sé

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Viviendo con un(a) compañero(a) pero no casado(a)*

Q30B ¿Ha cantado su pareja en un coro o participado en algún otro grupo musical?

- Sí
- No
- No lo sé

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Divorciado(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Separado(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Soltero(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Viudo(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Prefiero no responder*

Q30C ¿Ha cantado el padre/madre del niño/niña en un coro o participado en algún otro grupo musical?

- Sí
- No
- No lo sé
-

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Casado(a)*

Q31A ¿Ha tomado su esposo/esposa lecciones de música?

- Sí
- No
- No lo sé

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Viviendo con un(a) compañero(a) pero no casado(a)*

Q31B ¿Ha tomado su pareja lecciones de música?

- Sí
- No
- No lo sé

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you currently? = Divorciado(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Separado(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Soltero(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Viudo(a)*

*Or Are you currently? = Prefiero no responder*

Q31C ¿Ha tomado el otro padre/madre del niño/niña lecciones de música?

- Sí
- No
- No lo sé

**End of Block: Musical Experiences**

---

**Start of Block: Other organized music, educational, home environment and parent engagement**

Q32 ¿Su hijo/hija asiste a otras clases de música?

Sí

No

---

Q33 ¿Está su hijo/hija inscrito en otras clases (no de música)? Por ejemplo clases de arte, de natación, de baile, etc.

Sí

No

---

Q34 ¿A cuántos conciertos asistió con su hijo/hija el año pasado ?

Nunca he asistido a un concierto con mi hijo/hija

1-2

3-5

6-8

9 o más

---

Q35 ¿Cuántos juguetes musicales tiene su hijo/hija en casa? Por ejemplo: xilófonos, maracas, panderetas, etc.

0

1

2

3

4

5 o más

---





Q38 ¿En una semana cualquiera, aproximadamente cuántos días a la semana hace las siguientes actividades con su hijo/hija?

|   | 0                     | 1                     | 2                     | 3                     | 4                     | 5                     | 6                     | 7                     |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Juegan juegos como "peek-a-boo" (cucú-tras) o "gotcha"            | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Canta canciones o canciones de cuna a su hijo/hija                | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Lee libros de cuentos   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Le cuenta historias a su hijo/hija                                | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Escuchan juntos música de discos, de la radio, etc.               | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Juegan juntos dentro de la casa con juguetes como bloques o legos | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Toca un instrumento musical para su hijo/hija                     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Bailan or se mueven juntos al ritmo de la música.                 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Abraza o muestra afecto físico a su hijo/hija                     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Pone a su hijo/hija a dormir                                      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

End of Block: Other organized music, educational, home environment and parent engagement

Start of Block: Parental Values and Attitudes towards music and other activities



Q41 Por lo general, usted realiza las siguientes actividades ...

|   | Nunca                 | Una vez al año        | Una vez al mes        | Cada semana           | Diario                |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Leer libros   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Salir al cine o a ver una película                                | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Asistir a algún deporte para aficionados o profesionales          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Asistir a conciertos de música                                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Asistir a exposiciones de arte                                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Participar activamente en algún deporte o actividad al aire libre | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q42 ¿Qué tan importante es para usted brindarle a su hijo/hija oportunidades de educación en música? Por favor explique

- 0 = Nada importante
- 1
- 2 = Algo importante
- 3
- 4 = Muy importante

Q43 Por favor explique por qué

---

End of Block: Parental Values and Attitudes towards music and other activities

Start of Block: Additional

Q44 ¿Hay algo más que quisiera agregar o compartir?

---

---

---

---

---

End of Block: Additional

---

Appendix B

Principal Component Analysis Results from Imputations 2-5

*KMO and Bartlett's Test<sup>a</sup>*

|  |                    |         |
|--|--------------------|---------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. |                    | .768    |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity                    | Approx. Chi-Square | 474.734 |
|  | df                 | 28      |
|  | Sig.               | .000    |

Note: a. Imputation Number = 2

*Communalities<sup>a</sup>*

|   | Initial | Extraction |
|---|---------|------------|
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre   | 1.000   | .841       |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                            | 1.000   | .721       |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future  | 1.000   | .582       |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                    | 1.000   | .642       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | 1.000   | .637       |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in WeBop makes me feel more connected to this country. | 1.000   | .523       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | 1.000   | .574       |
| Friends recommended it  | 1.000   | .924       |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 2

*Total Variance Explained<sup>a</sup>*

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues |               |              |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
|           | Total               | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.565               | 32.063        | 32.063       |
| 2         | 1.048               | 13.096        | 45.158       |
| 3         | 1.010               | 12.625        | 57.783       |
| 4         | .822                | 10.276        | 68.059       |
| 5         | .731                | 9.132         | 77.191       |
| 6         | .687                | 8.588         | 85.778       |
| 7         | .616                | 7.703         | 93.481       |
| 8         | .522                | 6.519         | 100.000      |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 2

*Rotated Component Matrix<sup>a,b</sup>*

|   | Component   |             |             |             |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | 1           | 2           | 3           | 4           |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future  | <b>.728</b> |             |             |             |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                                  | <b>.698</b> |             |             |             |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                          | <b>.678</b> |             | .353        |             |
| It's an activity that allows me to spend time with my child   |             | <b>.825</b> |             |             |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | .408        | <b>.647</b> |             |             |
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre   |             |             | <b>.915</b> |             |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in the program makes me feel more connected to this country. |             | .425        | <b>.546</b> |             |
| Friends recommended it  |             |             |             | <b>.952</b> |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Equamax with Kaiser Normalization.<sup>a,b</sup>

a. Imputation Number = 2



b. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

*KMO and Bartlett's Test<sup>a</sup>*

|  |                    |         |
|--|--------------------|---------|
| <hr/>  |                    |         |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. |                    | .770    |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity                    | Approx. Chi-Square | 489.722 |
|  | df                 | 28      |
|  | Sig.               | .000    |
| <hr/>  |                    |         |

Note: a. Imputation Number = 3

*Communalities<sup>a</sup>*

|  | Initial | Extraction |
|--|---------|------------|
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre  | 1.000   | .820       |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                                   | 1.000   | .780       |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future   | 1.000   | .595       |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                           | 1.000   | .615       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others  | 1.000   | .627       |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in the program, makes me feel more connected to this country. | 1.000   | .536       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others  | 1.000   | .583       |
| Friends recommended it   | 1.000   | .926       |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 3

*Total Variance Explained<sup>a</sup>*

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues |               |              |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
|           | Total               | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.587               | 32.343        | 32.343       |
| 2         | 1.066               | 13.323        | 45.666       |
| 3         | 1.013               | 12.663        | 58.329       |
| 4         | .816                | 10.198        | 68.527       |
| 5         | .710                | 8.881         | 77.408       |
| 6         | .676                | 8.453         | 85.861       |
| 7         | .607                | 7.582         | 93.443       |
| 8         | .525                | 6.557         | 100.000      |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 3

*Rotated Component Matrix<sup>a,b</sup>*

|   | Component   |             |             |             |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | 1           | 2           | 3           | 4           |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future  | <b>.741</b> |             |             |             |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                                  | <b>.726</b> |             |             |             |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                          | <b>.643</b> | .374        |             |             |
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre   |             | <b>.902</b> |             |             |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in the program makes me feel more connected to this country. |             | <b>.602</b> | .328        |             |
| It's an activity that allows me to spend time with my child   |             |             | <b>.859</b> |             |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | .420        |             | <b>.612</b> |             |
| Friends recommended it  |             |             |             | <b>.955</b> |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Equamax with Kaiser Normalization.<sup>a,b</sup>

a. Imputation Number = 3

b. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

*KMO and Bartlett's Test<sup>a</sup>*

|  |                    |  |         |
|--|--------------------|--|---------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. |                    |  | .773    |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity                    | Approx. Chi-Square |  | 484.505 |
|  | df                 |  | 28      |
|  | Sig.               |  | .000    |

Note: a. Imputation Number = 4

*Communalities<sup>a</sup>*

|   | Initial | Extraction |
|---|---------|------------|
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre   | 1.000   | .846       |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                                  | 1.000   | .707       |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future  | 1.000   | .597       |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                          | 1.000   | .644       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | 1.000   | .641       |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in the program makes me feel more connected to this country. | 1.000   | .519       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | 1.000   | .560       |
| Friends recommended it  | 1.000   | .937       |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 4

*Total Variance Explained<sup>a</sup>*

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues |               |              |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
|           | Total               | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.591               | 32.391        | 32.391       |
| 2         | 1.040               | 12.998        | 45.389       |
| 3         | 1.006               | 12.577        | 57.966       |
| 4         | .814                | 10.175        | 68.141       |
| 5         | .736                | 9.203         | 77.345       |
| 6         | .680                | 8.504         | 85.849       |
| 7         | .607                | 7.583         | 93.432       |
| 8         | .525                | 6.568         | 100.000      |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 4

*Rotated Component Matrix<sup>a,b</sup>*

|   | Component   |             |             |             |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | 1           | 2           | 3           | 4           |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future  | <b>.740</b> |             |             |             |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                                  | <b>.700</b> |             |             |             |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                          | <b>.674</b> |             | .354        |             |
| It's an activity that allows me to spend time with my child   |             | <b>.814</b> |             |             |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | .398        | <b>.656</b> |             |             |
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre   |             |             | <b>.917</b> |             |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in the program makes me feel more connected to this country. |             | .439        | <b>.529</b> |             |
| Friends recommended it  |             |             |             | <b>.959</b> |

Notes: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.  
Rotation Method: Equamax with Kaiser Normalization.<sup>a,b</sup>

- a. Imputation Number = 4  
b. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

*KMO and Bartlett's Test<sup>a</sup>*

|  |                    |         |
|--|--------------------|---------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. |                    | .775    |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity                    | Approx. Chi-Square | 486.724 |
|  | df                 | 28      |
|  | Sig.               | .000    |

Note: a. Imputation Number = 5

*Communalities<sup>a</sup>*

|   | Initial | Extraction |
|---|---------|------------|
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre   | 1.000   | .816       |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                                  | 1.000   | .779       |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future  | 1.000   | .604       |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                          | 1.000   | .623       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | 1.000   | .617       |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in the program makes me feel more connected to this country. | 1.000   | .527       |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | 1.000   | .573       |
| Friends recommended it  | 1.000   | .936       |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 5

*Total Variance Explained<sup>a</sup>*

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues |               |              |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
|           | Total               | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.586               | 32.329        | 32.329       |
| 2         | 1.073               | 13.416        | 45.745       |
| 3         | 1.004               | 12.554        | 58.299       |
| 4         | .811                | 10.139        | 68.438       |
| 5         | .713                | 8.915         | 77.353       |
| 6         | .673                | 8.417         | 85.770       |
| 7         | .602                | 7.521         | 93.290       |
| 8         | .537                | 6.710         | 100.000      |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Imputation Number = 5

*Rotated Component Matrix<sup>a,b</sup>*

|   | Component   |             |             |             |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | 1           | 2           | 3           | 4           |
| Participating in a music class will help my child academically in the future  | <b>.749</b> |             |             |             |
| I believe that having education in the arts will provide my child with cultural enrichment                            | <b>.727</b> |             |             |             |
| It's important that my child has access to major cultural institutions like Jazz at Lincoln Center                    | <b>.652</b> | .375        |             |             |
| I'm passionate about jazz and wanted to expose my child to that musical genre   |             | <b>.901</b> |             |             |
| Jazz is America's one true original art form and participating in WeBop makes me feel more connected to this country. |             | <b>.587</b> | .366        |             |
| It's an activity that allows me to spend time with my child   |             |             | <b>.865</b> |             |
| It's an activity where my child gets to socialize with others   | .406        |             | <b>.592</b> | .312        |
| Friends recommended it  |             |             |             | <b>.962</b> |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Equamax with Kaiser Normalization.<sup>a,b</sup>

- a. Imputation Number = 5
- b. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Appendix C

Associations Between SES and Principal Components 2-3



*Equation 1: Association between SES and Appreciation of Jazz*

|                | Unstandardized<br>Coefficients |           |               |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|                | <i>B</i>                       | <i>SE</i> | 95 % CI       |
| Middle SES new | .155                           | .191      | [ - .24, .55] |
| Low SES new    | .157                           | .523      | [-1.22, 1.53] |
| Intercept      | -.037                          | .090      | [ - .24, .17] |

*Note:* Ref. group High SES. Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients, SE, and CI. Results reflect imputed data. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

*Equation 2: Association between SES and Appreciation of Jazz*

|                | Unstandardized<br>Coefficients |           |               |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|                | <i>B</i>                       | <i>SE</i> | 95 % CI       |
| Middle SES new | .120                           | .449      | [-1.13, 1.13] |
| High SES new   | -.358                          | .460      | [-1.53, 1.22] |
| Intercept      | -.157                          | .523      | [-1.05, 1.30] |

*Note:* Ref. group Low SES. Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients, SE, and CI. Results reflect imputed data. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

*Equation 1: Association between SES and Socialization and Bonding*

|                | Unstandardized<br>Coefficients |           | 95 % CI       |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|                | <i>B</i>                       | <i>SE</i> |               |
| Middle SES new | .197                           | .222      | [-.29, .68]   |
| Low SES new    | .244                           | .535      | [-1.17, 1.65] |
| Intercept      | -.050                          | .095      | [-.27, .17]   |

*Note:* Ref. group High SES. Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients, SE, and CI.

Results reflect imputed data. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

*Equation 2: Association between SES and Socialization and Bonding*

|                | Unstandardized<br>Coefficients |           | 95 % CI       |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|                | <i>B</i>                       | <i>SE</i> |               |
| Middle SES new | -.047                          | .413      | [-1.04, .95]  |
| High SES new   | -.244                          | .535      | [-1.65, 1.17] |
| Intercept      | .194                           | .456      | [-1.00, 1.39] |

*Note:* Ref. group Low SES. Table presents unstandardized regression coefficients, SE, and CI.

Results reflect imputed data. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$