

Spring 5-2016

A Quantitative Analysis of the Relationship Between K–12 Music Educators and Collegiate Music Education Researchers and Instructors: Is There a Disconnect?

Meghan Kilpatrick Sheehy
University of Southern Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Music Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sheehy, Meghan Kilpatrick, "A Quantitative Analysis of the Relationship Between K–12 Music Educators and Collegiate Music Education Researchers and Instructors: Is There a Disconnect?" (2016). *Dissertations*. 349.
<https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/349>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

The University of Southern Mississippi

A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
K-12 MUSIC EDUCATORS AND COLLEGIATE MUSIC EDUCATION
RESEARCHERS AND INSTRUCTORS: IS THERE A DISCONNECT?

by

Meghan Kilpatrick Sheehy

Abstract of a Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
and the School of Music
at The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2016

ABSTRACT

A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN K–12 MUSIC EDUCATORS AND COLLEGIATE MUSIC EDUCATION RESEARCHERS AND INSTRUCTORS: IS THERE A DISCONNECT?

by Meghan Kilpatrick Sheehy

May 2016

Many researchers in a variety of fields have reported on disconnect between researchers and practitioners (Barry, Taylor, & Hair, 2001; Buysse, Sparkman, & Wesley, 2003; Fox, 1992; Fuchs, Fuchs, Harris, & Roberts, 1996; Graham et al., 2006; Hattie & Marsh, 1996; Lang, Wyer, & Haynes, 2007; Rynes, Bartunek, & Daft, 2001). In music education, this topic is frequently discussed (Brand, 1984, 2006; Byo, 1991; Flowers, Gallant, & Single, 1995; Hedden, 1979; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004; Radocy, 1983), but evidence is still primarily anecdotal (Nelson, 2011). The purpose of this quantitative study was to measure the relationship between K–12 music educators and collegiate music education researchers to determine to what extent disconnect exists. Research questions focused on access and utilization of scholarly publications, perception of the relationship between the researcher and practitioner, and ratings of philosophical music statements. Participants ($N = 868$) were solicited through the National Association for Music Education listserv, where a questionnaire was distributed via electronic link. Three types of participants emerged during analysis of descriptive data: Group 1, K–12 music educators ($n = 752$); Group 2, collegiate music educators ($n = 86$); and Group 3, music educators teaching both K–12 and collegiate level courses ($n = 30$). The Research to Practice Gap Analysis Instrument was developed for this study.

Responses were analyzed using a variety of tests including Cronbach's alpha test for reliability, Kruskal–Wallis One–Way Analysis of Variance followed by Mann–Whitney U *post hoc* with a Bonferonni correction to control for Type I errors, and a multiple regression. Findings showed Group 1 and Group 2 differed significantly on access to music research journals, the way they used and valued research findings, how they perceived their relationships with one another, and their reception of philosophical statements. Almost no instances of significance were found when comparing Group 1 or Group 2 to Group 3. While findings are not generalizable until further testing of the instrument has been conducted, this study contributes empirical data to a narrative within the field of music education that is primarily limited to anecdote.

COPYRIGHT BY
MEGHAN KILPATRICK SHEEHY
2016

A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
K–12 MUSIC EDUCATORS AND COLLEGIATE MUSIC EDUCATION
RESEARCHERS AND INSTRUCTORS: IS THERE A DISCONNECT?

by

Meghan Kilpatrick Sheehy

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
and the School of Music
at The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Dr. Steven R. Moser, Committee Chair
Professor, School of Music

Dr. Christopher J. Goertzen, Committee Member
Professor, School of Music

Dr. Richard S. Mohn, Committee Member
Associate Professor, Educational Studies and Research

Dr. Amanda L. Schlegel, Committee Member
Assistant Professor, School of Music

Dr. Mark D. Waymire, Committee Member
Assistant Professor, School of Music

Dr. Karen S. Coats
Dean of the Graduate School

May 2016

DEDICATION

To my husband, Dr. Jeremy S. Kellett: For your unwavering companionship, support, and encouragement during this adventure. Thank you for pulling me into this journey with you. For me, this day may have never arrived were it not for your example of perseverance. You incite my determination.

To my dad, Richard Sheehy: For expecting and pushing for no more than my best effort; for being my chauffeur all those years ago in order to let me take advantage of all of the opportunities before me; for giving me everything you never had; for encouraging me to eschew (how's that for a word?) expectations and always be myself. You are my motivation.

To my mom, Heather Kilpatrick: For showing me that authenticity, compassion, and dedication are the foundation of an exceptional career; for teaching me that I do not have to fit any predetermined perimeters; for keeping your own last name and other courageous acts of feminism that were just normal actions for you. Grandmama would be so proud of us! You are my inspiration.

To my brother, Matt Sheehy: For always assuming that your sister was capable of achieving absolutely anything; for constantly goading me to go after the next goal; for believing I was more intelligent and successful than you, which has never, even for a moment, been true – and I wouldn't have it any other way; for showing me, by example, that being persistent and tenacious may be difficult but is rewarding in the end. You are my dedication.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, a huge and completely inadequate thank you to Dr. Steven Moser for serving as my committee chair, mentor, encourager, and even band director! You have gone above and beyond, always finding time where there was none, keeping me on track, and helping me develop a solid research project of which we can both be proud. I am so appreciative of your commitment to my growth as a scholar and student. It was a lucky day when I first committed to Southern Miss. You have played such an important role in my journey as a Golden Eagle.

Dr. Rich Mohn, the time you spent walking me through statistics was invaluable. I cannot express enough gratitude for your patience as I navigated from complete incomprehension to confident application. You are largely responsible for the self-assurance I have in my ability to conduct quantitative research and continue to develop my skills as a statistician.

Dr. Amanda Schlegel, you have spent hours, days, weeks, and more providing me with guidance, handling questions that run the gamut of topics within and outside of our field, and providing me with more resources than I can count. Equipping your students with the best foundation for a successful future is truly of utmost importance to you, and we all benefit greatly from your passion and commitment.

Dr. Mark Waymire and Dr. Chris Goertzen, thank you for your service on my committee. You have both been wonderful teachers, and I consider myself very fortunate to be your student. I will certainly bring part of you into my future classes.

Dr. Joyce McCall, your shining example and unwavering drive have always been and will continue to be a tremendous source of inspiration in my life. You are family, and

I am so proud of you. Thank you for your love and support over the last decade (and more).

Thank you to my Interdisciplinary Studies and A&L Dean's office family: Dr. Jeanne Gillespie, Dr. Lin Harper, Andrea Newell, Helen Rassier, Rusty Rolison, Diane Ross, Evon Swan, Lashonda Thompson, and Dr. Ellen Weinauer, for your love, support, and gentle motivation to stay on task. Serving as your graduate assistant afforded me priceless opportunities, lessons, and friendships that I will carry with me always.

Dr. Ed Hafer, your laughs and cooking are worth their weight in gold. Thank you Lindsey Keay and David Carter for your sympathetic ears and great company.

Finally, to my precious family at Purple Parrot Café, there is not enough paper and ink to give you each the attention you deserve. I have learned more about navigating the tumultuous waters of society at your side than in any other environment to which I have been exposed. You have expanded my understanding of food, beer, wine, teamwork, humility, family, and friendship. You allowed me respite from the weighty stresses of working towards a terminal degree. You instilled me with confidence and bestowed me with a degree of expertise among the company of professionals outside of the service industry. I am a better person because of my time with all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction to the Problem	
Disconnect	
Knowledge Translation Theory	
Literature	
Audiences	
Delimitations	
Research Hypotheses	
Research Questions	
Definition of Terms	
Summary	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	12
Introduction	
Value of Research	
Knowledge Translation	
Dissemination of Research	
Philosophy in Music Education	
Disconnect Between Theory and Practice	
Discourse Analysis	
Recommendations	
Teacher Education Programs	
Conclusion	
III. METHODOLOGY.....	32
Introduction	
Research Questions and Hypotheses	
Participants	
Data Collection	
Instrument	

	Data Analysis and Findings Summary	
IV.	ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	40
	Introduction	
	Analysis of Descriptive Data	
	Data Collection Methods	
	Data Analysis	
	Tests of Hypotheses	
	Summary	
V.	DISCUSSION.....	80
	Introduction	
	Summary of Results	
	Expert Panel	
	Results as Related to Research Questions and Hypotheses	
	Discussion of Results	
	Recommendations for Future Study	
	Reflection	
	Conclusion	
	APPENDICES.....	112
	REFERENCES.....	136

LIST OF TABLES

Table	
1.	Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Grade Level.....42
2.	Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Subject Area.....43
3.	Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Highest Degree Earned.....44
4.	Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Recency of Degree Completion.....45
5.	Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Current Graduate Student.....46
6.	Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Number of Years Teaching.....46
7.	Question Nine, Kruskal–Wallis – Trade Journals/Magazines.....48
8.	Question Nine, Mann–Whitney U post hoc – Trade Journals/Magazines.....49
9.	Question Seven, Kruskal–Wallis – Research Journals.....50
10.	Question Seven, Mann–Whitney U post hoc – Research Journals.....51
11.	MANOVA of Likert Ratings.....54
12.	Cronbach’s α Reliability Analysis of Researcher’s Grouping for Access of Research.....55
13.	Question Eleven, Kruskal–Wallis.....56
14.	Question Eleven, Mann–Whitney U post hoc.....58
15.	Question Eleven Multiple Regression.....59
16.	Cronbach’s α Reliability Analysis of Researcher’s Grouping for Researcher/Practitioner Relationship.....61
17.	Question Fifteen, Kruskal–Wallis.....63
18.	Question Fifteen, Mann–Whitney U post hoc.....65

19.	Question Fifteen Multiple Regression.....	67
20.	Cronbach’s α Reliability Analysis of Likert Ratings.....	69
21.	Question Seventeen, Kruskal–Wallis.....	70
22.	Question Seventeen, Mann–Whitney U post hoc.....	71
23.	Question Seventeen Multiple Regression.....	72
24.	Group 1 and Group 2 significant correlations.....	77
25.	Cronbach’s α Reliability Analysis of Expert Panel Likert Groupings, Hypothesis 1.....	85
26.	Cronbach’s α Reliability Analysis of Expert Panel Likert Groupings, Hypothesis 2.....	87
27.	Cronbach’s α Reliability Analysis of Expert Panel Likert Groupings, Hypothesis 3.....	89
28.	Researcher Access and Utilization of Research Statement Organization.....	125
29.	Researcher Relationship Between Researcher and Practitioner Statement Organization.....	126
30.	Researcher Music Education Philosophy Statement Organization.....	127
31.	Expert Panel Access and Utilization of Research Statements.....	130
32.	Expert Panel Relationship Between Researcher and Practitioner Statements....	131
33.	Expert Panel Music Education Philosophy Statements.....	132
34.	Question 11, Means of Independent Variable Groups	133
35.	Question 15, Means of Independent Variable Groups.....	134
36.	Question 17, Means of Independent Variable Groups.....	136

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I cannot for the life of me figure out the practical utility of research for music teaching or the potential impact and benefit to music education. (Brand, 2006, p. 83)

Introduction to the Problem

Many scholars report evidence of disconnect in the relationship between K–12 practitioners and collegiate researchers across a variety of fields including organizational innovation, nursing, social sciences, and health (Barry et al., 2001; Buysse et al., 2003; Dorfman & Lipscomb, 2005; Fuchs et al., 1996; Hahs-Vaughn et al., 2009; Hattie & Marsh, 1996; Huang & Goldhaber, 2012; Krist & Venezia, 2001; Lang et al., 2007; Rosen & Zlotnik, 2002; Rynes et al., 2001; Snell, 2012; Udo-Akang, 2012). With such volume of evidence, some educational researchers (Hattie & Marsh, 1996) are even calling for a move away from more collection of data on the zero or negative relationship between researchers and practitioners in favor of research focusing on how to bridge the gap between the two: “It should cease to be surprising that the relationship between teaching and research is zero, and it would be more useful to investigate ways to increase the relationship” (p. 533). For the purposes of this study, disconnect is the disparate relationship between K–12 music educators and their collegiate counterparts; knowledge transfer does not occur, communication or collaboration between the two groups is limited, or there are inconsistencies in the philosophical underpinnings that motivate educational behaviors.

In music education, evidence of disconnect in the relationship between researcher and practitioner has been reported or discussed in a variety of scholarly publications under a range of topics including problems with research dissemination (Brand, 1984, 2006; Byo, 1991; Flowers et al., 1995; Hedden, 1979; Jorgensen, 2010; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004; Thorpe, 1958), researchers who are out of touch with current practices in the K–12 music classroom (Brand, 1984; Hedden, 1979; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004), little to no evidence of music education researchers improving the field of music education (Brand, 1984; Hedden, 1979), K–12 educators who lack training in understanding and implementing research (Flowers et al., 1995; Hedden, 1979; Madsen & Furman, 1984), and a lack of interest in communication between practitioners and theorists (Cee, 2013; Kratus, 2007; Nelson, 2011). Unlike other fields, evidence of disconnect in music education is still primarily anecdotal, having rarely been intentionally measured (Nelson, 2011).

Causes of this lack of connection between music education practitioners and researchers with regard to publications include ineffective dissemination of research findings with authors citing issues such as interest, jargon, tone, and perceived usefulness (Brand, 1984, 2006; Flowers et al., 1995; Paney, 2004; Yarbrough, Price, & Bowers, 1991;), and lack of collaboration between researcher and K–12 educator (Byo, 1991; Brand, 2006). Several reports have sought to examine how scholarly writings influence the K–12 music educators personally or in practice regarding changes in methodological and philosophical approaches (Kacanek, 1982; Nelson, 2011; Yarbrough et al., 1991). Researchers found evidence of discrepancies between what practitioners claim to value versus actual behavior when leading a class or group (Yarbrough et al., 1991).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this quantitative study was to measure the degree to which disconnect exists between K–12 music education practitioners and collegiate music education researchers. Data were collected from primary, secondary, and tertiary music educators via electronic distribution of a questionnaire that included participant demographics, a measurement of participant access and use of scholarly publications as well as music education trade journals and magazines, Likert ratings of communication between researchers and practitioners, and Likert ratings of philosophical statements. After analysis of participant demographics, the independent variable groups changed from two groups divided into music education researchers and music education practitioners to three groups divided into K–12 music educators, collegiate level music educators, and participants who identified as teaching both K–12 and college level music courses at the time the questionnaire was distributed.

Disconnect

The term disconnect as used throughout this study refers to the relationship between K–12 and college/university level music educators when considering philosophical ideologies, value and use of scholarly publications, and general communication and collaboration. Disconnect makes reference to the anecdotal evidence reported within music education research that suggests disunity between researcher and practitioner, leading to problems with the “. . . communication and application of [research] results” (Flowers et al., 1995, p. 24). The concept of disconnect in the context of this study relates to Knowledge Translation Theory as well as the numerous terms

describing the transmission of knowledge from one area of a field of study to another area within the same field. These terms will be discussed in the following section.

Knowledge Translation Theory

Knowledge Translation Theory (Estabrooks, Thompson, Lovely, & Hofmeyer, 2006) informed this study. Graham et al. (2006) describe knowledge translation (KT) as the process by which knowledge is created and then becomes integrated into practice: “The primary purpose of KT is to address the gap between what is known from research and knowledge synthesis and implementation of this knowledge by key stakeholders” (p. 14). Lang and colleagues (2007) picture knowledge translation as “the bridge that brings together [researchers and practitioners] in the hope of closing the research-to-practice gap” (p. 362).

There are a variety of terms or phrases similar to knowledge translation that are used in scholarly writing outside of music education, including “. . . ‘translating research into practice,’ getting research into practice, knowledge use, knowledge dissemination . . . evidence translation, research uptake, evidence uptake” (Lang et al., 2007, p. 355), knowledge transfer, knowledge translation, knowledge exchange, research utilization, implementation, dissemination, diffusion, and even continuing education or continuing professional development (Graham et al., 2006). “Some are used as nouns to describe the entire process that results in the use of knowledge by decision makers. Others are used as verbs to represent actions or specific strategies taken to cause the uptake to occur” (p. 14).

Music education researchers also use a myriad of terms or phrases to describe something closely or directly associated with knowledge translation, such as research

reporting and research disseminating (Brand, 1984), application (Cee, 2013), upkeep and translation (Hedden, 1979), “participat[ion] in the field’s scholarship” (Jorgensen, 2010, p. 22), general divide (Nelson, 2011), and bridging the gap (Paney, 2004). The context in which these terms and phrases are referenced is often that of difficulty in dissemination and uptake of research findings and evidence–based suggestions outlined in scholarly reports.

The phrase ‘research dissemination’ is commonly found within music education publications (Brand, 1984; Flowers et al., 1995; Geringer & Madsen, 1984; Madsen & Furman, 1984) but may suggest a one–way process from researcher to practitioner. Similarly, Graham et al. (2006) state that *knowledge transfer* has been “interpreted as, and criticized for, suggesting that the process is unidirectional” (p. 16). Despite this criticism, the authors contend that transfer can happen in both directions. As this term is used in the scholarly writings of a variety of fields for the purpose of describing the process of moving knowledge between researchers and practitioners (or stakeholders), it will also be used throughout this paper in reference to the act of transferring knowledge between K–12 music educators and college/university music educators and music education researchers. Transfer does not refer to only the first step in the process, rather it is used in the same way Hutchinson and Huberman (1994) define dissemination: “. . . the transfer of knowledge within and across settings, with the expectation that the knowledge will be ‘used’ conceptually or instrumentally” (p. 28).

A common issue among fields that rely on knowledge transfer is difficulty in the transfer process. In health sciences, Graham et al. (2006) state: “A consistent finding from the literature is that the transfer of research findings into practice is often a slow and

haphazard process” (p. 13). Flowers et al. (1995) describe the “communication and application of results” as “problematic” at times (p. 24). Others outside of the field of music education write about the need to find “ways to overcome practitioner indifference to research and the widespread perception that educational research has not addressed relevant problems or generated useful solutions” (Buysse et al., 2003, p. 274).

Within music education, Geringer and Madsen (1987) observed little transfer where transfer was not “specifically taught” (p. 20). However, in their study on the impact of research findings on music teachers’ rehearsals, Yarbrough et al. (1991) found that “when teachers know and value research and when they interact in a purposeful way with feedback provided from objective recording techniques, they are indeed able to translate their ideas into behaviors” (p. 20).

Literature

In 1979, Hedden reported the existence of “casual evidence [suggesting] . . . many public school teachers regard research as an ‘ivory tower’ activity” (p. 35). In a survey of 37 Texas music educators, he found that 81.1% believed few of their colleagues even read research reports. Byo (1991) asserts, “There is little doubt that a general division exists between the research community and music educators” (p. 4). Yarbrough et al. (1991) believe a primary challenge for music education researchers lay with the dissemination of their scholarly works, and Flowers et al. (1995) concur saying, “Educational concerns may be constructively addressed by research; however, the communication and application of results are sometimes problematic” (p. 24). During a discussion with graduate music students who were also teaching in the Hong Kong school system, Brand (2006) uncovered that these teachers believed there was no

relationship between research and the music classroom; they resented the suggestion that teachers needed to change and struggled to synthesize findings into methods that could be incorporated into their lessons. Even university teachers fail to make a connection between research and classroom application. Barry et al. (2001) uncovered one participant who stated, “the studies do not help me inform my teaching at the undergraduate level. I find the topics too narrow and specialized and somewhat trivial” (p. 22). Further, several researchers uncovered a propensity for research participants to value rehearsal techniques that did not always occur within their own rehearsals (Kacanek, 1982; Nelson, 2011; Yarbrough et al., 1991), suggesting that value does not necessarily lead to application.

The existence of a strained relationship between practitioners and researchers is mentioned in many studies within the field of music education (Brand, 1984, 2006; Cee, 2013; Hedden, 1979; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004). Hedden (1979) found that his participants believed “that research students typically are not concerned with the ‘real world’” (p. 37). Regelski (1980) agreed, asserting that few contributions have been made to the public school classrooms through music education research; that they have instead driven away those very educators for whom we are often researching. Brand (1984) went even further, describing an “open contempt of research and researchers on the part of many practitioners in our profession” (p. 1). Twenty years later, Paney (2004) described the same issue of perceived value of music education research. Despite the passage of two decades, the research and publications produced by music education researchers were still perceived as being of little use to the practitioners’ classroom. When interviewing his graduate class of K–12 music educators, Brand (2006) was surprised to uncover a

“cynical tone regarding the value of music education research” among students (p. 81). According to Nelson (2011), evidence of division between practitioner and researcher exists in the negative feelings of K–12 music educators and the lack of impact research publications have made in primary and secondary classrooms. Cee (2013) worries that this disconnect makes it seem “as if we have nothing left to communicate as a profession” (p. 71). Returning to Hedden (1979), we find recommendations towards bridging this gap between practitioners and researchers. While he did find that music educators “seem[ed] to have little knowledge of the terms/methods/techniques used in research,” he also uncovered their willingness to use these publications to “guide practice if researchers will expend the effort to translate research findings from ‘researchese’ to everyday language” (p. 39). Hedden was among some of the earlier researchers to mention music education reform in conjunction with bridging the gap between researcher and practitioner.

Audiences

Kratus (2007) describes our field as existing “at a tipping point” (p. 42). The findings from this study are for the purpose of informing the music education research community about a potential measurement of the relationship between researcher and practitioner. While adding empirical data to the limited body of knowledge on the topic of disconnect between these two groups in music education may serve to benefit K–12 music education practitioners in the future, current findings are not transferrable to other scenarios within the field of music education as the instrument designed for this research must undergo further testing for validity and reliability. In future iterations of this research, data collected may help researchers continue to improve the ways they

disseminate scholarly findings to K–12 practitioners, who are often their intended audience. For practitioners, bridging the gap between themselves and collegiate researchers may serve to provide an exceptional resource for their curricular, methodological, and philosophical growth and development. If music education is truly at a precipice, we may stand to gain from a collaborative effort to reconsider, revise, or reform our communicative practices.

Delimitations

While this study fulfills a gap in research noticed by Nelson (2011), the findings are specific to this investigation and not generalizable to a larger population. Participants ($N = 868$) were sought from a national music association but were limited to educators participating in the organization who also had access to email and Internet connection, as no paper dissemination of this questionnaire occurred. As this instrument is newly developed, further testing is required before results will be generalizable to the field of music education.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed for this project:

H₁ – Collegiate music education participants will access scholarly music education publications more frequently than K–12 music educators, the former finding the writings more useful than the latter.

H₂ – The difference in ratings of philosophical statements will be statistically significant based on whether the participant is a K–12 or collegiate level music educator.

H₃ – Ratings of Likert questionnaire items on the relationship between researcher and practitioner will be significantly different between K–12 and collegiate music educators.

Research Questions

The following questions guided my research:

R₁ – How do K–12 music educators access scholarly music education publications compared to collegiate music educators? To what level do participants employ the reports within their classrooms?

R₂ – How do participants rate the tone and content of philosophical music education statements?

R₃ – How do music educators perceive their relationship with K–12 or collegiate counterparts?

Definition of Terms

1. *Disconnect* – “A discrepancy or lack of connection” (“Disconnect”, 2014)
2. *Practitioner* – A music educator for grades Pre–Kindergarten through twelve.
3. *Researcher* – A music educator who, in this study, has earned a Ph.D. in music education and is currently practicing at a university.
4. *Tertiary* – College or university level instruction.

Summary

This project sought to measure the gap between music education practitioners and collegiate music educators by comparing access and perceived usefulness of research publications as well as trade journals and magazines, perception of the relationship between researcher and practitioner, and ratings of philosophical statements. Most reports

of disconnect within scholarly writings are anecdotal, with little empirical data to support the premise. Several studies have measured dissemination, access, and usefulness of scholarly publications as well as practitioners' value and use of philosophical and methodological tenets outlined in research publications. Findings show while there may be a positive correlation between belief and practice, the implementation of beliefs is weaker in practice than in value. This survey may encourage reflection of personal behaviors among participants specifically tied to the correlation between belief and practice. This study may also drive participants to reflect on the relationships between themselves and their counterparts in the primary, secondary, or tertiary branches of our field. Finally, this research serves as a first step in the development of an instrument designed specifically to measure the relationship between researchers and practitioners within the field of music education. Findings add to the body of knowledge on the topic of knowledge transfer between music educators in K–12 schools as well as colleges and universities.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much of what music educators do is based on tradition and inertia. Although some practices have withstood a test of time, it is good to question long-standing practices occasionally. (Radocy, 1983, p. 30)

Introduction

Music education researchers have struggled to effectively disseminate the findings of their scholarly efforts to practitioners within the field (Brand, 1984, 2006; Byo, 1991; Flowers et al., 1995; Hedden, 1979; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004; Yarbrough et al., 1991). The publications are either not read, or read but not transferred to the classroom (Jones, 2005; Jorgensen, 2010; Leonhard, 1999; Regelski, 2007; Woody, 2007). Anecdotal evidence (Nelson, 2011) suggests that this could be caused by disconnect between K–12 practitioners and researchers (Brand, 1983, 2006; Byo, 1991; Hedden, 1979; Radocy, 1983). Other possible factors affecting knowledge transfer include research language (Hedden, 1979; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004), difficulty applying the recommendations of scholarly writings into useful classroom practices (Brand, 2006; Paney, 2004), professionals who are already burdened and lack time to effectively analyze and synthesize research publications (Barrett, 2013; Jorgensen, 2010), adherence to status quo and tradition (Jorgensen, 2010; Nelson, 2011; Radocy, 1983; Regelski, 2013; Russell, 2007), or the experience of cognitive dissonance (Nelson, 2011) when educators are asked to consider revision and reform (Kratus, 2007). If this disconnect exists (Nelson, 2011), both theorists and practitioners must engage in critical discourse in an effort to bridge the gap (Brand, 1984; Cee, 2013; Nelson, 2011; Talbot,

2013). With a curriculum largely based on tradition (Allsup, 2012; Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Jones, 2005; Nelson, 2011; Woody, 2007), the development of a personal philosophy of music education is important in strengthening the foundation of our methodological choices (Jorgensen, 1990). However, there is evidence of discrepancy between the philosophical statements and actual methodology of educators (Yarbrough et al., 1991). This study was designed to measure the relationship between K–12 music education practitioners and collegiate music education practitioners and researchers. Variables included access and utilization of research publications, perception of the relationship between researcher and practitioner, and ratings of philosophical statements. This chapter outlines the ways various components of this project have been measured, reported, or discussed in studies both within and outside of the field of music education.

Value of Research

Hattie and Marsh (1996) express the necessity of research: “If instructors are to keep abreast of new developments in their field and . . . stimulate their thinking”(p. 512). The systematic inquiry undertaken in research can provide guidance for revision or reform of methodology and curriculum within the field of music education (Geringer & Madsen, 1987). Radocy (1983) explains that “all well–done projects raise worthwhile questions and offer provocative suggestions for pedagogical and performance practices” (p. 30). He also posits that anyone conducting a “systematic investigation” could be considered a researcher:

Perhaps of greatest importance, a teacher who has a problem in a professional setting can find guidance in stating the problem and investigating alternative solutions. Anyone who conducts systematic investigation is a researcher. Are

there competing methods? What functions well to motivate particular students to practice? Research literature can suggest techniques for investigating such questions. (p. 30)

While Hattie and Marsh (1996), Geringer and Madsen (1987), and Radocy (1983) provided information and evidence supporting the value of research, Barry et al. (2001) found that music educators considered the publications extraneous and redundant, with topics often focusing on validating what is already known. One participant even suggested, “research should ‘move beyond confirming what we know through practice and begin to truly advance practice thru [sic] relevant topics’” (p. 22). Practitioners said they “view research reports as having little practical value unless [the teacher was] capable of making an application to their own teaching or performing situation” (Geringer & Madsen, 1987, p. 45). Barry et al. (2001) also reported teachers are often unsure of the relevance of these reports in their classrooms. Others substantiated such findings, including Dorfman and Lipscomb (2005), who discovered:

Respondents fail to make a real connection between research and practice . . . [they] do not foresee research as having a profound effect on the way they teach, nor do they see themselves as becoming involved in research as part of their professional activities. (pp. 38–39)

Buyse et al. (2003) suggest educational research is hindered by “. . . one-shot studies that do not lead to major insights, and the need to improve the trustworthiness, usability, and accessibility of our research in order to promote consonance between socially and empirically validated practices” (p. 273).

One possible way to approach such improvements is the inclusion of research methodology and participation among undergraduate music education students (Barry et al., 2001); “The notion that music education research is not relevant to the ‘real world’ of teaching is likely to persist until higher education faculty take a more active role in promoting research in undergraduate music teacher education” (p. 23). While practitioners often view research as marginal, they are interested in conducting research (Dorfman & Lipscomb, 2005). It is possible to develop that interest into action in a variety of ways, including “encouraging graduate students and teachers to define questions and interests . . . help[ing] them to develop their own research projects or find solutions to problems in the existing literature” (Flowers et al., 1995, p. 28). Poet, Rudd, and Kelly (2010) found that, while only one third of participants had recently been involved in “research and enquiry” (p. 15), those who had found the process beneficial.

Another way to improve access and usability of scholarly works is to reconsider our methods of dissemination. In an analysis of systematic reviews on the distribution of research findings among physicians, researchers (Lang et al., 2007) found the most common modus operandi – “didactic presentations and the dissemination of printed material” (p. 359) – was also the least successful way to affect change in practitioner behaviors.

Knowledge Translation

As noted by Lang and colleagues (2007), “The Canadian Institutes of Health Research defines knowledge translation as ‘the exchange, synthesis and ethically sound application of knowledge – within a complex system of interactions among researchers and users – to accelerate the capture of the benefits of research . . . ’” (p. 355). Backer

(National Institute for Drug Abuse, 1991) discusses “research, scholarly, and programmatic intervention activities aimed at increasing the use of knowledge to solve human problems” (p. 226) under the name knowledge utilization. Estabrooks et al. (2006) cite the definition of knowledge translation “as the ‘exchange, synthesis and ethically – sound application of knowledge – within a complex system of interactions among researchers and users’” (p. 28), but go on to note that such definitions of knowledge translation are often absent from the articles in which the concept is utilized or discussed.

Graham et al. (2006) define and clarify a variety of terms used to describe the dissemination of information between researchers and practitioners, commonly referred to in their article as *Knowledge-to-Action (KTA) Implementation*, used primarily in the United Kingdom and Europe, refers to the “scientific study of methods to promote the systematic uptake of clinical research findings and other evidence-based practices into routine practice” (p. 17). *Knowledge exchange*, also known as the two-communities theory, sees the facilitation of conversations between researchers and other stakeholders. *Research utilization*, most popular within the field of nursing, “. . . is focused only on moving research findings into action” (p. 17). Lang et al. (2007) reference the uptake of research evidence, or *evidence uptake*.

Dissemination of Research

Music education researchers also struggle with dissemination, value, and use. Brand (1984) stated “. . . if one of the major goals of research is to improve significantly the practice of music education, there is little evidence that research has made progress in that direction” (p.7). Less than a decade later Yarbrough et al. (1991) uncovered data showing secondary educators were actually “likely to adjust their teaching when

presented with research relating to their subject area” (p. 19), but conceded there was difficulty in circulating scholarly works among K–12 educators and pre–service teachers. Researchers continue to find evidence showing music education research as having little impact on primary and secondary level practitioners. Flowers et al. (1995) believe that while scholarly writings often report on topics of value to the field, dissemination is not always effective. Fiske asserts, “Practicing music teachers generally pay little attention to . . . research” (as cited in Paney, 2004, p. 85). Results of a survey conducted by Paney (2004) focusing on the dissemination of research among Texas music educators further support Fiske’s claim, showing that not one participant ($n = 37$) believed research journals positively affected their teaching quality. When Brand (2006) informally interviewed a classroom of music teachers participating in a master’s degree program in Hong Kong he also found that, rather than using scholarly writing to help with developing teaching methods or exploring new classroom techniques, teachers would seek the advice of another colleague (p. 82). Two decades earlier, Brand (1984) argued that a cause of this limited consumption of scholarly writings by K–12 music educators might have been the failure of researchers to effectively promulgate the results of their research. Moreover, Paney (2004) believed that much of our “research has repelled those who need it most . . . ” (p. 2). Various studies have shown that these repellants include contradictory or not–significant findings (Brand, 1984), inflammatory language (Nelson, 2011), technical jargon (Hedden, 1979), difficulty transferring research findings into useful classroom methods (Brand, 2006), and an “ . . . effort . . . when reading research reports [that] outweighs the benefits” (Paney, 2004, p. 2). During his Hong Kong interviews, Brand’s (2006) students confessed to frustrations with the tone of scholarly

writings that “giv[e them] the feeling that the music teacher is inadequate. Why is it always the teacher that needs to change and improve?” (p. 82). Brand (1984) believes that we cannot expect teachers to change something as personal as teaching methodology after reading research reports alone, despite the suggestions of some researchers such as Byo (1991), who has asserted that much could be gained by those who “take an active stance in the reading process” (p. 6). Even further, Yarbrough et al. (1991) believed that transfer of thought into action is accomplished with more ease and effectiveness by educators who “know and value research . . . [and] interact in a purposeful way with feedback provided from objective recording techniques” (p. 20).

Brand (1984) also believes the researcher should create new ways to communicate their findings with practitioners by including “easy to read summaries” (p. 85) as well as working with K–12 practitioners to “identify the most pressing research questions for music education” (p. 85). “As a scholarly community, our concern is to encourage greater understanding about . . . research in our publications” (Jorgensen, 1990, p. 38). While researchers have made an effort to more efficiently distribute research findings (Byo, 1991), there are other ways they can encourage consumption of and participation in scholarly projects. Undergraduate music education programs do not necessarily offer a sufficient foundation for the synthesis of scholarly findings within the primary or secondary music classroom (Flowers et al., 1995). Some (Barry et al., 2001) suggest that it is the researcher’s responsibility to consult K–12 educators specifically on the quality and relevance of their teacher training programs (p. 23). The field benefits greatly when research improves classroom methodology and student receptiveness (Brand, 2006).

The belief that the responsibility is shared is also held: “There has been a failure of both the researcher and the teacher to understand one another and to foster positive and cooperative relationships” (Brand, 1984, p. 2). Flowers et al. (1995) recommend we all attempt to cultivate an environment in which educators and future teachers are open to research and actively encourage participation in and review of scholarly efforts that may subsequently be utilized within their own classrooms. The National Association for Music Education (NAfME, formerly MENC) offered support to educators in the areas of “understanding, applying, and conducting research” in the 1980s (Radocy, 1983, p. 31).

In consideration of other stakeholders, Barry et al. (2001) surveyed 544 state music educator association board members from across the country, finding that 67.6% of participants read music journals. For those board members not reading this type of scholarly publication, hindering factors included “lack of time, lack of relevance of research to the ‘real world’ of the classroom, and no access to journals” (p. 22). Regardless of field or investment, “unless successful socialization occurs between academics and practitioners—with each side truly understanding and empathizing with the other—attempts to transfer explicit knowledge across boundaries are likely to fall on deaf ears” (Rynes et al., 2001, p. 348). Scholarly research is often “based on knowledge conversion within the bounds of the academic community” (p. 348) and fails to cross the partition between practitioner and researcher. Lang et al. (2007) remind their readers that findings in medical research are only advantageous to the patients when they are effectuated. Fuchs et al. (1996) lament the linear process whereby,

Educational interventions, curricula, materials, and so forth are typically developed and tested by researchers . . . Such products or ‘goods’ are then

packaged and delivered to teachers, who are expected to use them in a manner prescribed by the researchers in a user's manual. (p. 262)

They believe that it is our “fondness for a ‘linear model’ of educational change” (p. 262) that perpetuate the research-to-practice disconnect.

A variety of recommendations have been made in an effort to affect better research dissemination and utilization. Spencer (2001) discovered that, while research published by practitioners is typically more highly valued by that audience, scientists who publish in journals notoriously read by practitioners were almost as highly appreciated. In the field of organizational science, Rynes, Bartunek, and Daft (2001) directly addressed journal editors, challenging them to “make conscious attempts to solicit and provide more room for articles reflecting the full range of knowledge creation techniques – socialization, externalization, and internalization” (p. 349). In the medical field, Lang and colleagues (2007) recommend a searchable database that includes summaries formatted in a manner easy for the reader to digest and discern practical applications of the information provided. This is based on “a growing body of research [that] suggests . . . ready access to synopses can have various degrees of impact on physician practice and patient outcomes” (p. 358). They also recommend continually monitoring and improving methodological changes occurring on a large scale, and suggest that the researcher consider dissemination and implementation at the beginning of the process when they are choosing their research design. In educational research, Hahs-Vaughn et al. (2009) stress the importance of the abstract as a gateway to research. Whatever the method, “unless successful socialization occurs between academics and practitioners – with each side truly understanding and empathizing with the other –

attempts to transfer explicit knowledge across boundaries are likely to fall on deaf ears” (Rynes et al., 2001, p. 348).

Philosophy in Music Education

Music education practitioners are under the impression that philosophy is unrelated to what is happening within their music classrooms (Jorgensen, 1990) when in reality, “. . . the philosopher serves an important purpose in music education of clarifying concepts, and analyzing and criticizing ideas and the practices that they promote” (Jorgensen, 2001, p. 23). Oftentimes pre-service music teachers begin their college experience with existing expectations of the way music education should be taught, entering the field years later with little about those opinions having changed (Austin & Reinhardt, 1999; Lortie, 1975; Schmidt, 2012). Furthermore, these inflexible opinions may not come to fruition in the classroom, as “the aesthetic beliefs expressed by music educators are seldom found to be manifested in actual teaching practices” (Austin & Reinhardt, 1999, p. 19). Jorgensen (2001) counters this phenomenon, asserting music educators music be able to express their own interpretations of content and methodology “rather than import them uncritically from other places and times” (p. 22). Schmidt (2012) corroborates Jorgensen, stating, “. . . reflection on one’s own direct experiences is essential for educative learning of ideas, concepts, or understandings” (p. 31).

In 1991, Yarbrough and colleagues conducted a study entitled *The Effect of Knowledge of Research on Rehearsal Skills and Teaching Values of Experienced Teacher*. Through the analysis of data, researchers discovered “. . . on the pretest, the verbally expressed teaching values . . . and the behaviorally expressed teaching objectives of experienced teachers were somewhat different from those validated by research . . .

their values did not correlate highly with their behavior” (p. 19). This expression of philosophical underpinnings related to methodology is critical to educators who wish to be effective (Reimer, 1989) and to the field of music education if we “[intend to avoid misdirection and atrophy” (Elliot, 1995, p. 5).

Jorgensen suggests we prepare “reflective practitioners” (p. 29) who are critical thinkers and readers of research, continually developing and molding their classroom practices based on recommendations from academia as well as informed evaluation of their own students and classes. As practitioner’s methods are informed by their own personal philosophies (Eddowes, 1992) even if they “don’t think consciously about the type of teaching philosophy they are using” (p. 45) they should be trained to develop “philosophically grounded goals” (Reimer, 1989, p. 167) for their music programs. If philosophers wish to reach non-philosophers, they must toe the line between simplified explanation and research language and format (Jorgensen, 2001). After all,

Philosophers may articulate ideas, tease them out, criticize them, and provide a framework for formulating, thinking through, and evaluating alternatives, but the eventual responsibility for working out particular plans for specific instructional situations rests upon educational policy makers and teachers. (p. 20)

Cognitive Dissonance

Nelson (2011) measured the reactions of band directors reading two styles of writing about music education revision and reform. When addressing the negative reaction of participants, he turned to Leon Festinger’s cognitive dissonance theory: “. . . Individuals seek consistency within themselves and when presented with ideas inconsistent with held beliefs, the individual will experience psychological discomfort

and be motivated to actively reduce the dissonance in order to return to consonance” (p.17). Music education teaching styles are ingrained in tradition and status quo (Barrett, 2013; Kratus, 2007; Nelson, 2011; Regelski, 2013). The unwillingness of educators to alter their methods may not relate solely to the researcher’s ability to effectively disseminate their research findings, but may also be an effect of cognitive dissonance.

According to Jorgensen (1990), our reluctance to critically examine our practices in music education may affect the strength of our profession; “Knowing why we teach as we teach, why we adopt certain curricular and instructional approaches, increases our effective power . . . ” (p. 22). She continues, questioning the unwillingness of educators to examine their own teaching practices, recommending that we should instead welcome critics and rely on evidence we have gathered to “justify our claims and carefully arrive at our conclusions” (p. 20). Kratus (2007) speculates whether or not this disdain towards critical assessment is caused by constraints inherited in our musical upbringing. “We must seek every opportunity to better prepare ourselves to examine the ideas and underpinnings of our profession, and to carefully examine how we may be better able to serve our students in the future” (Jorgensen, 1990, p. 24).

Disconnect Between Theory and Practice

Dissemination of research and disconnect between researcher and practitioner appear closely related, with the struggles of dissemination playing a role in the level of disconnect perceived by both parties (Brand, 1984; Hedden, 1979; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004). Scholarly writings often reference anecdotal evidence of disconnect between collegiate music educators and K–12 practitioners (Brand, 1984; Byo, 1991; Hedden, 1979; Radocy, 1983) despite lack of empirical data (Nelson, 2011). Thorpe (1958)

discussed the opportunities for improvement that were being missed by music educators who were not cognizant of the discoveries of scholarship within their field. Hedden (1979) referenced the belief among K–12 educators that research is “an ‘ivory tower’ activity” full of “researchese” (p. 35) and conducted by scholars they believed were largely “not concerned with the ‘real world’” (p. 37). He surveyed a few dozen music educators in an effort to uncover these opinions regarding research within our field. Participants also believed that researchers published work for their own advancement as opposed to advancing the field.

As reported by Rynes et al. (2001), “prior to 1982, Beyer and Trice concluded that ‘the most persistent observation . . . is that researchers and users belong to separate communities with very different values and ideologies and that these differences impede utilization’” (p. 341). Reimer (as cited in Brand, 1984) describes this as a “disaffection” caused by “misunderstandings of what research is and does” (p. 6). Teachers feel that researchers are too separated from the primary and secondary music classrooms, going as far as deriding collegiate researchers and their publications that have a negligible relationship with what is occurring within the K–12 classroom (Brand, 1984). “. . . Thomas Regelski’s voice is the most critical: ‘most of the research to date has contributed little, except perhaps to ‘turn–off’ the very people who have the most need for it, music teachers and therapists’” (p.1).

Kanacek (1982) asked music educators to read and respond to selections from Reimer’s first edition of *A Philosophy of Music Education*; Participants “indicat[ed] their attitude towards [each] statement in theory and the perceived value of the statement in actual practice” (Nelson, 2011, p. 30). Results showed that while most practitioners

agreed with the principle tenets, levels of agreement were lower in consideration of practice versus theory.

Two years later, Brand (1984) published an article in which he summarized various publications reporting on dissemination of music education research up to that point, parroting themes that emerged among Hedden's participants in 1979. These reiterations included complaints about knowledge transfer and the belief that research publications did not serve the field, having little relationship to practical situations. Brand saw other causes of disconnect between practitioner and researcher as well, stating "there has been a failure of both the researcher and the teacher to understand one another and to foster positive and cooperative relationships" (p. 2). The K–12 music educator feels that the researcher is "too far removed from the realities of schools" (p. 5), while the researcher wonders what keeps the practitioner from utilizing data from research publications to improve their classroom. Brand suggested a compromise in which music teachers were to avail themselves to current research publications and recommendations, and researchers would make those publications more accessible both in language and attainability. This included the promise of a new journal specifically geared towards the dissemination of music education research to practitioners. *Update* was subsequently published in 1989.

Brand's (2006) previously mentioned discussion with Hong Kong music education master's level students revealed further evidence of disconnect: "' . . . My feeling is that music education research is consumed with rigor but not with usefulness. This relationship between research and music classroom . . . well there is none'" (p. 81). Fiske (as cited in Brand, 2006, p. 85) assigns blame for this gap on the inability of

scholars to effectively disseminate research in a manner that is easily accessible and readily useful to the primary and secondary classroom teacher. Paney (2004) does note that “several attempts have been made to bridge the gap between researchers and teachers” (p. 4), and Brand (2006) suggests “partnerships” (p. 84) where researcher and K–12 educator collaborate on scholarly efforts. Despite the wealth of research in music anecdotally addressing a divide between researcher and educator, theorist and practitioner, very little empirical data has been collected on this matter (Nelson, 2011).

Discourse Analysis

If there is disconnect between researcher and practitioner, we must move towards reconciliation by “. . . creat[ing] an atmosphere that facilitates closer communication between researchers, philosophers, and teacher” (Nelson, 2011, p. 57). Failure does not lay with one or the other, but instead between both teacher and scholar, who must work to develop interconnections (Brand, 1984). Cee (2013) states “. . . it seems reasonable to conclude that the profession does not offer meaningful, substantive support to our inservice [sic] teachers, either through research or advocacy” (p.71). Yet we must work to focus our discourse, as the benefits to the profession may be exceptional (Talbot, 2013). Teachers “might switch readily between languages and musics (p. 10) . . . [and] may have more freedom than they take up. Using discourse analysis, teachers may discover successful ways to switch between languages, musics, and legacies of participation” (p. 12).

Fox (1992) found that research and teaching are often at odds even within individuals responsible for both. In her study of social scientists in BA, MA, and PhD granting departments, Fox uncovered data suggesting, “research and teaching do not

represent aspects of a single dimension of academic investments, but are different, conflicting dimensions” (p. 293). In their Meta-analysis of fifty-eight studies, Hattie and Marsh (1996) categorize the relationship between researcher and practitioner as either negative, positive, or zero. They describe three models of negative relationships: The *scarcity model* accounts for scarcity of time, energy, and commitment and suggests that, based on the personal correlations of the separate activities of the researcher and practitioner; the relationship is potentially negative and, at best, zero.

Time devoted to research and teaching is negatively correlated, time in teaching is positively correlated to teaching productivity, and time in research is positively correlated to research productivity . . . There is little evidence, however, showing that time devoted to teaching is related to teaching quality. (pp. 508–509)

Ramsden and Moses (1992) also found teaching and research to be incompatible (as cited in Hattie & Marsh, 1996, p. 231).

The *differential personality model* outlines the idea that teachers and researchers are truly different personalities, as the responsibilities of each profession “require contrary personal orientations that are contrasting” (Hattie & Marsh, 1996, p. 510).

Buyse et al. (2003) concur, noting the gender differences as research is a male-dominated field, while teaching is female-dominated.

Finally, in the *divergent reward system model*, Hattie and Marsh (1996) state “. . . research and teaching are conflicting roles with different expectations and obligations that are motivated by differing reward systems.” The authors did note that “it was not possible to find evidence supporting or challenging this model” (p. 510).

Hattie and Marsh (1996) also investigated the positive relationship between teaching and research in the same study. Their findings were organized into two models: The conventional wisdom model and the 'g' model. The *conventional wisdom model* is representative of the widespread belief that the relationship between teaching and research is positive. The *g model* underscores the basis of a relationship built on the assumption that the skills and abilities required in successful teaching are the same required of a successful researcher.

The authors go on to outline the models of a zero relationship between teacher and researcher, including the different enterprises model, the unrelated personality model, and the bureaucratic funding model. In the *different enterprises model*, "research effort exists in the public domain and can count as a bonus for the researcher; teaching is often private and counts only if it has an impact on another person" (Hattie & Marsh, 1996, p. 513). The *unrelated personality model* is based on the antithetic of differential personality model; that practitioners and researchers are actually just disparate people. Finally, the *bureaucratic funding model* reflects on the financial tie between teaching and research at the university level. Unyoking the two at this level could affect the budgets and curricula of both programs.

In concluding their Meta-analysis, Hattie and Marsh (1996) reported the "the overall relationship between quality of teaching research was slightly positive" (p. 525), although "only 20% of the 498 correlations were significant" (p. 529). In Friedrich and Michalak's (1983) analyses of a variety of empirical studies, little to no relationship was found. Feldman (1987) discovered, "The likelihood that research productivity actually benefits teaching is extremely small [and] that the two, for all practical purposes, are

essentially unrelated” (p 275). Hattie and Marsh (1996) suggest that we should no longer be bewildered by the lack of relationship between the two groups but instead should consider how we may foster a positive connection, as currently, “at best research and teaching are very loosely coupled” (p. 529).

Recommendations

“ . . . The sharp divide between education research and scholarship and the practice of education in schools and other settings’ is one of the fundamental reasons for the lack of public support for education” (Buysse et al., 2003, p. 264). Researchers outside of the field of music education have made many recommendations regarding addressing the gap between researchers and practitioners. Buysse et al. (2003) suggest educational researchers persuade teachers to participate more in research projects. Researchers may benefit from an inside authority, as they “expend considerable time and energy sequestered from nonresearchers [attempting] to anticipate emerging problems . . . and identify research priorities and processes to address them” (p. 273). As noted by Zeichner (1995) and Achilles (1998), music educators also have a wealth of expertise and know-how from which researchers may gain insight or knowledge about their particular project. In the U. S. Congress’ *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* (1994), the relationship between researchers and practitioners is described as “essential to ensuring that research on effective practice is useful, disseminated to and supported with technical assistance for all educators, and that all educators are partners in the research and development process” (Section 941 A.1e). Flowers et al. (1995) recommend an adjustment in attitude towards the utilization of research within the classroom, whereby researchers encourage teachers

to put the recommendations made in various scholarly publications to use in their own classrooms.

Teacher Education Programs

Teacher education programs could be a starting point for addressing disconnect between practitioner and researcher. Flowers et al. (1995) believes these programs do not offer much exposure for undergraduates to the process of coordinating or comprehending educational research, although they reported that, “it was clear that students at research institutions held a more positive attitude about the applications of research to music teaching than did students enrolled in a program that emphasized teaching methodology” (p. 29). Hedden (1979) found teacher educators advocating for a required research course in teacher training programs. “Courses in music education research might emphasize application as a process of integration that enables practitioners and researchers to relate theory and practice more easily” (Geringer & Madsen, 1987, p. 45). While empathizing with already full teacher education degree plans, Barry et al. (2001) urge music teacher educators to “meet the challenge” (p. 23) of incorporating these courses.

The ambiguous role of research in teacher education may be a deterrent, especially when compared with pedagogically and methodologically-focused classes (Dorfman & Lipscomb, 2005). This only enhances the need to advance the purposes and benefits of research among current and future practitioners. Unfortunately, in their research Dorfman and Lipscomb found that students in an Introduction to Research Methods course failed to make a strong connection between the actions and publications of researchers and music teacher classroom practices. Considering that it was the instructor who failed to make such a correlation, the authors believe “the implication of

this ‘broken link’ is that teachers, even those seeking advanced degrees, do not recognize the influence of research on their everyday practice” (p. 38). This link is crucial, as exposure to findings and recommendations of the authors of various music education studies may lead to adjustments or improvements in teaching methodology (Yarbrough et al., 1991). As asserted by Radocy (1983), “There never has been and never will be just one way to teach music” (p. 30).

Conclusion

While research is considered highly valuable for practitioners (Byo, 1991; Geringer & Madsen, 1987; Hattie & Marsh, 1996; Radocy, 1983) the intended audience often believes the studies are unrelated to their own teaching (Barry et al., 2001), too uninteresting or difficult to read (Graham et al., 2006; Hedden, 1979; Paney, 2004), or impractical to apply to their own classrooms (Brand, 2006). These struggles in knowledge transfer may contribute to disconnect in the relationship between researcher and practitioner (Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004). Numerous researchers have discussed this relationship and have made suggestions on the ways we as a field might work to improve the communication of ideas and flow of information between the two groups (Brand, 1984, 2006; Byo, 1991; Flowers et al., 1995; Hedden, 1979; Jorgensen, 2010; Paney, 2004; Radocy, 1983). However, information regarding the existence of a gap in the relationship between K–12 music educators and collegiate music education researchers is primarily anecdotal (Nelson, 2011). This study will provide empirical data on this topic where little currently exists within the field of music education.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine if disconnect exists in the relationship between K–12 and collegiate level music educators when considering access and application of research publications, participant perception of the relationship between K–12 and collegiate music educators, and ratings of philosophical statements. An instrument was designed (Barry et al., 2001; Dorfman & Lipscomb, 2005; Guzman, 1999; Hedden, 1979; Hong-Yu, 2008; Kos, 2007; Kotora, 2001; Mercavich, 1987; Paney, 2004; Snell, 2012; Tom, 2004) and used for data collection (Appendix C). Data included participant demographics and access of scholarly music education publications, as well as ratings regarding research dissemination and utilization, research participation, philosophical statements, and statements related to the relationship between researcher and practitioner. This chapter covers research questions and hypotheses, participants, data collection methods, and questionnaire development, concluding with data analysis, findings, and a brief summary.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This research was guided by three primary questions. The first question focused on the dissemination and uptake, or knowledge transfer, of music education research publications among participants. Data were also collected on access of music education magazines and trade journals. The corresponding hypothesis focused on the likelihood of music education researchers to access and utilize research findings reported in scholarly publications with more frequency than their K–12 counterparts. The second question was

designed to gather information on the personal music education philosophies of participants through their ratings of philosophical statements. The related hypothesis stated that K–12 educators would rate these statements differently than their collegiate counterparts. The final research question focused on the participant’s perception of their relationship with either K–12 or collegiate music educators. Based on previous research findings (Barry et al., 1995; Brand, 1984, 2006; Bussye et al., 2003; Cee, 2013; Dorfman & Lipscomb, 2005; Fuchs et al., 1996; Hahs-Vaughn et al., 2009; Hattie & Marsh, 1996; Hedden, 1979; Kratus, 2007; Lang et al., 2007; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004; Rynes et al., 2001), the researcher hypothesized that the Likert items relating to ratings of perceived relationships would differ significantly between participant groups (Group 1, K–12 music educators; Group 2, collegiate music educators and researchers; Group 3, participants identifying as both K–12 and collegiate music educators).

Participants

Participants were sought using a service offered by the National Association for Music Educators (NAfME), where questionnaires were electronically distributed to a random sample of members who matched criteria selected by the researcher (who must also be a member of the NAfME) (Appendices A & B). Originally, the researcher anticipated contacting more national and state level organizations for assistance circulating the questionnaire. However, NAfME was able to distribute the instrument to 10,390 potential participants, well above expectations. Participation was limited to citizens of the United States who were practicing music education at primary or secondary grade levels, or in colleges and universities at the time of completion of the questionnaire. Three weeks after the initial email, a second message was sent to the same

10,390 members reminding them to complete the questionnaire. Five weeks after the first email was sent to members of NAfME, the questionnaire was closed. A total of 868 participants had successfully completed the questionnaire in its entirety. Three participant groups emerged during analysis of descriptive data. Group 1, K–12 music educators, was comprised of the largest number of participants ($n = 752$). Group 2, collegiate music educators ($n = 86$) was created by combining participants identifying as music education researchers ($n = 33$) and all other college–level educators. Group 3 ($n = 30$) were music educators who identified as teaching both K–12 and collegiate music education courses simultaneously. While these groups depict a non–normally distributed sample, the percentages are representative of the population from which the participants were sought.

Data Collection

An online survey link was made available to participants via hyperlink embedded within an email sent by NAfME. Data were stored using Qualtrics, a password protected hypertext transfer protocol secure site (<https>). Responses were organized by IP address, with no other identifying information available to the researcher. The dependent variables (DVs)—access and use of music education research journals and trade journals/magazines, music education philosophy, and the perceptions of the relationship between participant and their counterparts—were measured by analyzing the differences in responses on Likert items related to the DV by the independent variables (IVs). IVs were organized into three groups: Group 1, K–12 music educators; Group 2, collegiate music educators; Group 3, music educators identifying as currently teaching both K–12 and collegiate level music courses.

Instrument

For this study, the Research to Practice Gap Analysis Instrument (RPGAI) was developed (Appendix C) based on instruments used in a variety of other music education studies (Barry et al., 2001; Dorfman & Lipscomb, 2005; Guzman, 1999; Hedden, 1979; Hong-Yu, 2008; Kos, 2007; Kitora, 2001; Mercavich, 1987; Paney, 2004; Snell, 2012; Tom, 2004). Only four questions were duplicates from a previous study (Paney, 2004); permission to reuse those questions in a new instrument was obtained from the author during a conference the winter prior to development of the instrument.

A pilot test was run to determine content validity of RPGAI. Thirty-two questions covered a variety of topics including demographic information, professional and personal music activities, access of research, use of research, interest in research, usage of the National Standards, format and application of curriculum and assessments, and the rating of philosophical statements. Participants were contacted via social media messaging and link sharing. A multiple-option question addressing which areas of music respondents were teaching resulted in a variety of answers. While 61.9% of the participants identified as band directors, 42.3% of the band directors also selected one or more of the other teaching area options. Of the 11.9% of educators who selected elementary music, eighty percent also selected another area of teaching. Both participants who selected choir as their area of teaching also selected general music or music appreciation as another teaching responsibility. Of the two music theorists, only one was exclusively a theorist. The other identified as also teaching music appreciation and music technology. The remaining 16.7% of participants exclusively taught orchestra (2.4%) or an “other” area (14.3%), which included percussion, piano, guitar, private lessons, or applied lessons.

Due to the range of responses, this question was changed from a select all to a select one, and directions indicated the participant select the option that reflects the area most representative of their teaching responsibilities. An “other” option with an open-ended response section allowed participants to clarify when they felt none of the subject areas were a best fit for their situation.

Of 42 participants, 32 completed the survey in its entirety. Participant response rate began dropping after eleven questions; only 32 participants answered questions twenty-four through thirty-one. Six participants completed an optional, open-ended recommendation question. With this in mind, the questionnaire was adjusted from thirty-two questions including nine Likert rating groups to a seventeen question instrument with only three Likert rating groups (questions eleven, fifteen, and seventeen). Likert items related to the National Standards for Music Education, K-12 music curriculum, and music assessments were removed. Questions related to professional and personal music activities as well as format and application of curriculum and assessments were also removed. The remaining Likert items were reorganized into three questions based on the hypothesis to which they may have been related. Question eleven contained seven items associated with hypothesis one, the access and use of music education research. Question seventeen contained seven items affiliated with the second hypothesis regarding music education philosophy. Finally, question fifteen was comprised of eighteen items corresponding with hypothesis three, the relationship between researcher and practitioner. These questions were then intentionally separated by non-Likert questions to avoid perfunctory responses.

The final iteration of the RPGAI (Appendix C) contained seventeen questions: Six demographic questions; four questions on access and use of trade journals/magazines and scholarly research journals (Paney, 2004); three Likert groups with thirty-two items total (seven for question eleven, eighteen for question fifteen, and seven for question seventeen) covering access and use of research, philosophy, and the relationship between researcher and practitioner; three philosophical select all questions; and one philosophical ranking question. Likert items were ranked on a five-point scale to allow for a neutral response option.

Data Analysis and Findings

This research follows a retrospective causal–comparative design. Phillips (2008) describes this as “a form of *ex post facto* study in which the data are collected after the treatment has occurred . . . [where] two groups can be compared as to the incidence of factors or conditions influencing the dependent or measured variable” (p. 11). Likert–type ratings were analyzed for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha, followed by a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) to see if there were significant differences among the Likert ratings between the three participant groups. As the MANOVA for the three Likert groupings (questions eleven, fifteen, and seventeen) were each significant, a Kruskal–Wallis test and Mann–Whitney U *post hoc* with Bonferonni correction to control for inflated Type 1 error rates were calculated to determine which combinations of groups rated Likert statements significantly different. Kruskal–Wallis was used in lieu of a one–way independent Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as the participant pool is non–normally distributed. A MANOVA, Kruskal–Wallis test, and Mann–Whitney U *post hoc* with Bonferonni correction were also used to compare the

grade level taught by respondents with how many research journals or magazines they read (Paney, 2004). Multiple regressions were run on each of the three Likert questions to explore other variables that may be predictors of significant difference in ratings.

Reflexivity, as defined by Savin–Baden and Major (2010) is the process of “continually challeng[ing] our biases and examining our stances, perspectives, and views as researcher” (p. 177) by admitting personal assumptions (Creswell & Miller, 2000). The researcher’s experiences as a musician, band director, and doctoral student suggested anecdotal evidence of disconnect between K–12 and collegiate level music educators would be confirmed as significant by the data collected in this project. The work of others, both in music education and outside fields, substantiates this hypothesis (Hattie & Marsh, 1996; Nelson, 2011). Sources were sought to provide peer review of the research processes employed within this study. “A peer reviewer provides support, plays devil’s advocate, challenges the researchers’ assumptions, pushes the researchers to the next step methodologically, and asks hard questions about methods and interpretations” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985 as cited in Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 129).

Summary

This study was designed to measure the anecdotal disconnect reported within the field of music education between researchers and practitioners. Using an online questionnaire, the researcher collected data from primary, secondary, and tertiary music educators. Data were related to knowledge transfer as access and application of research publications, perception of the relationship between researcher and practitioner, and ratings of philosophical statements. While no study has been found that exclusively addresses a measurement of disconnect between practitioner and researcher, many studies

outside of music education have reported on knowledge transfer. Music education researchers have touched on the topic as embedded within other reports.

This study was intended to address the primarily anecdotal data (Nelson, 2011) available on the relationship between K–12 music education practitioners and collegiate music education researchers by providing empirical evidence as measured using the RPGAI. Data collection centered on three primary research questions concerning access and use of scholarly research and music education magazines, the perception of the participants' relationships with counterparts, and rankings of philosophical statements to determine if a difference exists between philosophical underpinnings of the three participant groups. Participants were sought through the National Association for Music Education through an email sent to 10,390 members across the United States resulting in a total of 868 participants ($N = 868$). The RPGAI was designed for this study and adjusted following administration of a pilot questionnaire. Data were collected using Qualtrics online software. Likert responses were analyzed using Chronbach's Alpha for reliability, MANOVA to test for significance of the Likert rating averages compared to the independent variables, and Kruskal-Wallis with Mann–Whitney *U post hoc* to check which combinations of the three IVs were significant. A Bonferonni Correction was applied following the Mann-Whitney *U post hoc* to control for Type I errors.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study was designed to measure disconnect between researchers and practitioners in music education. Participants completed an online questionnaire with items related to demographics, education, music education research, music education philosophy, and participants' relationships with colleagues. This chapter will review the analyses of descriptive data, summarize statistical analyses conducted on questions within the survey, review the measurement of variables that tested the hypotheses, report on data analyses relevant to the statistical testing of each hypothesis, and conclude with a summary of statistical findings in order of significance. Participants will be referenced based on their group categorization: Group 1, K–12 music educators; Group 2, collegiate music educators; and Group 3, participants identifying as teaching both K–12 and collegiate music courses.

Statement of limitations

These data were collected using a new instrument. While findings may be significant, they are not generalizable to the field until further explorations of the instrument's validity are conducted. The original purpose of this study was to measure the existence of disconnect between K–12 music educators and collegiate music education researchers. Of 868 participants, only 33 (3.8%) identified as the latter compared to 752 (86.6%) of the former. Therefore, it was necessary to group all collegiate level educators together ($n = 86$). While the sample was still not normally

distributed, by reporting all collegiate level educators together, it was representative of the population from which the sample was pulled.

Analysis of Descriptive Data

The National Association for Music Education (NAfME) distributed an email to 10,390 potential participants in all fifty states and the District of Columbia. The first message had an open rate of 37%. After approximately three weeks, the email was again distributed to the same 10,390 people. The second circulation saw an open rate of 34%. As the email was distributed to the same population twice, a notice was included asking participants to refrain from completing the questionnaire a second time. Despite that message, there was no way to confirm that duplicates did not exist. The responses were stored via IP address and, after converting the data to an excel file, a search for duplicate IP addresses was conducted. If a repeated IP address was located and responses were exactly the same between the two entries, one of the replications was deleted. While this process eliminated one duplicate, it could not account for a duplicate completed from different computers or a duplicate with the same IP address but different answers, as the latter could have been colleagues completing the questionnaire on the same work computer. Of 10,390 potential participants, 868 successfully completed the questionnaire, resulting in a response rate of 8.35%.

Frequency Characteristics Discussion and Chart

Participants were asked to provide six different descriptive characteristics including grade level(s) and subject area they were teaching at the time of questionnaire distribution, the highest degree they had earned to date, how recently they completed their highest degree earned, whether or not they were currently enrolled in graduate

school, and their number of years of teaching experience. Of the participants ($N=868$), 86.6% ($n = 752$) identified as K–12 teachers, 9.9% ($n = 86$) as college or university level educators, and the remaining 3.5% ($n = 30$) were organized into a third group identifying as teaching both K–12 and collegiate levels music courses at the time of questionnaire distribution (see Table 1). There were no missing data.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Grade Level

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Grade Level		
K–12	752	86.6
College	86	9.9
Both	30	3.5

Below, Table 2 shows the subjects being taught by the participants. The area with the largest percentage of participants was general music at 32.4% ($n = 281$), followed by band with 26.7% ($n = 232$), choir with 15.9% ($n = 138$), other with 11.9% ($n = 103$), orchestra with 6.8% ($n = 59$), and music education with 3.8% ($n = 33$). The remaining 2.5% ($n = 22$) selected music appreciation, music history/musicology, music technology, or music theory. Of the 103 participants who selected other, 70 (67.96%) noted that their responsibilities included a combination of options already listed. Of the remaining 32.04% ($n = 33$), guitar, percussion, piano, and applied lessons were each mentioned by six participants or 5.83% per subject area ($n = 24$, 23.32%). Two participants listed music administration (1.94%). The final 6.78% ($n = 7$) was distributed evenly between seven

areas, one participant per area, and included musical theatre, blind/visually impaired education, physical education, liturgical music, ethnomusicology, world music/cognitive function, and conducting. There were no missing data.

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Subject Area

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Subject Area		
Band	232	26.7
Choir	138	15.9
General music	281	32.4
MA	6	.7
MH/M	3	.3
MTch	2	.2
Music theory	11	1.3
Orchestra	59	6.8
Other	103	11.9
ME/MTE	33	3.8

Note. MA = Music appreciation, MH/M = Music history/musicology, MTch = Music technology, ME/MTE = Music education/music teacher education.

As shown in Table 3, the majority of participants (84.8%, $n = 736$) had earned their bachelor's ($n = 292$, 33.6%) or master's degree ($n = 444$, 51.2%). Of the remaining participants ($n = 132$, 15.2%), 10.9% ($n = 95$) identified as having completed at doctoral degree, 1.8% ($n = 16$) were all but dissertation (ABD), 1.6% ($n = 14$) had earned a specialist's, two (.2%) selected none indicating they did not have any type of college degree, associate's and associate's plus teaching certificate each had one participant ($n = 1$, .1%), and three people failed to respond to this question ($n = 3$). Of the three participants missing data, all responded to the next item regarding recency of degree

completion, suggesting that they had earned a college or university degree despite having failed to indicate which type in the previous question. It is also possible that their highest degree earned was a High School Diploma or GED, in which case they would have been forced to leave this question blank if “none” did not seem to fit their circumstances and because no “other” option was available to them (Table 3). If that were the case, a GED or High School Diploma could have been the degree to which they were referring when selecting an answer to the following question about recency of degree completion (Table 4).

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Highest Degree Earned

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Highest degree earned				
Associates	1	0.1	0.1	0.1
A+TC	1	0.1	0.1	0.2
Bachelors	292	33.6	33.8	34.0
Masters	444	51.2	51.3	85.3
Specialists	14	1.6	1.6	86.9
ABD	16	1.8	1.8	88.8
Doctorate	95	10.9	11.0	99.8
None	2	0.2	0.2	100.0
Missing	3	–	–	–

Note. A+TC = Associate’s plus teaching certificate, ABD = All but dissertation.

*Cumulative percent adjusted for missing responses.

Participants were asked to identify how recently they had completed their highest degree. Fifteen percent of participants ($n = 130$) had completed their degree within the last 0–2 years, 18.4% ($n = 160$) within the past 3–5 years, 17.5% ($n = 152$) selected 6–10 years, 23.3% ($n = 202$) selected 11–20 years, 15.3% ($n = 133$) selected 21–30 years, and

the final 10.5% ($n = 91$) had completed their degree thirty or more years ago (Table 4).

There were no missing data.

Table 4

Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Recency of Degree Completion

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
<hr/>		
RDC (in years)		
0–2	130	15
3–5	160	18.4
6–10	152	17.5
11–20	202	23.3
21–30	133	15.3
30+	91	10.5

Note. RDC = Recency of degree completion.

Participants were also asked to identify whether or not they were currently (at the time of the questionnaire) enrolled in graduate school (Table 5). Eighty-four (9.7%) participants selected yes, 783 (90.2%) selected no, and one participant failed to respond. It is possible that the missing data came from a participant who unintentionally skipped the question or intentionally skipped the question due to recently being accepted into graduate school for the following semester or school year and subsequently finding themselves unsure how to respond to a Yes or No option.

Table 5

Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Current Graduate Student

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Current graduate student				
Yes	84	9.7	9.7	9.7
No	783	90.2	90.3	100.0
Missing	1	–	–	–

The final question in the descriptive section asked participants to identify their number of years of teaching experience (Table 6). The smallest group in this section was teachers who reported one to two years of experience ($n = 86, 9.9\%$) and the largest group comprised of teachers who had more than thirty years teaching experience ($n = 152, 17.5\%$). The rest of the participants were distributed throughout the six other groups between the least and most experienced (Table 6). There were no missing data.

Table 6

Demographic Characteristics of Participants – Number of Years Teaching

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
NYT		
1–2	86	9.9
3–5	95	10.9
6–10	128	14.7
11–15	108	12.4
16–20	114	13.1
21–25	98	11.3
26–30	87	10.0
30+	152	17.5

Note. NYT = Number of years of teaching experience.

Data Collection Methods

The questionnaire included two select–all questions on access and use of research based on Paney (2004). Question seven was a select–all asking participants to identify which music education research journals they read, followed by question eight where they reported the frequency of their access by selecting one of seven options related to the amount of time spent reading the music education research journals. Question nine was a select–all asking participants to identify which music education trade journals/magazines they read, followed by question ten which contained the same frequency report in question eight. Statistical analysis of questions seven and nine included a Kruskal–Wallis followed by Mann–Whitney U *post hoc* with a Bonferonni correction ($p < .0023$, $p < .0038$).

Table 7 shows results of the Kruskal-Wallis. Significant difference ($p < .05$) of ratings between participant groups was found in six of the twenty-one items listed below. These trade journals/magazine included *Coda Magazine*, *Downbeat*, *General Music Today*, *JaZZed*, *Music Educators Journal*, *Teaching Music*, and *Voice of Chorus America*. Following the Kruskal-Wallis, a Mann-Whitney U *post hoc* with Bonferonni correction ($p < .0023$) was run to determine which specific group combinations were significant.

Table 7

Question Nine, Kruskal–Wallis – Trade Journals/Magazines

Trade Journal/Magazine	<i>df</i>	H	Sig.
<i>American Music Teacher</i>	2	.904	.637
<i>American String Teachers</i>	2	.218	.897
<i>Coda Magazine</i>	2	26.05	<.001
<i>Choral Journal</i>	2	2.27	.321
<i>Downbeat</i>	2	4.84	.089
<i>General Music Today</i>	2	8.46	.015
<i>Guitar Player</i>	2	0.63	.731
<i>JaZZed</i>	2	6.30	.043
<i>Music Alive!</i>	2	3.30	.192
<i>Music Educators Journal</i>	2	13.96	.001
<i>Music Teacher</i>	2	0.55	.760
<i>Opera Opera</i>	2	0.47	.792
<i>Performing/Songwriter</i>	2	0.94	.626
<i>Sequenza 21</i>	2	0.16	.925
<i>Sounds of Timeless Jazz</i>	2	<.001	.999
<i>Symphony Magazine</i>	2	2.89	.236
<i>Teaching Music</i>	2	9.23	.010
<i>The Instrumentalist</i>	2	0.71	.701
<i>Voice of Chorus America</i>	2	11.69	.003
None	2	1.46	.483
Other	2	0.48	.787

Table 8 contains results of a Mann-Whitney U *post hoc* with Bonferonni correction ($p < .0023$). Analysis of grade level impact on access and use of music education trade journals and magazines was significant between Group 1 (K–12 music educators) and Group 2 (collegiate music educators) for *Music Educators Journal* ($p = .001$), between Group 1 and Group 3 (participants identifying as both K–12 and collegiate music educators) for *Coda Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Voice of Chorus America* (p

= .002), and *General Music Today* ($p = .005$), and finally, between Group 2 and Group 3, for *JAZZed* ($p = .003$).

Table 8

Question Nine, Mann–Whitney U post hoc – Trade Journals/Magazines

Trade Journal/Magazine	Groups 1 vs. 2	Groups 1 vs. 3	Groups 2 vs. 3
<i>American Music Teacher</i>	.351	.908	.599
<i>American String Teachers</i>	.771	.700	.866
<i>Coda Magazine</i>	.631	< .001	.016
<i>Choral Journal</i>	.248	.290	.784
<i>Downbeat</i>	.122	.149	.020
<i>General Music Today</i>	.298	.005	.114
<i>Guitar Player</i>	.503	.705	.434
<i>JaZZed</i>	.035	.219	.003
<i>Music Alive!</i>	.070	.847	.264
<i>Music Educators Journal</i>	.001	.052	.961
<i>Music Teacher</i>	.730	.531	.462
<i>Opera Opera</i>	.557	.728	.999
<i>Performing/Songwriter</i>	.405	.623	.999
<i>Sequenza 21</i>	.735	.841	.999
<i>Sounds of Timeless Jazz</i>	.999	.999	.999
<i>Symphony Magazine</i>	.111	.653	.402
<i>Teaching Music</i>	.044	.016	.301
<i>The Instrumentalist</i>	.505	.637	.452
<i>Voice of Chorus America</i>	.405	.002	.016
None	.234	.901	.405
Other	.524	.820	.602

Table 9 shows results of a Kruskal-Wallis test to determine significant difference of responses on a select all question containing the titles of research journals. Significant difference ($p < .01$) of ratings between participant groups was found in twelve of the

thirteen items listed below. Following the Kruskal-Wallis test, a Mann-Whitney U *post hoc* was run to determine which specific group combinations were significant.

Table 9

Question Seven, Kruskal–Wallis – Research Journals

Research Journal	<i>df</i>	H	Sig.
<i>Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education</i>	2	94.93	< .001
<i>International Journal of Research in Choral Singing</i>	2	9.33	.009
<i>Journal for Research in Music Education</i>	2	29.75	< .001
<i>Journal of Band Research</i>	2	18.10	< .001
<i>Journal of Music Teacher Education</i>	2	33.92	< .001
<i>Journal of String Research</i>	2	1.13	.570
<i>Music Education Research</i>	2	31.43	< .001
<i>Philosophy of Music Education Review</i>	2	57.00	< .001
<i>Research Studies in Music Education</i>	2	55.72	< .001
<i>Update: Applications of Research in Music Education</i>	2	101.46	< .001
<i>Visions of Research in Music Education</i>	2	33.03	< .001
None	2	26.38	< .001
Other	2	21.90	< .001

Table 10 contains results of the Mann-Whitney U *post hoc* with Bonferonni correction ($p < .0038$). Analysis of grade level impact on access and use of music education research journals was significant between group 1 and group 2 for *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* ($p = < .001$), *International Journal of Research in Choral Singing* ($p = .005$), *Journal of Research in Music Education Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Journal of Band Research Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Journal of Music Teacher Education Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Music Education Research Magazine*

($p = < .001$), *Philosophy of Music Education Review Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Research Studies in Music Education Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Update: Application of Research in Music Education Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Visions of Research in Music Education Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *None Magazine* ($p = < .001$), and *Other Magazine* ($p = < .001$). Statistical significance was also found between group 1 and group 3 for *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Music Education Research Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Philosophy of Music Education Review Magazine* ($p = < .001$), *Research Studies in Music Education Magazine* ($p = < .001$), and *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education Magazine* ($p = < .001$). There were no instances of significance between Group 2 and Group 3.

Table 10

Question Seven, Mann–Whitney U post hoc – Research Journals

Research Journal	Groups 1 vs. 2	Groups 1 vs. 3	Groups 2 vs. 3
<i>Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education</i>	< .001	< .001	.158
<i>International Journal of Research in Choral Singing</i>	.005	.052	.992
<i>Journal for Research in Music Education</i>	< .001	.024	.479
<i>Journal of Band Research</i>	< .001	.363	.058
<i>Journal of Music Teacher Education</i>	< .001	.394	.061
<i>Journal of String Research</i>	.396	.555	.415
<i>Music Education Research</i>	< .001	< .001	.781
<i>Philosophy of Music Education Review</i>	< .001	< .001	.757
<i>Research Studies in Music Education</i>	< .001	< .001	.681
<i>Update: Applications of Research in Music Education</i>	< .001	< .001	.232
<i>Visions of Research in Music Education</i>	< .001	.052	.406
None	< .001	.144	.124
Other	< .001	.086	.502

The questionnaire also included three Likert ratings groups. At the researcher's discretion, Likert items were divided into three groups (questions eleven, fifteen, and seventeen on the instrument) as the items were perceived to be related to the three aspects being investigated: Question eleven, access and use of music education research publications; Question fifteen, the relationship between research/researcher and practitioner; Question seventeen, music education philosophy (Appendix D). Question eleven consisted of seven Likert items related to access and use of music education research, trade journals, and/or magazine articles. Question fifteen consisted of eighteen Likert items corresponding with relationships between counterparts within the field of music education. The final Likert group, question seventeen, consisted of seven philosophical statements. Of thirty-two total Likert items organized by the researcher, seven (21.88%) were related to participant access and use of scholarly research or trade journals/magazines, eighteen (56.25%) were ratings of the participants' perceptions of their relationships with others in the field of music education, and the final seven (21.88%) were related to philosophy. Statistical analysis of Likert ratings included Cronbach's Alpha, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), Kruskal-Wallis test with Mann-Whitney *post hoc*, and Multiple Regression.

Assumptions

For the MANOVA, the following assumptions were met: Independence, random sampling, and homogeneity of covariance matrices using Levene's test. While multivariate normality was not met, the lack of normal distribution was accounted for by following the MANOVA with a Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test as opposed to an ANOVA, which is not robust when measuring not-normally distributed samples.

The following assumptions were met for the Kruskal–Wallis test: Dependent variable measured at the ordinal or continuous level, independent variable was categorical and consisted of three independent groups, independence of observations, and the assumption of similar shape as determined by box plots. Finally, the true assumptions for the multiple regression included quantitative variable types, non–zero variance, no perfect multicollinearity, no correlation between predictors and external variables, and independence.

Data Analysis

In order to determine reliability prior to other statistical analyses, a Cronbach alpha was calculated on the three original Likert questions. Each of the three five–point Likert–scale groups on the questionnaire had high reliabilities with Cronbach’s $\alpha > .7$ (Field, 2009). After completion of the Cronbach Alpha tests on the researcher’s original organization of Likert items, data from Questions eleven, fifteen, and seventeen were analyzed by conducting a MANOVA on the averages of each of the three Likert response questions (see Table 13). Results showed a significant main effect of grade level taught on Likert ratings in Question 11 where $F(2, 860) = 3.31, p = .037$, Question 15 where $F(2, 860) = 28.45, p = < .001$, and Question 17 where $F(2, 860) = 4.57, p = .011$.

Table 11

MANOVA of Likert Ratings

Question Number/Hypothesis	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	Sig.
11/Access and use of music education research reports and trade journals/magazines.	2	3.310	.037
15/Value of music education research, ratings of philosophical statements about research in music education, and perceptions of relationships with counterparts	2	28.445	< .001
17/Ratings of philosophical statements and perceptions of relationships with counterparts	2	4.568	.011

Following the MANOVA, a Kruskal–Wallis test was run on each of the Likert questions to determine which of the three Grade Level combinations showed significance. The Kruskal–Wallis was accompanied with a Mann–Whitney *post hoc* where a Bonferonni correction was used to control for Type I errors. Results are discussed below, organized by question number. Organization of participants by grade level is as follows: Group 1, participants who identified as K–12 educators ($n = 752$); Group 2 ($n = 86$), participants who identified as college/university level educators; and Group 3, participants who identified as both K–12 and college/university level educators ($n = 30$). Finally, a multiple regression was run on the three Likert groups against descriptors in questions one through six to determine if there was a relationship between factors outside of grade level significantly affecting Likert ratings. Results of the initial ANOVA in the regression showed significance ($p = < .001$) for all three Likert groups.

Question Eleven, Access of Research Likert Items

MANOVA. As shown in Table 12, question eleven was composed of Likert items related to access of music education research and trade journals/magazines. The relationship between items had high reliability ($\alpha = .701$). Had the last item, 11G, been removed, Cronbach's Alpha would have been raised to .719. However, as this item was paired with another similar item (11F), it was not deleted.

Table 12

Cronbach's α Reliability Analysis of Researcher's Grouping for Access of Research

Question and Item	α	Frequency	α if Item Deleted
Question Eleven	.701	868	
I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals			.662
I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals			.633
I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines			.664
Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator			.625
Reading music education trade journals/magazines helps my growth as an educator			.672
I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice			.690
I feel there are not enough trade journal/magazine articles focused on my area of practice			.719

Kruskal–Wallis. When testing question eleven for significant difference among ratings by participant groups, significance ($p < .05$) was found in five of the seven Likert items listed below (Table 13), including “I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals” ($p = .001$), “I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals” ($p = .002$), “I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines” ($p < .001$), “Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator” ($p < .001$), and “I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice” ($p = .036$).

Table 13

Question Eleven, Kruskal–Wallis

Statement	<i>df</i>	H	Sig.
I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals	2	13.90	.001
I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals	2	12.34	.002
I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines	2	17.05	< .001
Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator	2	16.49	< .001
Reading music education trade journals/magazines helps my growth as an educator	2	0.161	.923

Table 13 (continued).

Statement	<i>df</i>	H	Sig.
I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice	2	6.63	.036
I feel there are not enough trade journal/magazine articles focused on my area of practice	2	3.03	.220

Mann-Whitney U post hoc. Following the Kruskal-Wallis test, a Mann-Whitney U *post hoc* was computed to determine which group combinations rated the Likert items significantly different from one another (Table 14). When comparing Group 1 to Group 2, Likert ratings of the first four items in question eleven were significantly affected based on grade level groups ($p \leq .001$). The last three items were not statistically significant. When comparing Group 2 to Group 3 and Group 1 to Group 3, no instances of statistical significance were found. With the Bonferonni correction applied, effects are reported at or below a .007 level of significance.

Table 14

Question Eleven, Mann–Whitney U post hoc

Statement	Groups 1 vs. 2	Groups 1 vs. 3	Groups 2 vs. 3
I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals	< .001	.313	.230
I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals	.001	.205	.413
I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines	< .001	.070	.564
Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator	< .001	.993	.024
Reading music education trade journals/magazines helps my growth as an educator	.727	.864	.725
I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice	.096	.059	.019
I feel there are not enough trade journal/magazine articles focused on my area of practice	.164	.330	.135

Multiple Regression. Results of the initial ANOVA showed significance for the Likert ratings in question eleven, where $F(31,828) = 2.16$, $p = < .001$. Specific independent variables that significantly ($p < .05$) affected the dependent variable when compared to their predictor included participants currently teaching at a college or university, participants having earned a Doctorate degree, participants not currently enrolled in Graduate School, and participants identifying as music teacher educators (Table 15). Comparison groups included K–12 grade level, an earned Master’s degree,

general music as subject area taught, participants currently in graduate school, participants with more than thirty years of teaching experience, and completion of highest degree within the past eleven to twenty years.

Table 15

Question Eleven Multiple Regression

Characteristic	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Constant	3.71	32.66	< .001
Grade Level			
College	-.241	-2.19	.029
Both	.016	.13	.896
Highest degree earned			
Associates	.364	.56	.577
A+TC	-.499	-.81	.419
Bachelors	-.090	-1.65	.100
Specialists	.100	.59	.554
ABD	.267	1.63	.104
Doctorate	.251	2.51	.012
None	.714	1.61	.107
Subject Area			
Band	.023	.41	.680
Choir	.004	.07	.945
MA	.194	.75	.455
MH/M	.511	1.15	.252
MTch	.403	.92	.359
Music theory	.257	1.25	.213
Orchestra	.092	1.03	.301
Other	.108	1.51	.131
ME/MTE	.358	2.64	.009
Current graduate student			
No	-.194	-2.57	.010

Table 15 (continued).

Characteristic	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
NYT			
1–2	-.171	-1.29	.197
3–5	-.001	-.01	.996
6–10	-.135	-1.37	.172
11–15	.104	1.12	.262
16–20	-.081	-.94	.349
21–25	-.061	-.71	.478
26–30	-.022	-.26	.799
RDC (in years)			
0–2	.155	1.70	.089
3–5	.115	1.46	.144
6–10	.039	.55	.583
21–30	-.029	-.39	.700
30+	-.071	-.80	.423

Note. A+TC = Associate’s plus teaching certificate, ABD = All but dissertation, MA = Music appreciation, MH/M = Music history/musicology, MTch = Music technology, ME/MTE = Music education/music teacher education, NYT = Number of years of teaching experience, RDC = Recency of degree completion.

Question Fifteen

This question covered participants’ perceptions of their relationships with K–12 and collegiate counterparts. The reliability of question fifteen was the highest of the three Likert questions, where Cronbach’s $\alpha = .921$ (Table 16). Deletion of any one item would have resulted in a Cronbach’s Alpha below .921 and was therefore unnecessary.

Table 16

Cronbach's α Reliability Analysis of Researcher's Grouping for Researcher/Practitioner Relationship

Question and Item	α	Frequency	α if Item Deleted
Question Fifteen	.921	868	
I read music education research often and understand it			.913
I know what it means to conduct research			.918
I am experienced in conducting research			.917
I am interested in conduction research			.913
I am experienced in serving as a participant in research			.914
I am interesting in serving as a participant in research			.924
I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek			.921
My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and understand it			.912
My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music			.915
I see an important connection between research and how I teach music			.914
Research is a very important part of my career as a music teacher			.914

Table 16 (continued).

Question and Item	α	Frequency	α if Item Deleted
There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music			.916
Research is important to the music education profession			.917
Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students			.918
I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field			.914
I feel connected to research in music education			.915
I feel connected to music education researchers			.916
I feel connected to K–12 music educators			.918

Kruskal–Wallis. When testing question fifteen for significant difference among ratings by participant groups, significance ($p < .01$) was found in sixteen of the eighteen Likert items listed below (Table 17). Only two items were not rated significantly different between groups: “Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students” ($p = .999$) and “I feel connected to K–12 music educators” ($p = .263$).

Table 17

Question Fifteen, Kruskal–Wallis

Statement	<i>df</i>	H	Sig.
I read music education research often and understand it	2	37.15	< .001
I know what it means to conduct research	2	26.63	< .001
I am experienced in conducting research	2	55.60	< .001
I am interested in conduction research	2	36.87	< .001
I am experienced in serving as a participant in research	2	45.62	< .001
I am interesting in serving as a participant in research	2	9.84	.007
I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek	2	39.77	< .001
My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and understand it	2	32.34	< .001
My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music	2	16.34	< .001
I see an important connection between research and how I teach music	2	20.54	< .001
Research is a very important part of my career as a music teacher	2	36.20	< .001
There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music	2	11.34	.003
Research is important to the music education profession	2	18.61	< .001

Table 17 (continued).

Statement	<i>df</i>	H	Sig.
Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students	2	.002	.999
I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field	2	22.73	< .001
I feel connected to research in music education	2	46.66	< .001
I feel connected to music education researchers	2	50.78	< .001
I feel connected to K–12 music educators	2	2.67	.263

Mann–Whitney U post hoc. Following the Kruskal-Wallis test, a Mann-Whitney *U post hoc* was computed to determine which group combinations rated the Likert items significantly different from one another (Table 18). When comparing Group 1 to Group 2, fifteen of eighteen Likert items were shown to have statistically significant differences in ratings. Of the fifteen, fourteen showed $p < .001$ and one showed $p = .001$. There was no statistical significance found between the responses of Group 2 and Group 3. When comparing Group 1 to Group 3, only one instance of statistical significance was found for the item “I am experienced in conducting research,” where $p = .002$. With the Bonferonni correction applied, effects are reported at or below a .0027 level of significance.

Table 18

Question Fifteen, Mann–Whitney U post hoc

Statement	Groups 1 vs. 2	Groups 1 vs. 3	Groups 2 vs. 3
I read music education research often and understand it	< .001	.037	.108
I know what it means to conduct research	< .001	.016	.453
I am experienced in conducting research	< .001	.002	.103
I am interested in conduction research	< .001	.108	.083
I am experienced in serving as a participant in research	< .001	.006	.294
I am interesting in serving as a participant in research	.007	.082	.953
I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek	< .001	.022	.155
My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and understand it	< .001	.007	.414
My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music	< .001	.993	.040
I see an important connection between research and how I teach music	< .001	.991	.020
Research is a very important part of my career as a music teacher	< .001	.664	.005
There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music	.001	.632	.152
Research is important to the music education profession	< .001	.938	.011

Table 18 (continued).

Statement	Groups 1 vs. 2	Groups 1 vs. 3	Groups 2 vs. 3
Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students	.961	.998	.995
I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field	< .001	.068	.374
I feel connected to research in music education	< .001	.089	.016
I feel connected to music education researchers	< .001	.018	.055
I feel connected to K–12 music educators	.409	.145	.397

Multiple Regression. Question fifteen had the most instances of significance where $F(31, 831) = 6.23$, $p < .05$, with seven characteristics showing statistically significant impact on the dependent variable. These independent variables included having an earned Doctorate degree, having an earned Bachelor’s degree, having an Associate’s degree plus teaching certificate, not currently being enrolled in Graduate School, identifying band as the participant’s primary subject area, having identified as a music teacher educator, and having finished their degree with in the past 0 to 2 years (Table 20). Comparison groups included K–12 grade level, an earned Master’s degree, general music as subject area taught, participants currently in graduate school, participants with more than thirty years of teaching experience, and completion of highest degree within the past eleven to twenty years.

Table 19

Question Fifteen Multiple Regression

Characteristic	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Constant	3.63	29.98	< .001
Grade Level			
College	-.156	-1.33	.185
Both	.054	.423	.672
Highest degree earned			
Associates	-.557	-.799	.424
A+TC	-1.44	-2.18	.029
Bachelors	-.119	-2.02	.044
Specialists	-.020	-.112	.911
ABD	.299	1.71	.088
Doctorate	.601	5.63	< .001
None	.075	.158	.874
Subject Area			
Band	.196	3.37	.001
Choir	.118	1.72	.086
MA	.349	1.26	.209
MH/M	.572	1.20	.231
MTch	.620	1.32	.187
Music theory	.405	1.84	.066
Orchestra	.084	.880	.379
Other	.143	1.87	.062
ME/MTE	.654	4.50	< .001
Current graduate student			
No	-.307	-3.82	< .001
NYT			
1–2	-.144	-1.02	.309
3–5	.065	.530	.597
6–10	-.102	-.967	.334
11–15	< .001	-.004	.997
16–20	-.045	-.496	.620
21–25	-.105	-1.14	.254
26–30	-.010	-.104	.917

Table 19 (continued).

Characteristic	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
RDC (in years)			
0–2	.258	2.66	.008
3–5	.075	.887	.376
6–10	.032	.421	.674
21–30	-.015	-.186	.852
30+	-.181	-1.91	.057

Note. A+TC = Associate’s plus teaching certificate, ABD = All but dissertation, MA = Music appreciation, MH/M = Music history/musicology, MTch = Music technology, ME/MTE = Music education/music teacher education, NYT = Number of years of teaching experience, RDC = Recency of degree completion.

Question Seventeen

Table 20 shows a high Cronbach Alpha ($\alpha = .704$) for question seventeen, the final Likert rating inquiry. This question contained seven Likert items related to philosophy and music education. Item 17A, “Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present,” could have been deleted to improve the score to $\alpha = .729$, but was not due to the limited number of philosophical items in the questionnaire.

Table 20

Cronbach's α Reliability Analysis of Likert Ratings

Question and Item	α	Frequency	α if Item Deleted
Question Seventeen	.704	868	
Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present			.729
Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum			.649
Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others			.648
As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me			.691
Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation			.612
The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures			.660
I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non-traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom			.689

Kruskal-Wallis. Following the MANOVA, a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted on question seventeen to determine which of the seven items were rated significantly different among participant groups. Significance ($p < .01$) was found in three of the seven Likert items listed below (Table 21).

Table 21

Question Seventeen, Kruskal–Wallis

Statement	df	H	Sig.
Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present	2	0.19	.910
Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum	2	9.47	.009
Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others	2	10.02	.007
As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me	2	1.12	.570
Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation	2	11.54	.003
The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures	2	2.28	.320
I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non–traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom	2	0.14	.934

Mann–Whitney U post hoc. Analysis of a Mann-Whitney U *post hoc* (Table 22) showed, when comparing Group 1 with Group 2, three items were found to have statistical significance, including “Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum” ($p = .003$), “Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others” ($p = .003$), and “Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation” ($p = .001$). No statistical significance was found when comparing

Group 2 to Group 3 or Group 1 to Group 3. With the Bonferonni correction applied, effects are reported at or below a .01 level of significance.

Table 22

Question Seventeen, Mann–Whitney U post hoc

Statement	Groups 1 vs. 2	Groups 1 vs. 3	Groups 2 vs. 3
Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present	.671	.956	.778
Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum	.003	.324	.376
Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others	.003	.190	.662
As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me	.452	.430	.746
Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation	.001	.182	.506
The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures	.133	.781	.608
I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non–traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom	.719	.921	.896

Multiple Regression. Question Seventeen showed the dependent variables were significantly affected by the following participant characteristics compared to their predictor variables, where $F(31, 832) = 2.79, p < .001$: An earned Doctorate degree, having selected ‘Other’ for subject area taught, having selected music teacher education

for subject area taught, having three to five years of teaching experience, and having eleven to fifteen years of teaching experience (Table 23). Comparison groups included K–12 grade level, an earned Master’s degree, general music as subject area taught, participants currently in graduate school, participants with more than thirty years of teaching experience, and completion of highest degree within the past eleven to twenty years.

Table 23

Question Seventeen Multiple Regression

Characteristic	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Constant	3.13	24.15	< .001
Grade Level			
College	.102	.809	.419
Both	.090	.658	.511
Highest degree earned			
Associates	.224	.300	.765
A+TC	-1.37	-1.94	.053
Bachelors	-.034	-.540	.589
Specialists	.232	1.20	.231
ABD	.124	.660	.509
Doctorate	.231	2.02	.044
None	-.675	-1.33	.183
Subject Area			
Band	.078	1.25	.211
Choir	.032	.438	.662
MA	.295	.990	.322
MH/M	-.700	-1.37	.171
MTch	-.464	-.925	.355
Music theory	-.350	-1.49	.138
Orchestra	.022	.212	.832
Other	.211	2.58	.010
ME/MTE	.318	2.04	.042

Table 23 (continued).

Characteristic	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Current graduate student			
No	-.067	-.776	.438
NYT			
1–2	.246	1.63	.104
3–5	.329	2.52	.012
6–10	.121	1.08	.281
11–15	.256	2.42	.016
16–20	.107	1.09	.275
21–25	.089	.901	.368
26–30	.059	.591	.555
RDC (in years)			
0–2	.027	.259	.796
3–5	.099	1.10	.272
6–10	.018	.219	.827
21–30	-.109	-1.29	.198
30+	-.115	-1.13	.260

Note. A+TC = Associate’s plus teaching certificate, ABD = All but dissertation, MA = Music appreciation, MH/M = Music history/musicology, MTch = Music technology, ME/MTE = Music education/music teacher education, NYT = Number of years of teaching experience, RDC = Recency of degree completion.

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

“Collegiate music education participants will access scholarly music education publications more frequently than K–12 music educators, the former finding the writings more useful than the latter.”

A Kruskal–Wallis analysis followed by Mann–Whitney *U post hoc* was used to analyze the statistical impact the current grade level being taught had on participants’ accessing scholarly music education publications and music education trade journals/magazines. The same tests were conducted on Likert items to assess the

participants' perception of the usefulness of scholarly publications with grade level being taught as the independent variable. Findings show the access of scholarly music education publications by participants from Group 1 (K–12 music educators) differ significantly from participants in Group 2 (collegiate music educators and researchers), with twelve of the thirteen items having a p value of .005 or lower. Significant differences were also shown in six of the thirteen items when comparing access between Group 1 and Group 3 (participants identifying as both K–12 and collegiate music educators). No instances of significance were found between Group 2 and Group 3. Due to the significance of the statistical findings when comparing K–12 music educators to collegiate level music educators and those who identified as “both”, as well as the lack of statistical significance when comparing collegiate educators to the latter group, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Hypothesis 2

“The difference in ratings of philosophical statements will be statistically significant based on whether the participant is a K–12 or collegiate level music educator.”

A Cronbach Alpha was run on a Likert group related to philosophy and found high reliability between the items. A MANOVA showed significance between the Likert averages and responses based on grade level groupings. A Kruskal–Wallis with Mann–Whitney *U post hoc* adjusted with a Bonferonni correction found statistical significance between the Likert ratings of grade level Group 1 and Group 2. No instances of significance were found when comparing Group 1 to Group 3 or Group 2 to Group 3. Therefore, with 42.86% of the Likert items showing a statistically significant difference between the ratings of Group 1 and Group 2, Hypothesis 2 is partially supported.

Hypothesis 3

“Ratings of Likert questionnaire items on the relationship between researcher and practitioner will be significantly different between K–12 and collegiate music educators.”

A Cronbach Alpha was also run on the Likert group related to the relationship between K–12 and collegiate music educators and found high reliability between the items. A MANOVA showed significance between the Likert averages and responses based on grade level groupings. A Kruskal–Wallis with Mann–Whitney U *post hoc* adjusted with a Bonferonni correction found statistical significance in three of the seven Likert items between Group 1 and Group 2. No instances of significance were found when comparing Group 1 to Group 3 or Group 2 to Group 3. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported.

Missing Data

The original purpose of this study was to measure the relationship between music education researcher and practitioner. Once all data were collected, only 33 participants had identified themselves as music education researchers compared to 752 primary and secondary level music educators, resulting in a ratio of approximately 23:1 music education researchers to K–12 music educators. While the number of collegiate level participants in total only reached 86, the ratio of ~9:1 was reflective of the membership of the association from which potential participants were recruited and therefore the collegiate level group was expanded to include all tertiary music educators identifying only as educators of students at the undergraduate and/or graduate level. Respondents identifying as members of both groups were not anticipated, but did occur. While small in number ($n = 30$) they were included as a third independent variable.

Initially, participants were going to be sought from a variety of national and state-level music associations in an effort to reach a large number of potential participants in consideration of a triple-digit goal ($N \sim 350$). The first organization contacted, NAfME, had unexpected protocol in place for the distribution of materials related to studies to benefit the field of music education research. As NAfME was able to distribute the questionnaire to more than 10,000 potential participants, contacting other national or state organizations was no longer necessary for the purposes of this study. Also, the researcher anticipated a need to make the questionnaire available via QR code to educators attending regional music education conferences. This too was nullified by the large electronic invitation distributed by NAfME.

Summary

Findings of statistical analyses showed high reliability among the three Likert groups ($\alpha = .701$, $\alpha = .921$, and $\alpha = .704$). A MANOVA of each of the three questions revealed a statistically significant likelihood that the independent variables affected Likert ratings where $F(2, 860) = 3.31$, $p = .037$ for question eleven, $F(2, 860) = 28.45$, $p < .001$ for question fifteen, and $F(2, 860) = 4.57$, $p = .011$ for question seventeen. Using a Kruskal-Wallis followed by a Mann-Whitney U *post hoc* to determine which combinations of the three independent variables were significant as well as the application of a Bonferonni correction to control for Type I errors, the following items show significant statistical correlation between independent variables in Group 1 and Group 2 (Table 24):

Table 24

Group 1 and Group 2 significant correlations

Item	Statement	Group 1 <i>M</i>	Group 2 <i>M</i>	Sig.
11A	I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals	3.504	3.951	$p < .001$
11B	I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals	3.601	3.963	$p = .001$
11C	I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines	4.189	4.531	$p < .001$
11D	Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator	3.647	4.099	$p < .001$
15A	I read music education research often and understand it	3.039	3.852	$p < .001$
15B	I know what it means to conduct research	4.122	4.543	$p < .001$
15C	I am experienced in conducting research	3.079	4.123	$p < .001$
15D	I am interested in conduction research	2.960	3.864	$p < .001$
15E	I am experienced in serving as a participant in research	3.053	3.975	$p < .001$
15G	I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek	3.336	4.086	$p < .001$
15H	My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and understand it	3.715	4.247	$p < .001$
15I	My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music	3.488	3.963	$p < .001$
15J	I see an important connection between research and how I teach music	3.624	4.111	$p < .001$

Table 24 (continued).

Item	Statement	Group 1 <i>M</i>	Group 2 <i>M</i>	Sig.
15K	Research is a very important part of my career as a music teacher	3.134	3.926	$p < .001$
15L	There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music	4.171	4.444	$p = .001$
15M	Research is important to the music education profession	4.269	4.593	$p < .001$
15O	I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field	3.549	3.988	$p < .001$
15P	I feel connected to research in music education	2.938	3.827	$p < .001$
15Q	I feel connected to music education researchers	2.624	3.642	$p < .001$
17B	Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum	3.033	3.383	$p = .003$
17C	Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others	3.271	3.605	$p = .003$
17E	Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation	3.499	3.852	$p = .001$

Between variables in Group 1 and Group 3, 15C —“I am experienced in conducting research”—was the only item where the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables was statistically significant ($p = .002$). There were no instances of significance between independent variables Group 2 and Group 3 in any of the Likert items. Following the Bonferonni correction, Likert group question eleven had

an adjusted significance level of $p < .007$, question fifteen as $p < .0027$, and question seventeen where $p < .01$. A multiple regression of each question suggested factors such as highest degree earned, subject area taught, current graduate school status, recency of degree completion, and number of years of teaching experience may also be predictors of the way Likert items would be rated on this questionnaire.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

Across educational research, measurements of the relationship between practitioner and researcher are shown to be zero at best, and often negative (Hattie & Marsh, 1996). Ramsden (1991, as cited in Buckley, 1997, p. 184) found “. . . teaching and research, far from being complementary activities, appear to be either completely unrelated or to be in conflict with each other.” While the relationship between these two stakeholders is frequently discussed in music education research, studies designed explicitly for the measurement thereof are limited (Nelson, 2011). The purpose of this study was to quantitatively analyze this relationship by comparing responses provided in an anonymous questionnaire. In this chapter, the researcher will explore the interpretations of the data introduced in Chapter IV, limitations of the research, and implications for future study.

This investigation was designed to determine the level of relationship between K–12 and collegiate music educators. Factors measured included knowledge transfer, philosophical ideologies, and the participants’ own ratings of their relationships with their counterparts. While studies of relationships between researcher and practitioner have been conducted to abundance in other fields (Hattie & Marsh, 1996), research of this kind in music education is rare. Therefore, the purpose of this work was to fill a gap in the existing literature within the field of music education.

Reports published as this study was being conducted have continued to expand upon our understanding of the relationship between researcher and practitioner. Ansdell

(2014) mentioned evidence of an alliance manifesting between researchers and practitioners of music and health, specifically music psychologists and therapists. Stanley and Conway (as cited in Pithouse-Morgan, & Samaras, 2015) discussed the “prioriti[zation of] community, collaboration, and conversation” with stakeholders in music education outside of higher education institutions, encouraging researchers to eschew the isolation associated with “traditional university positions” (p. 127). In perhaps the most consequential publication related to this study, Harrison (2014) served as editor of *Research and Research Education in Music Performance and Pedagogy*, a book with numerous chapters continuing the discourse on connecting research and practice. Contributing authors explored the role of practitioners in contemporary music research, exposing undergraduate students to research methods, practice-based research, research dissemination, and connecting the various tenets presented within the book towards the advancement of research and practice in music education.

Summary of Results

To measure the relationship between participants, an instrument was designed using established questionnaires as reference where possible (Barry et al., 2001; Dorfman & Lipscomb, 2005; Guzman, 1999; Hedden, 1979; Hong-Yu, 2008; Kos, 2007; Kotora, 2001; Mercavich, 1987; Paney, 2004; Snell, 2012; Tom, 2004). Adjustments were made following the distribution of a pilot study. The final instrument contained seventeen questions and was distributed via listserv to a random sample of 10,390 music educators who were members of the National Association for Music Education in Spring 2015. Three groups emerged in the analysis of the descriptive data: Group 1, K–12 music educators; Group 2, collegiate music educators; and Group 3, music educators identifying

as teaching both K–12 and collegiate music courses at the time of data collection. Questions seven and nine asked participants to indicate which of the listed music education research journals and music education trade journals/magazines they read. Questions eleven, fifteen, and seventeen were Likert groupings containing seven, eighteen, and seven items respectively for a total of thirty-two statements. Likert ratings were analyzed in consideration of three participant groups using Cronbach Alpha for reliability, MANOVA, Kruskal–Wallis One–Way Analysis of Variance followed with a Mann–Whitney U *post hoc*, and a Bonferonni correction to control for Type I errors. A multiple regression was also run to analyze which other descriptive statistics may have been predictors of statistically significant differences in ratings between participant groups.

Of the music education trade journals/magazines listed, statistically significant difference in readership between Group 1 and Group 2 was shown only for *Music Educators Journal*. Group 1 and Group 3 showed significant differences for *Coda Magazine*, *General Music Today*, and *The Instrumentalist*. The only example of significance between Group 2 and Group 3 was in access to *JaZZed*. Possibly, the instances of significant difference in access are limited because participants in all groups access these trade journals/magazines at a primarily similar rate. For Group 1 (K–12 music educators), these may be the most common source of reading material among their colleagues. The trade journals/magazines may also appear to be the most directly related to the classrooms of Group 1 participants and therefore may hold higher interest to participants in Group 1. For Group 2 and 3, knowing their counterparts in Group 1 access these trade journals/magazines may be reason enough to also access these materials.

Habitually accessing publications of all types within the field of music education may also have contributed to Group 2 and Group 3's similar access of trade journals/magazines.

Numerous instances of statistical significance were found between the three groups when comparing reported access to music education research journals. Between Group 1 and Group 2, statistically significant differences were found for 84.62% of their options, including *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *Journal for Research in Music Education*, *Journal of Band Research*, *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *Music Education Research*, *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *Research Studies in Music Education*, *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, *Visions of Research in Music Education*, and finally, self-report data on "None" and "Other." Fewer instances of significance were found when comparing Group 1 to Group 3. Journals accessed significantly different when comparing these two groups included *Music Education Research*, *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *Research Studies in Music Education*, and *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*. There were no instances of significant difference when comparing the responses between Group 2 and Group 3. As found in previous research, a variety of factors may impact K-12 educator's access and utilization of music education research publications, including tone, content, and researchese (Brand, 1984, 2006; Byo, 1991; Flowers et al., 1995; Hedden, 1979; Jorgensen, 2010; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004; Thorpe, 1958). While finding numerous instances of significant difference in the access of research publications between Group 1 and Group 2 was hypothesized, finding no instances of significance between Group 2 and Group 3 was unanticipated. Perhaps educators who teach in both

K–12 and collegiate settings are truly scholars of two worlds, carefully balancing their interest in research and practice, as evidenced by their frequent position between the mean ratings of two-thirds of Group 1 and Group 3's Likert items.

Analysis of Likert items showed a statistically significant relationship among the majority (68.75%) of Likert ratings when comparing Group 1 with Group 2. Only one of the thirty-two Likert items (3.13%) was found to have a statistically significant difference in ratings between Group 1 and Group 3. There were no significant relationships among ratings between Group 2 and Group 3. This is likely due to the shared experiences of Group 1 and Group 3, and Group 2 and Group 3. As Group 3 identified as teaching both K–12 and collegiate level music courses, they likely adhered to philosophies and had experiences that were somewhere between Group 1 and Group 2. Of the thirty-two Likert items, the Group 3 Mean for twenty-three of the items fell between the Means for Group 1 and Group 2 (Appendix G), lending credence to the idea that these Group 3 participants teaching in both K–12 and collegiate classrooms struck a balance between the other participant groups.

Expert Panel

Following the distribution of the questionnaire, a worksheet was distributed to a panel of experts to review and organize the thirty-two Likert items found in questions eleven, fifteen, and seventeen into three groups related to the hypotheses proposed in Chapter I (Appendix E). Seven members of this panel included three collegiate researchers outside of the field of music education, three K–12 music educators, and one K–12 librarian who was also a part-time music instructor. As creation of this panel should have occurred prior to distribution of the questionnaire in an effort to measure for

content and construct validity, the results of this study are not generalizable without further testing of RPGAI.

Results of the expert panel’s Likert item organization differed from the researcher’s original organization (Appendix F) and are indicated as each question is discussed below. All Likert question analyses were conducted with items organized in the original format developed by the researcher and presented to participants in the RPGAI as questions eleven, fifteen, and seventeen. Reliability analysis was run on each of these new groups. Results presented below are organized by groupings as they related to a particular hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1 is related to the way participant’s access and utilize music education research. Of the thirty-two Likert items, the expert panel grouped thirteen (40.63%) items as being related access and utilization of research. The Likert items listed in Table 25 show which statements were categorized as related to this hypothesis based on expert panel review. Reliability of this grouping is very high ($\alpha = .859$).

Table 25

Cronbach’s α Reliability Analysis of Expert Panel Likert Groupings, Hypothesis 1

Question and Item	α	α if Item Deleted
Hypothesis 1	.859	
I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals		.852
I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals		.845

Table 25 (continued).

Question and Item	α	α if Item Deleted
I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines		.855
I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice		.864
I feel there are not enough trade journal/magazine articles focused on my area of practice		.869
I read music education research often and understand it		.840
I know what it means to conduct research		.849
I am experienced in conducting research		.848
I am interested in conduction research		.842
My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and understand it		.843
My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music		.846
Research is a very important part of my career as a music teacher		.841
I feel connected to research in music education		.843

Hypothesis two considers the difference in ratings of philosophical statements by participant groups. The Likert items in Table 26 were categorized as relating to hypothesis two by the panel of experts. Reliability was also within an acceptable range (α

= .749). The second grouping of Likert items contained twelve philosophical statements (37.5%).

Table 26

Cronbach's α Reliability Analysis of Expert Panel Likert Groupings, Hypothesis 2

Question and Item	α	α if Item Deleted
Hypothesis 2	.749	
Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator		.725
Reading music education trade journals/magazines helps my growth as an educator		.743
Research is important to the music education profession		.717
I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek		.728
There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music		.725
I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field		.719
Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present		.746
Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum		.753
Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others		.743

Table 26 (continued).

Question and Item	α	α if Item Deleted
As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me		.739
Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation		.724
The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures		.728

Hypothesis 3 explores the relationship between music education researcher and practitioner, and the expert panel selected the Likert items listed below (Table 27) as those most closely associated with this hypothesis. Reliability of this grouping was low ($\alpha = .676$). The final grouping organized by the panel of experts consisted of seven statements (21.88%) corresponding with the relationship between researcher and practitioner, or research question three.

Table 27

Cronbach's α Reliability Analysis of Expert Panel Likert Groupings, Hypothesis 3

Question and Item	α	α if Item Deleted
Hypothesis 3	.676	
I am interesting in serving in research		.591
I see an important connection between research and how I teach music		.599
I am experienced in serving as a participant in research		.605
Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students		.662
I feel connected to music education researchers		.587
I feel connected to K-12 music educators		.682
I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non-traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom		.730

Results of the expert panel groupings show high reliability in Likert groupings related to hypothesis one and two, and acceptable reliability for hypothesis three. As this measure of content validity was not conducted until after the questionnaire was distributed to participants, results are not generalizable. Future use of this questionnaire will be preceded by input from an expert panel.

Results as Related to Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

In the questionnaire, thirty-two Likert items were organized into three different questions by the researcher, based on the relationship of the statement to the three hypotheses being explored. Following dissemination of the questionnaire to participants, the researcher distributed a worksheet with all Likert items in no specific order to a panel of experts for their opinions of the items' relationship to a list of three hypotheses. While the expert ratings of these placements required the shifting of several items into different categories, data were analyzed in the order presented to participants on the questionnaire first and then as related to the expert panel organization. Tests for reliability were satisfactory for all three of the researcher's groupings and two of the three groups that emerged from the panel averages. Hypotheses one and three were accepted. Hypotheses two was accepted with recommendation for further research in consideration of the discrepancy between the researcher and expert panel's organization of statements considered related to this topic. For the following section on the results of the statistical analyses as correlating with research questions and hypotheses, Likert items are first discussed as in the order they originally appeared on the questionnaire and then as they were organized after being ranked by a panel of experts.

1. How do K–12 music educators access scholarly music education publications compared to collegiate music educators? To what level do participants employ the reports within their classrooms?

Two select–all questions were designed to have participants identify music education research journals and trade journals/magazines that they read or have read. An

‘other’ option was also available to accommodate for publications not listed. While three or four of twenty-one (<20%) trade journals and magazines showed significant difference in selection between all three participant groups, more than 92% of the research journals were selected significantly different between Group 1 and Group 2. When comparing Group 1 to Group 3, six of thirteen items (46.15%) were significant. There were no instances of significance when comparing the selections of Group 2 to those of Group 3. These findings show K–12 music educators access music education research journals much less frequently than collegiate music educators. All three groups accessed music education trade journals and magazines at a similar rate.

Participants were also asked to rate thirty-two statements on a Likert scale across three separate questions. Of the 32 items, the researcher identified seven Likert items as statements related to how participants accessed, applied, and valued research in the field of music education ($\alpha = .701$). Of those seven, four statements showed significant difference in ratings when comparing Group 1 to Group 2. These statements were: “I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals,” “I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals,” “I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines,” and “Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator.” There were no instances of statistical significance when comparing the seven Likert ratings related to research question one between Group 1 and Group 3 or Group 2 and Group 3.

Of the thirty-two Likert items, the expert panel identified thirteen statements being related to research question one ($\alpha = .859$). Of these thirteen items, only two were non-significant when comparing Group 1 with Group 2: “I feel there are not enough

research journal articles focused on my area of practice” and “I feel there are not enough trade journal/magazine articles focused on my area of practice.” When comparing Group 1 with Group 2, the remaining eleven items showed significant difference in ratings. When comparing Group 1 with Group 3, only one item showed statistical significance: “I am experienced in conducting research.” There were no instances of statistical significance when comparing the thirteen Likert ratings related to research question one between Group 2 and Group 3.

Based on these data, participants in this study who identified as collegiate music educators or as music educators teaching both K–12 and collegiate level courses shared a similar level of comfort with, value of, and interest in the content of scholarly music education publications, reporting their level of access to these publications comparably. Conversely, ratings by participants who identified as K–12 music educators were significantly different from those of their collegiate counterparts in the majority of Likert items related to access and utilization of music education research. While participants overall Likert ratings of access questions are almost entirely above a mean rating of 3, indicating that research access, perception, and use is reported as more agreeable than disagreeable, K–12 music educators’ ratings are significantly lower than those of their collegiate counterparts in 67% of the items that correspond with the first research question.

2. How do participants rate the tone and content of philosophical music education statements?

The final question on the RRGAI contained seven Likert statements related to music education philosophy ($\alpha = .704$). Of these statements, three (42.86%) were rated

significantly different when comparing Group 1 and Group 2: “Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum,” “Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others,” and “Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation.” There were no instances of significance between Groups 1 and 3 or Groups 2 and 3.

Following expert panel review of Likert statements, twelve items were identified as being related to research question two ($\alpha = .749$), including six of the seven items from the researcher’s original philosophical grouping provided to participants on their questionnaires. Of those twelve, four showed no significant difference in ratings when comparing the three groups: “Reading music education trade journals/magazines helps my growth as an educator”, “Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present,” “As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me,” and “The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures.” The Mean Likert rating for each of these items was no lower than 3.95 and as high as 4.38 in the case of the third statement. Possibly, these four items were considered broad and non-controversial, and their conceptual aspect made it easy for participants to rank these statements highly regardless of the link to practical application in their own teaching. The remaining eight items only showed statistically significant differences in ratings when comparing Group 1 to Group 2. Those items included: “Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator,” “Research is important to the music education profession,” “I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek,” “There is value in systematically explaining how

students learn music,” “I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field,” “Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum,” “Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others,” and “Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation.” Of these eight statements, the first five relate to music education research or researchers; therefore, statistically significant differences in the responses between the K–12 group and the collegiate group were not surprising. The final three items were negative statements about the status or impact of music education. The tone of these statements may have caused K–12 music educators to feel as though the statements were personal attacks on their music programs and teaching styles, leading to defensive ratings that may have been an over exaggeration of actual opinion. With an average mean of 3.79 for the twelve philosophical Likert items, participants seem to primarily agree with the provided philosophical statements even where items were rated significantly different between groups. Possibly, discourse related to the philosophical underpinnings of how and why we teach music is more common and less threatening among collegiate music educators and researchers. These conversations often focus on adjusting music teacher education program requirements in an effort to prepare future educators to teach a wider variety of music classes, matching primary and secondary students’ differentiated musical interests. Such recommendations may seem threatening to current and seasoned band, choir, and orchestra directors who have carved careers similar to their own director’s examples. Offering more courses may also be perceived as a tremendous burden on the already over-booked schedules of K–12 music educators trying to prepare for the next festival, competition, or concert. Although critical discourse can be of great benefit to our field,

perhaps the most necessary voices in that conversation are the K–12 educators themselves. Researchers are highly qualified and have the tools to expose practitioners to more philosophical discourse, but knowledge transfer may be more successful when practitioners are leading and feel invested in the discussion.

3. How do music educators perceive their relationship with K–12 or collegiate counterparts?

Eighteen Likert items were originally attributed to research question three ($\alpha = .921$). Of these, fifteen were found to have significant differences in ratings when comparing Group 1 to Group 2. The three items showing no statistical significance were “I am interesting in serving as a participant in research,” “Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students,” and “I feel connected to K–12 music educators.” There was only one significant difference when comparing Group 1 and Group 3: “I am experienced in conducting research.” Comparison of the mean of each group of participants shows that collegiate music educators rated every single item related to question three higher than their K–12 counterparts save one – “Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students.” These findings suggest music educators differ in perception of their relationship with counterparts based on what level they teach; Collegiate music educators were more agreeable to 94.44% of relationship statements than their K–12 counterparts, fifteen of which were significantly so.

Seven items were included in the relationship category by the expert panel ($\alpha = .676$). Of the seven, four showed no significant difference in ratings between the three participant groups. They included “I am interesting in serving as a participant in

research,” “Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students,” “I feel connected to K–12 music educators,” and “I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non–traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom.” The first three items were rated largely agreeable, with means ranging from 3.56 to 4.06. The final item earned the lowest overall average of all Likert items on the questionnaire, with a mean of 2.42, showing that most participants had not felt ostracized for utilizing uncommon teaching styles. The first statement is broad and non–committal, easily agreeable when no actual commitment to participate in research is required, and therefore it was unsurprising to find a high mean and no significant differentiation between participant group responses. Similarly, the second statement related to this research question showing no significant difference between group responses was also broad and non–committal. No specific goals were listed, making it more difficult to find something with which to disagree in that item. The mean is closer to neutral than any of the others in the non–significant group, suggesting that there is potential for disagreement or neutrality if more specificity was provided for this particular Likert item. With the majority of participants identifying as K–12 educators, a high rating was anticipated for the third statement listed above. The lowest rated statement with non–significance dealt with exclusion for uncommon educational methods. There were no postulations regarding the average rating for this question or the potential implications of significant difference of ratings between participant groups.

The remaining three items corresponding to the relationship between researcher and practitioner as decided by the panel of experts were rated significantly different between Group 1 and Group 2 only. The three items were “I see an important connection

between research and how I teach music,” “I am experienced in serving as a participant in research,” and “I feel connected to music education researchers.” The first statement regarding the connection between research and teaching earned an average rating of 3.66 for the entire group of participants. Individual means of Group 1 ($M = 3.624$), Group 2 ($M = 4.111$), and Group 3 ($M = 3.600$), show a rating between Agree and Strongly Agree for the collegiate group, but ratings between Neutral and Agree for the K–12 and Both groups. It is possible that there were participants who believed the item deserved a lower rating but gave a higher rating in anticipation of a researcher reading their response. The remaining two items received mean ratings either at or slightly below neutral. Unsurprisingly, the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 were some of the largest of all the Likert items, as collegiate music educators are often implementing or participating in research projects and are either themselves music education researchers or working in the same building as their music education research colleagues.

Hypotheses

1. Collegiate music education participants will access scholarly music education publications more frequently than K–12 music educators, the former finding the writings more useful than the latter.

In the questionnaire, access to and utilization of music education research was measured using both a select all question and Likert ratings of statements. A MANOVA, Kruskal–Wallis, and Mann–Whitney *U post hoc* were used to analyze data. Findings showed the selection of music education research journals indicated in the select all question was significantly different between Group 1 and Group 2 for twelve of the thirteen items ($p < .05$). When comparing the Likert items identified as access questions

prior to expert review, four of the seven were rated significantly different between Group 1 and Group 2 ($p < .005$). Finally, eleven of the thirteen Likert items identified by a panel of experts to be related to access to and utilization of music education research ($\alpha = .859$) were rated significantly different by participants in Group 1 when compared to Group 2 ($p < .005$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

2. The difference in ratings of philosophical statements will be statistically significantly based on whether the participant is a K–12 or collegiate level music educator.

In the questionnaire, participants were asked to rate philosophical statements on a 5–point Likert scale. A MANOVA, Kruskal–Wallis, and Mann–Whitney *U post hoc* were used to analyze data. Of the seven Likert items identified as philosophical statements prior to expert review, three were shown to have statistically significant differences of ratings when comparing Group 1 and Group 2 ($p < .005$). A panel of experts designated twelve Likert items to be related to music education philosophy ($\alpha = .749$). Of those twelve, eight were significantly different when comparing ratings between Group 1 and Group 2 ($p < .005$). While further research of this topic is recommended, for the purposes of this study, Hypothesis 2 was tenuously supported.

3. Ratings of Likert questionnaire items on the relationship between researcher and practitioner will be significantly different between K–12 and collegiate music educators.

A Likert question containing eighteen items related to the relationship between music education researcher and practitioner was included in the questionnaire. A MANOVA, Kruskal–Wallis, and Mann–Whitney *U post hoc* were used for analysis. Of

those eighteen items, fifteen were rated significantly different when comparing Group 1 to Group 2 ($p < .005$). Following the expert panel review, only six of the original items remained in the relationship category; eight were moved to the access to and utilization of research group and four were moved to the philosophical statement group. One item was moved into the relationship group, leaving a total of seven Likert items related to the relationship between music educator and music education researcher, as determined by the panel. Of those seven items, only three were rated at a significantly different level between Group 1 and Group 2. However, with a lower Cronbach's Alpha for the expert panel grouping ($\alpha = .676$) than for the researcher's group ($\alpha = .921$), it is possible a more thorough analysis of the statements corresponding with the relationship between researcher and practitioner in music education is required to effectively assess the research question related to this hypothesis. In consideration of low reliability among the expert panel's grouping of items related to this hypothesis, deference was given to the original grouping provided by the researcher for participants in the questionnaire. Therefore, hypothesis three is supported.

Discussion of Results

Based on the statistically significant level of discrepancy between K-12 music educators and collegiate music educator responses, these results show there are differences between the way Group 1 and Group 2 approach and consider research, researcher and practitioner relationships, and philosophy. As mentioned previously, the relationship between researcher and practitioner has been measured thoroughly throughout educational research (Hattie & Marsh, 1996) but empirical data is still limited within the field of music education (Nelson, 2011). This study substantiates the

differences of opinion between K–12 and collegiate music educators on statements related to access and understanding of research, interest in conducting or participating in research, the role of research in music classrooms, the importance and value of research, the current state of music education in the United States of America, and the connection between researchers and practitioners. What is not determined in this work is whether or not these data reported are an effective measure of relationship. While Likert groupings earned high reliability in five of six tests, validity cannot be confirmed without further testing, including exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of the RPGAI. For this group of participants, disconnect exists as it relates to the way Group 1 and Group 2 access, utilize, and value scholarly publications within the field of music education, among the ratings of philosophical statements, and in the perceptions of the relationship between researcher and practitioner.

Implications

While the pool for this study was a random sample of members of the National Association for Music Education, generalization is not possible due to the use of a newly developed instrument. In consideration only of the population of this study, it would seem collegiate music educators' access and use research, assimilate philosophical statements, and perceive their relationship with counterparts differently than K–12 music educators. However, instances of significant differences in ratings between the group identifying themselves as teaching both K–12 and collegiate music when compared with either Group 1 or Group 2 were rare. It is possible the value of research is impacted by the educator's relationship with the research community; more access to collegiate level

students and educators may mean a stronger relationship with research, philosophy, and the researchers within the field of music education.

Improving the perception of value of research earlier may lead to a more widespread uptake of research throughout the K–12 music educator populace. This study found Group 1 participants were somewhat interested in serving as participants in research but neutral or uninterested in acting as researcher. Perhaps, by incorporating practitioners' expertise into research studies where they serve as researcher alongside a collegiate colleague, and by exposing practitioners to the process of writing, presenting, and publishing their research, they will develop a more tangible and applicable interest in research publications. Certainly our research could be even more valuable with the expertise of K–12 educators embedded within every step of the process.

Exposing undergraduate students to music research and the writings of prominent philosophers may lead to a stronger comprehension and perpetuation of discourse on topics relevant to strengthening the future of music education. While disconnect is evident in our field among philosophical frameworks (Elliot, 1995; Reimer, 1989), making practitioners aware of the broad field of philosophy and the role it plays informing our daily actions within the classroom will fortify our understanding of why and how we teach what we teach. Nuanced discussion can grow over time, and disseminating philosophy may become as natural as organic conversation within an undergraduate music education course. The first step is introducing students to the philosophical underpinnings that inform their efforts as a musician and educator.

It is possible that alone, greater cognizance of research and philosophy due to earlier exposure could improve the perception of the relationships between K–12 and

collegiate music educators. Seeking opportunities to involve undergraduate music students and K–12 music educators in research studies as researcher instead of participant, as well as involving them in important philosophical discussions could also fortify the connection between K–12 and tertiary music educators. Oftentimes we see collegiate music educators in K–12 classrooms offering suggestions to directors and students in the weeks prior to a major performance, evaluating teacher candidates, or as leaders of in-service meetings. Rarely is the opposite true; we need to find valuable reasons to engage the expertise of practitioners at our colleges and universities. While there are certainly challenges to such a concept, benefits of showcasing practitioners as experts from whom collegiate educators and their students may glean important information and deeper understanding of practice far outweigh the difficulties of organizing schedules, finding appropriate settings, and providing compensation.

Questions to Consider

The results of this study provide a first step in quantitatively understanding the relationship between music practitioners and researchers. While the pool of participants required changing the groupings from researcher/practitioner to music educators teaching either K–12 students, collegiate level students, or both, future iterations of this study will work towards measuring parametric groups of practitioners and researchers. There are a number of ways a relationship can be measured, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and music education may have a multitude of studies to cover before we can call for a stop on publications related to the relationship between researcher and practitioner as Hattie and Marsh (2006) did following their meta-analysis of such studies in the field of educational research. While the pool is saturated when considering educational research as a whole,

within the field of music education few studies have been designed with the explicit intention of measuring this relationship.

With such a breadth of studies to consult outside of the field of music education pointing towards a zero relationship (Hattie & Marsh, 2006), it was not surprising to learn of the significant differences between the ratings of K–12 and collegiate music educators. Organization of Likert items and type of statement provided for Likert ratings may relate to the unclear outcome for Hypothesis 2, and therefore running studies specifically focusing on Likert ratings of philosophical statements or statements related to the relationship between researcher and practitioner may strengthen the validity of the RPGAI.

In the original questions containing Likert items, reliability was strong for all three groupings, but only hypothesis one and three were supported. When grouping the Likert ratings according to the expert panel's recommendations, reliability was weak for hypothesis three and less than half of the items were rated significantly different when comparing Group 1 with Group 2, but hypotheses one and two were supported. The acceptance of hypothesis two was previously discussed in this chapter. While it is possible to abandon hypothesis three in consideration of the expert panel's organization of Likert items where only three of seven were rated significantly different between Group 1 and Group 2, evidence from the Hattie and Marsh meta-analysis (2006) shows that the relationship between researcher and practitioner is tenuous, and Likert ratings related to their relationship in self-report data from the two groups would likely support the findings of the work done throughout educational research. Also, of the eighteen Likert statements organized by the researcher as being related to the hypothesis 3, fifteen

were rated significantly different between Group 1 and Group 2. Therefore it is more likely that the instrument must be redesigned to reflect Likert statements more clearly related to the relationship between researcher and practitioner as determined by both a panel of experts and reliability analysis.

Results as related to existing literature

The results of this study corroborate those reported in similar research publications. It is important to note Hattie and Marsh (1996) discouraged further educational research studies measuring the relationship between researcher and practitioner. As music education research is younger than other domains of study in the field of educational research, organizing studies that are new to our field, even when thoroughly covered in other fields, is a valuable effort. With this in mind, as future studies are conducted to validate and expand upon this research, they should be balanced with studies related to testing ways in which we may improve the relationship between research and practitioner. Rather than follow the exact footsteps of others in educational research, we can take advantage of their experiences and approach our research agenda with deliberation.

These findings may point us toward a more specific disconnect in the transmission of information between music education practitioners and researchers. Data analyses indicate a solution in the form of Group 3—participants who identified themselves as teaching both K–12 and collegiate level music courses, and further investigation of this type of music educator is recommended. It seems more common for collegiate level music educators to insert themselves into K–12 music programs through observation of teacher candidates, use of K–12 students and educators as participants in

research projects, offering expert review of ensembles, and more. What is less common is the availability of or access to ways in which K–12 music educators can become part of the collegiate music education community. While examples exist, such as courses for continuing education units or participation as researcher on studies, they are atypical compared to the former opportunities listed for collegiate music educators.

Limitations

Although the outcome of this study is similar to what was described in other educational research studies related to the relationship between researcher and practitioner, there are limitations related to participant pool and design. First, the participant groups were non-parametric. With only thirty-three music education researchers completing the questionnaire, their group had to be changed to include all collegiate music educator participants ($n = 86$). In future iterations of this research, it may be beneficial to first contact music education researchers and then, following analysis of descriptive data provided by initial participants, seek matched pairs among K–12 music educator responses in a secondary distribution of the instrument in an effort to develop a parametric pool. Also, an unanticipated third group arose who reported themselves as teachers of both K–12 and collegiate music courses. Seeking participants from and tailoring Likert statements in consideration of this group may provide valuable insight into the ways in which we may bridge the gap between researcher and practitioner.

Secondly, there were conflicts in the design of this instrument. While a pilot was run ($N = 42$) and several changes made based on those findings, consultation of a panel of experts regarding Likert statement organization occurred after the questionnaire had been distributed to participants. Likert items were organized based on the researcher's

assessment of their association with the three hypotheses; dividing the items into three separate questions was more a product of participant fatigue discovered in the pilot than an effort to organize items based on a correlated hypothesis. Future studies should first provide a list of statements in no particular order for a panel of experts to organize into categories related to hypotheses while also providing an “other” category to account for items that may not fit the provided hypotheses, and second, organize Likert items on the questionnaire according to the results of the expert panel analysis prior to distributing to participants. Additionally, several grammatical errors went uncorrected from the pilot into the final instrument. Other discrepancies noted include the lack of a ‘not applicable’ option on the question related to recency of degree earned. Analysis of descriptive data showed two participants did not respond. This could have been an indication that they had not earned a college degree of any kind but were not given the option to specify such. Similarly, participants were asked to specifically identify their college degree from a list of options. While ‘none’ was an option, including ‘high school diploma,’ ‘GED,’ ‘no college level degree,’ or ‘other’ may provide more clear indications of the education background of participants. In the question asking participants to identify their primary area of instruction, no option was available for ‘music education,’ a major oversight when considering music education researchers were half of the target audience. These participants were instead relegated to selecting ‘other’ and typing music education in the space provided. Also, it may be judicious to change the five–point Likert scale to a six–point rating scale in an effort to avoid ‘neutral’ responses that allow the participant an opportunity to ‘skip’ the question while still providing a response.

Finally, the instrument used in this research is unique to this study. The demographic data was relatively standard and related to analysis of several music education questionnaires cited in Chapter III. Questions eight, nine, and ten appeared almost exactly in an earlier study (Paney, 2004) and question seven was designed to match question nine, covering music education trade journals and magazines separately from music education research journals. However, the remaining questions, including Likert statements, were organized by consulting a variety of sources, none of which used these questions or statements for the same purpose. In order to confirm the validity of this instrument, further exploration and development must occur. Future studies may include Exploratory Factor Analysis followed by Confirmatory Factor Analysis over several iterations of the instrument. While the reliability measured in this questionnaire was strong and the number of participants was ample, generalizability is not possible due to the use of a newly developed instrument. Further testing is required to confirm the validity of this questionnaire.

Recommendations for Future Study

These data show a significant difference in the way K–12 music educators’ access and utilize music education research when compared to their collegiate counterparts. By further researching this discrepancy, we may find ways to more effectively transfer knowledge between practitioners and researchers. We may also find unknown, underlying issues related to the lack of research uptake among K–12 music educators by continuing to look into the relationship practitioners have with music education researchers. These data also showed significance when comparing the ratings of philosophical statements between K–12 and collegiate music educators. Further

exploration of the reception of philosophical statements and ideologies among practitioners and researchers may lead to an enhanced comprehension of the purpose of philosophy in music education.

The next step in this line of research will be to reorganize Likert items based on larger expert panel review, which may also involve the addition or subtraction of several statements. The instrument will also be shortened to include only those items relevant to the original hypotheses; several questions were ancillary to the topic but ultimately unnecessary for the purposes of this study. Grammatical and content errors will also be corrected. Consideration of a six–point rating scale as opposed to a five–point Likert scale will be concluded with corresponding updates implemented. Following these adjustments, a parametric participant pool of music education practitioners and researchers will be sought. Replicating this study with the adjusted instrument in other education fields may also be beneficial both for the validity of the instrument and to provide a comparison of the responses of researcher and practitioners within music education to the responses of other similar fields.

Numerous questions emerged during the implementation and analysis of this study. First, further exploration of participants who were placed in Group 3 may be necessary to understand the role they play in bridging the gap between research and practice. More needs to be learned about their daily schedules, the responsibilities they have in both K–12 and collegiate classrooms, and how the opportunity arose to teach in primary, secondary, and tertiary classrooms simultaneously. Second, the Likert average reported by collegiate participants when asked to rate their connection with music education researchers was slightly above neutral ($M = 3.642$). It was anticipated that most

participants in this group would themselves be music education researchers, so a rating of less than ‘somewhat agree’ was unexpected. Investigating this occurrence may yield important findings about the relationship between collegiate music educators and music education researchers. A third question surfaced during data analysis related to the use of a five–point Likert scale. Of thirty–two Likert items, eighteen had a mean higher than 3.5, one had a mean lower than 2.5, and the final thirteen were rated between 2.51 and 3.5, indicating 40.63% of mean responses were neutral. What cannot be determined is whether participants treated neutral as a middle ground between ‘somewhat agree’ and ‘somewhat disagree,’ as a truly neutral stance, or as a way of not fully responding to the statement while still completing the questionnaire in its entirety. While analysis of pilot data did not indicate the need to deviate from a five–point scale, perhaps future research requires a six–point scale to avoid the use of ‘neutral’ with directions reminding participants they are free to abstain from responding to statements or questions at their discretion. Finally, how can we explore the impact of music education trade journals and magazines? Only one of thirty–two Likert items was rated significantly different between groups 1 and 3 while twenty–two of thirty–two were significant between groups 1 and 2. Yet analysis of the select–all question related to access to trade journals and magazines showed more instances of significance between groups 1 and 3 than 1 and 2 or 2 and 3 combined. Discovering what may account for this discrepancy could also provide knowledge of ways in which we may bridge the gap between research and practice in music education.

Discourse on the ways we may improve knowledge transfer is not uncommon among music education researchers (Brand, 1984; Brand, 2006; Cee, 2013; Hedden,

1979; Jorgensen, 2010; Nelson, 2011; Paney, 2004; Snell, 2012). Knowing the statistics corresponding to ways music educators perceive their relationships with each other, ways scholarly writing and articles in trade journals and magazines are received and utilized, and how practitioners consider philosophical statements may hone this conversation. Although others in the broad spectrum of educational research recommend we move away from investigating this relationship between research and practice, music education has just begun to empirically explore this topic. We must then balance our measurement of this relationship with experiments tied to the already prolific discourse of knowledge transfer. We can uncover ways to fortify the connection between researcher and practitioner through both further exploration of empirical data analyzing, and experiments designed with the objective of improving, the relationship between these two groups.

Reflection

Throughout this study I anticipated the data would suggest that yes, there is disconnect between research and practice. In consideration of my own experiences as musician, K–12 music educator, and student researcher, coupled with the extensive publications I uncovered during organization of my literature review, it would have been more surprising were the data to have shown little to no suggestion of disconnect. Our field is rife with passionate educators who love music and teaching. While there may be disconnect between researchers and practitioners, many on both sides could agree that their purpose as music educator, at least in some part, is to imbue students with skills as musicians and future music educators that will perpetuate the field of music education. Defining said skills becomes a much more complicated matter. However, knowing that

disconnect likely exists in areas of access and use of research, music philosophy, and perceptions of the relationship between research and practitioner has shed some light on areas of focus in my near future as a collegiate music educator.

Exposing undergraduate students to research should become a priority. Helping them develop a hands-on connection to the research process may instill in them a value for scholarly work that may not be obtained via publications and brief lectures. Kinesthetic application may also drive students to develop their own action research once employed in K–12. Introducing educators to the field who are adept in conducting research studies may slowly strengthen knowledge transfer. We may find our breadth of research topics grow as experts in the K–12 music classrooms develop studies based on their questions and experiences. Further, organizing and encouraging informed discourse on philosophy in music education from the beginning of an undergraduate’s tertiary experience will promote reflective music practitioners who are constantly and comfortably questioning how and why they teach what they teach.

Showing K–12 music educators that they are valued for their practical expertise must become a priority. Although collegiate music education researchers are often former K–12 educators, the classrooms and students change every year. Our understanding of these spaces diminishes every year as we move further from our last K–12 teaching position. Collegiate music educators often find their way from tertiary classrooms into primary and secondary schools to impart knowledge, but rarely are opportunities made for practitioners to do the same. Finding ways to promote practitioners as experts within our colleges and universities could fortify relationships among stakeholders within our

field, showing practitioners they are respected and training undergraduate students/future music educators knowledge from a myriad of sources.

Acknowledging our disconnect, utilizing undergraduate teacher education courses and other means to expose students to research early and often, promoting discourse on philosophy in music education, and showing K–12 educators their expertise is valued are all first steps toward practical application based on the findings of this dissertation. This research topic developed from my concern for equitable relationships between K–12 and collegiate music educators. I now find myself more equipped to affect positive change, however small or large, to the benefit of the future of music education.

Conclusion

This study was designed to measure the disconnect between researcher and practitioner by analyzing three facets of music education, including access and use of research, perceived relationships between participants and other music educators, and philosophical statements. Findings showed numerous instances of statistical significance when comparing responses between Group 1, K–12 music educators, and Group 2, collegiate music educators. An extremely limited number of items on the questionnaire were found to be significant when comparing Group 1 to Group 3 – participants identifying as both K–12 and collegiate music educators – and Group 2 to Group 3. These results support the first hypothesis, which stated collegiate music participants would access scholarly music education publications more frequently than K–12 music educators, finding them more useful than their primary and secondary school counterparts. Hypothesis three was also supported when analysis showed statements on the relationship between researcher and practitioner were rated significantly different

between Group 1 and Group 2. While some discrepancy was uncovered between researcher and expert panel organization of items related to philosophy, hypotheses two was tenuously supported with recommendations for further development of the RPGAI.

As we continue our discourse on the relationship between researcher and practitioner, we must be mindful of the work already accomplished in other educational fields, using their efforts as a guide for our future studies. However, we are also responsible for knowing our own field as well as others are known, and must continue to analyze our practitioner–researcher relationship despite the abundance of similar work outside of music education. By balancing what is known and recommended in other fields against what we are beginning to learn in music education, we may be able to more effectively plan and implement our research agenda. Of utmost importance is uniting music educators at all levels with the intention of improving knowledge transfer. As most are working towards a similar goal related to passing on an appreciation, comprehension, and practical application of music knowledge to future generations, we may find great rewards when we begin walking the same path together.

APPENDIX A

NAFME QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION FORM



RESEARCH ASSISTANCE FROM NAFME

NAFME has had a long association with the research community in schools, colleges and universities, and through our members who have a keen interest in supporting research efforts in the field of music education. We wish to support those who need to communicate in a broad and timely fashion with potential research subjects or collaborators (e.g. members who might be asked to complete a survey, participate in an experimental research study, or collaborate in evaluating the effectiveness of a new instructional strategy). With this in mind, **NAFME is pleased to provide indirect access to the association's membership list using our e-mail transmission platform.**

The purpose of providing this research assistance is to allow those with a legitimate research program or material to reach out to NAFME's membership in a way that might result in the collection of additional data points that may be useful to complete ongoing research projects. The majority of our members are in the United States. Our members represent all interests, specialties and teaching levels, with experience ranging from the Collegiate and first-year teacher to highly skilled and seasoned professionals. The list is highly accurate, and current. We estimate that nearly 50% of all music educators in the U.S. are NAFME members. **This is your opportunity to send a research-related message to NAFME members. This service is available for members only.**

Research Transmission via Email - Details:

- **Standard Transmission: \$50.00**
 - **Includes:** Transmission of an HTML or text-based e-mail to **5,000 members or fewer**, with up to 2 selection criteria (example: states, teaching levels, etc.), using NAFME's mass e-mail transmission tool.
 - The transmission is sent by NAFME on the individual's / company's / institution's behalf.
 - An NAFME staff member will request the text that will be included in your e-mail, and will transfer it to our system. The blast will be sent using a standard NAFME (design) template.
 - Minor proofing of design and content is included as part of the standard service.
 - Though **member e-mail addresses are not provided directly to the client** as part of this program, you may elect to forward members to a survey or other related tool, or have replies sent to a specific survey tool, department or staff member.
 - NAFME will confirm final cost and request final approval from client prior to transmission.
 - E-mails are approved / scheduled **within five business days** upon receipt of order and payment, based on network availability.
 - **Requirements:** Proof of current membership and a **valid IRB (Institutional Review Board) number** must be presented to NAFME by the client prior to any approval/scheduling of e-mail transmissions.
 - **The following disclaimer must be included in the e-blast text:** "This invitation is sent as a service to the profession by NAFME, as part of our ongoing efforts to support research in music education. The sending of this invitation does not constitute endorsement of the content or quality of the research project for which this invitation is sent by NAFME or its component Societies or Councils."
 - **Regarding Content:** NAFME reserves the right to approve ALL content prior to transmission. NAFME will deny requests for transmission of messages/materials which include non-research-related material and/or links to specific product sales pages.
- **Additional Services:**
 - Transmission to more than 5,000 members: **\$25.00 for each add'l 5,000 members (or portion thereof)**
 - Additional list criteria (in excess of 2 criteria): **\$10.00 per criteria**
 - Re-send to original distribution list (non-responders only): **\$25.00**
 - Rush Order (guaranteed transmission in less than five business days): **\$25.00**
- **To Order:**
 - Provide a copy of the completed order form, payment, and .a sample of your intended text . Membership and a valid IRB number are required. Send all materials to NAFME by mail or e-mail. See the order form for the current mailing address / e-mail address.



RESEARCH ASSISTANCE ORDER FORM

Mail: NAFME, Attn: Mike Blakeslee, 1806 Robert Fulton Drive, Reston, VA 20191. E-mail: mikeb@nafme.org.

NAME _____ Member ID _____
 COMPANY / INSTITUTION _____ IRB Number _____
 PHONE _____ E-MAIL _____
 ADDRESS _____
 CITY _____ ST/PROV _____ ZIP _____

List Criteria (first 2 are free):

Please list any specifications below, according to geography (ZIP, state, foreign), teaching level (elementary, higher education, etc.) and/or teaching area (choral, instrumental, jazz, etc.).

Geography (please choose one): BY STATE BY ZIP CODE (range)
 Details: _____

Teaching Level: Private/Studio Pre-School
 Elementary Only Middle School / Jr. High Only
 High School Only K-12 Collegiate (students)
 Higher Ed (professors, staff) None (no charge)
 Other (please list): _____

Interest Area: Band Orchestra Choral Marching Band
 Guitar Voice Show Choir
 Jazz Special Education Teacher Education
 Research Hist/Theor/Comp General Music
 Mariachi Technology Keyboard

Services Requested (select all that apply):

- Standard Transmission (see page 1 for details): **\$50.00**
- Basic Proofing/Programming Time : **Included**
- # of Additional List Criteria (in excess of 2): _____ **\$10.00 per criteria**
- Re-send to non-responders: **\$25.00**
- Rush Order (guaranteed transmission < 5 business days): **\$25.00**

SUBTOTAL (est.): \$ _____

Payment Type:

Credit Card Check
 If credit, please choose: Visa MasterCard Amex Discover
 Credit Card Number: _____ Exp. Date: _____ CVV: _____
 Name (as it appears on card): _____

Agreement: By signing this form below, you agree that you have the full power and authority to enter into this agreement on behalf of your company or institution. The company / institution agrees that this transmission shall be for legitimate research purposes, and is not intended to serve as a sales tool.

Signature of Representative: _____ **Date:** _____

Current as of 3/2014. This service is available to members only. Rules and restrictions subject to change without notice.

APPENDIX B

NAfME QUESTIONNAIRE EMAIL FORMAT APPROVAL

From: National Association for Music Education [mailto:memberservices@nafme2.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2015 11:42 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Study on music education research and teacher philosophy

TEST #2

Dear [REDACTED], (this will be personalized to the recipient)

The following research opportunity is being sent as a public service on behalf of a legitimate researcher by the National Association for Music Education. Your e-mail address has not been disclosed to any third party, and any information you supply as part of this survey is optional.

Dear Music Educator,

This invitation is sent as a service to the profession by NAFME, as part of our ongoing efforts to support research in music education. The sending of this invitation does not constitute endorsement of the content or quality of the research project for which this invitation is sent by NAFME or its component Societies or Councils.

I am a doctoral candidate collecting data for my dissertation on teacher philosophy and music education research. If you are currently a full-time music educator teaching pre-K-12, college, or university level music classes, please take 10 minutes to complete a short questionnaire by following [this hyperlink](#). **Please respond on or before Friday, February 6th.** Thank you for your time!

Meghan K. Sheehy

Forward this email

This email was sent to [REDACTED]@nafme.org by memberservices@nafme2.org |

[Update Profile/Email Address](#) | Rapid removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#).



Try it FREE today.

National Association for Music Education | 1806 Robert Fulton Drive | Reston | VA | 20191

APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRE



Participant demographics

What grade level are you currently teaching? Select all that apply.

- Pre-kindergarten
- Elementary
- Middle school
- Junior high school
- High school
- Undergraduate
- Graduate

What area best describes your primary instructional responsibilities at this time?

- Band
- Choir
- Composition
- General music
- Music appreciation
- Music history/musicology
- Music technology
- Music theory
- Orchestra
- Other (please specify):

Select your number of years of teaching experience:

This should include all teaching experiences after teacher candidacy/student teaching.

Select the highest degree you have currently attained:

When did you complete your highest degree currently attained?

- Within the past 0-2 years
- Within the past 3-5 years
- Within the past 6-10 years
- Within the past 11-20 years
- Within the past 21-30 years
- Within the past 30+ years

Are you currently enrolled in a graduate program?

- Yes
- No

Dissemination of information

Which of the following music education research journals do you read? Select all that apply.

- Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education
- International Journal of Research in Choral Singing
- Journal for Research in Music Education
- Journal of Band Research
- Journal of Music Teacher Education
- Journal of String Research
- Music Education Research
-

- Philosophy of Music Education Review
- Research Studies in Music Education
- Update: Applications of Research in Music Education
- Visions of Research in Music Education
- None (Do not currently read music education research journals)
- Other (please list):

How much total time do you spend per month (on average) reading the above music education research journals?

- No time
- 30 minutes
- 1 hour
- 2 hours
- 3 hours
- 4 hours
- More than 4 hours

Which of the following music education trade journals/magazines do you read? Select all that apply.

- American Music Teacher
- American String Teachers
- Coda Magazine
- Choral Journal
- Downbeat
- General Music Today
- Guitar Player
- Jazz Ed
- Music Alive!
- Music Educators Journal (MEJ)
- Music Teacher
- Opera Opera
- Performing/Songwriter
- Sequenza 21
- Sounds of Timeless Jazz

- Symphony Magazine
- Teaching Music
- The Instrumentalist
- Voice of Chorus America
- None (Do not currently read music education magazines)
- Other (please list):

How much total time do you spend per month (on average) reading the above trade journals/magazines?

- No time
- 30 minutes
- 1 hour
- 2 hours
- 3 hours
- 4 hours
- More than 4 hours

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education research journals .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I fully understand the content of the articles in music education trade journals/magazines .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reading music education trade journals/ magazines helps my growth as an educator.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel there are not enough trade journal/magazine articles focused on my area of	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

practice.

Music education philosophy

What is music for? Select all that apply.

- Entertainment
- Expressions of feelings
- Music making and enjoyment are part of being human
- Personal growth and satisfaction
- Representation of culture
- Reflection, nostalgia, and/or pastime
- Other (please describe)

What kind of music classes should be taught in schools? Select all that apply.

- All kinds
- Band
- Choir
- Composition
- Electronic music
- Folkloric
- Guitar
- Jazz
- Orchestra
- Rock and Roll
- Small ensembles
- Whatever interests the students
- Other (Please list)

What is the purpose of including music in K-12 curriculum?

Rank the following choices from 1 to 10, with 1 being of highest priority and 10 being the lowest. Use your mouse to drag each item into the order of your preference.

Aesthetic enjoyment

Communication

Contributing to the continuity of culture

Enforcing conformity to social norms

Entertainment

Outlet for emotional expression

Physical response

Social integration

Symbolic representation

Validation of social institutions and religious rituals

Other (please explain)

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I read music education research often and understand it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I know what it means to conduct research.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am experienced in conducting research.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am interested in conducting research.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am experienced in serving as a participant in research.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am interested in serving as a participant in research.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and I understand it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I see an important connection between research and how I teach music.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research is a very important					

part of my career as a music teacher.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research is important to the music education profession.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel connected to research in music education.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel connected to music education researchers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel connected to K-12 music educators.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Which of the following do you consider to be research? Select all that apply.

- Answering questions through systematic investigation using the scientific method.
Example: I will answer my question by developing a hypothesis, testing the hypothesis with an experiment, analyzing the results of the experiment, drawing conclusions from the analysis, and communicating the findings with others.
- Reading books, journals, magazines, or articles on topics I find interesting.
Example: I will read an article in a magazine about ways to improve diction with my middle school choir students and then apply those suggestions to my classes.
- Seeking the opinions of colleagues with more experience.
Example: I will invite a band director from a local university to work with my group while I take notes on the rehearsal.
- Online exploration.
Example: I will enter the question "How do I integrate solfege into my elementary music class?" into an online search engine such as Google in order to learn more about using solfege in my classroom.
- Going to a library.
Example: I will check books out of a library to read as much as I can on a topic in which I am interested.

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Music education in the United States is static or lacks forward	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

momentum.

Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others.

As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me.

Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation.

The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures.

I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non-traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

APPENDIX D

LIKERT ITEMS AS ORGANIZED BY RESEARCHER

Table 28

Researcher Access and Utilization of Research Statement Organization

Question and Item	Statement
11A	I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals
11B	I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals
11C	I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines
11D	Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator
11E	Reading music education trade journals/magazines helps my growth as an educator
11F	I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice
11G	I feel there are not enough trade journal/magazine articles focused on my area of practice

Table 29

Researcher Relationship Between Researcher and Practitioner Statement Organization

Question and Item	Statement
15A	I read music education research often and understand it
15B	I know what it means to conduct research
15C	I am experienced in conducting research
15D	I am interested in conduction research
15E	I am experienced in serving as a participant in research
15F	I am interesting in serving as a participant in research
15G	I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek
15H	My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and understand it
15I	My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music
15J	I see an important connection between research and how I teach music
15K	Research is a very important part of my career as a music teacher
15L	There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music
15M	Research is important to the music education profession
15N	Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students
15O	I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field
15P	I feel connected to research in music education
15Q	I feel connected to music education researchers
15R	I feel connected to K–12 music educators

Table 30

Researcher Music Education Philosophy Statement Organization

Question and Item	Statement
17A	Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present
17B	Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum
17C	Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others
17D	As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me
17E	Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation
17F	The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures
17G	I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non-traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom

APPENDIX E

EXPERT PANEL LIKERT ORGANIZATION WORKSHEET

Please choose ONE column for each statement by marking an X underneath. The three options are:

- 1) Philosophy: If you choose philosophy it means that you believe the statement corresponds with hypothesis 2.
- 2) Relationship: If you choose relationship it means that you believe the statement corresponds with hypothesis 3.
- 3) Access to/Use of Research: If you choose Access to/Use of Research it means that you believe the statement corresponds with hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 1

“Collegiate music education participants will access scholarly music education publications more frequently than K-12 music educators, the former finding the writings more useful than the latter.”

Hypothesis 2

“Collegiate level participants will rate differently the philosophical statements than will their K-12 counterparts.”

Hypothesis 3

“Questionnaire ratings of the relationship between researcher and practitioner will differ from other data collected to triangulate participant responses.”

	Philosophy	Relationship	Use of/Access to Research
SAMPLE- THIS STATEMENT LOOKS LIKE IT IS ABOUT RELATIONSHIPS		X	
I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals			
I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals			
I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines			
Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator			
Reading music education trade journals/magazines helps my growth as an educator			
I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice			
I feel there are not enough trade journal/magazine articles focused on my area of practice			
I read music education research often and understand it			
I know what it means to conduct research			
I am experienced in conducting research			
I am interested in conducting research			

	Philosophy	Relationship	Use of/Access to Research
	I am experienced in serving as a participant in research		
	I am interesting in serving as a participant in research		
	I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek		
	My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and understand it		
	My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music		
	I see an important connection between research and how I teach music		
	Research is a very important part of my career as a music teacher		
	There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music		
	Research is important to the music education profession		
	Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students		
	I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field		
	I feel connected to research in music education		
	I feel connected to music education researchers		
	I feel connected to K-12 music educators		
	Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present		
	Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum		
	Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others		
	As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me		
	Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation		
	The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures		
	I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non-traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom		

APPENDIX F

EXPERT PANEL ORGANIZATION OF LIKERT ITEMS

Table 31

Expert Panel Access and Utilization of Research Statements

Question and Item	Statement
11A	I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals
11B	I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals
11C	I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines
11F	I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice
11G	I feel there are not enough trade journal/magazine articles focused on my area of practice
15A	I read music education research often and understand it
15B	I know what it means to conduct research
15C	I am experienced in conducting research
15D	I am interested in conduction research
15H	My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and understand it
15i	My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music
15K	Research is a very important part of my career as a music teacher
15P	I feel connected to research in music education

Table 32

Expert Panel Relationship Between Researcher and Practitioner Statements

Question and Item	Statement
11D	Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator
11E	Reading music education trade journals/magazines helps my growth as an educator
15M	Research is important to the music education profession
15G	I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek
15L	There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music
15O	I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field
17A	Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present
17B	Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum
17C	Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others
17D	As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me
17E	Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation
17F	The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures

Table 33

Expert Panel Music Education Philosophy Statements

Question and Item	Statement
15F	I am interesting in serving as a participant in research
15J	I see an important connection between research and how I teach music
15E	I am experienced in serving as a participant in research
15N	Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students
15Q	I feel connected to music education researchers
15R	I feel connected to K–12 music educators
17G	I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non–traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom

APPENDIX G

MEANS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLE GROUPINGS BY QUESTION

Table 34

Question 11, Means of Independent Variable Groups

Statement	Group 1 <i>M</i>	Group 2 <i>M</i>	Group 3 <i>M</i>
I read through titles and abstracts of research articles when I receive music education journals	3.504	3.951	3.733
I fully understand the content of the articles in music education research journals	3.601	3.963	3.833
I fully understand the content in music education trade journals/magazines	4.189	4.531	4.500
Reading music education research journals helps my growth as an educator	3.647	4.099	3.600
Reading music education trade journals/ magazines helps my growth as an educator	3.952	3.988	3.867
I feel there are not enough research journal articles focused on my area of practice	3.035	2.815	3.333
I feel there are not enough trade journal/ magazine articles focused on my area of practice	2.886	2.691	3.033

Table 35

Question 15, Means of Independent Variable Groups

Statement	Group 1 <i>M</i>	Group 2 <i>M</i>	Group 3 <i>M</i>
I read music education research often and understand it	3.039	3.852	3.433
I know what it means to conduct research	4.122	4.543	4.567
I am experienced in conducting research	3.079	4.123	3.800
I am interested in conduction research	2.960	3.864	3.333
I am experienced in serving as a participant in research	3.053	3.975	3.667
I am interesting in serving as a participant in research	3.376	3.753	3.700
I use my role as a teacher to explore answers to questions researchers might seek	3.336	4.086	3.733
My exposure to research is sufficient so that I can read it and understand it	3.715	4.247	4.200
My exposure to research methods will likely change the way I teach music	3.488	3.963	3.500
I see an important connection between research and how I teach music	3.624	4.111	3.600
Research is a very important part of my career as a music teacher	3.134	3.926	3.200
There is value in systematically explaining how students learn music	4.171	4.444	4.267

Table 35 (continued).

Statement	Group 1 <i>M</i>	Group 2 <i>M</i>	Group 3 <i>M</i>
Research is important to the music education profession	4.269	4.593	4.233
Music teachers and music researchers have similar goals for educating students	3.576	3.494	3.567
I aim to base my own teaching on research that has been done in my field	3.549	3.988	3.800
I feel connected to research in music education	2.938	3.827	3.267
I feel connected to music education researchers	2.624	3.642	3.100
I feel connected to K–12 music educators	4.055	4.160	4.333

Table 36

Question 17, Means of Independent Variable Groups

Statement	Group 1 <i>M</i>	Group 2 <i>M</i>	Group 3 <i>M</i>
Music educators should pass on traditions of the field, reshaping them to become more relevant to the present	4.154	4.198	4.167
Music education in the United States is static or lack forward momentum	3.033	3.383	3.233
Music education privileges some music cultures while marginalizing others	3.271	3.605	3.533
As a music educator, I am receptive to what other genres of music may teach me	4.359	4.469	4.433
Music education in the United States is in need of change/transformation	3.499	3.852	3.767
The music education curriculum should be broadened to include a wide variety of musical genres and cultures	3.915	4.086	3.933
I have felt excluded by other music educators for using unorthodox or non-traditional techniques and/or music in my classroom	2.432	2.395	2.400

APPENDIX H

NOTICE OF IRB APPROVAL



INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001

Phone: 601.266.5997 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/research/institutional.review.board

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months. Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 15010506

PROJECT TITLE: A Quantitative Analysis of the Relationship between K-12 Music Educators and Collegiate Music Education Researchers and Instructors: Is There a Disconnect?

PROJECT TYPE: New Project RESEARCHER(S): Meghan K. Sheehy

COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Arts and Letters

DEPARTMENT: Music Education

FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: N/A

IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Exempt Review Approval

PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 01/27/2015 to 01/26/2016

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board

REFERENCES

- Achilles, E. (1998). The relationship between research and practice in early childhood music education. *Early Childhood Music Newsletter*, 25(1), 9.
- Allsup, R. E. (2012). The moral ends of band. *Theory into Practice*, 51(3), 1–9.
- Allsup, R. E. & Benedict, C. (2008). The problems of band. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 16(2), 156–175.
- Ansdell, G. (2014). *Yes, but, No, but*: A contrarian response to Cross (2014). *Psychology of Music*, 42(6), 820–825.
- Austin, J. R., & Reinhardt, D. (1999). Philosophy and advocacy: An examination of preservice music teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 47(1), 18–30.
- Barrett, J. R. (2005). Planning for understanding: A reconceptualized view of the music curriculum. *Music Educators Journal*, 91(4), 21–25.
- Barry, N. H., Taylor, J. A., & Hair, H. I. (2001). A national survey of state music education board members: Their interests in and attitudes toward music education research. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 20(1), 19–25.
- Brand, M. (1984). Music teachers versus researchers: A truce. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 80, 1–13.
- Brand, M. (2006). Hong Kong music teacher ask: “Does music education research matter”? *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 169, 79–86.

- Buckley, R. P. (1997). Note: Legal scholarship for new law teachers. *Legal Education Review*, 8(2), 181–212. Retrieved from http://epublications.bond.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1091&context=law_pubs
- Bussye, V., Sparkman, K. L., & Wesley, P., (2003). Communities of practice: Connecting what we know with what we do. *Exceptional Children*, 69(3), 263–277.
- Byo, J. L. (1991). Research and the band director: Marriage not divorce. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 10(1), 4–9.
- Cee, V. (2013). The end(s) of advocacy: Responding to our own mandates instead of creating new leadership. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 12(1), 64–81.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into practice*, 39(3), 124–130.
- Disconnect. (n.d.). In *New Oxford American Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/disconnect
- Dorfman, J., & Lipscomb, S. D. (2005). Graduate music students' attitudes toward research. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 15, 31–42.
- Eddowes, E. A. (1992). Variation between elementary teachers in philosophy of teaching. *Reading Improvement*, 29(1), 45–49.
- Elliot, D. J. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Estabrooks, C. A., Thompson, D. S., Lovely, J. E., & Hofmeyer, A. (2006). A Guide to Knowledge Translation. *The Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 26(1), 25–36.
- Feldman, K. A., (1987). Research productivity and scholarly accomplishment of college teachers as related to their instructional effectiveness: A review and exploration. *Research in Higher Education*, 26(3), 227–298.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications Inc.
- Flowers, P. J., Gallant, M. W., & Single, N. A. (1995). Research dissemination in music education: Teachers' research questions and preference for writing style. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 14, 23–30.
- Fox, M. F. (1992). Research, teaching, and publication productivity: Mutuality versus competition in academia. *Sociology of Education*, 65(4), 293–305.
- Friedrich, R., & Michalak, S., (1983). Why doesn't research improve teaching? Some answers from a small liberal arts college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 54, 145–163.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L.S., Harris, A. H., & Roberts, P. H. (1996). Bridging the research-to-practice gap with mainstream assistance teams: A cautionary tale. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 11(3), 244–266.
- Geringer, J. M., & Madsen, C. K., (1987). An Investigation of Transfer: Music Education Research and Applied Instruction. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 91, 45–49.

- Goals 2000: Educate America Act, H. R. 1804, 103rd Cong. (1994). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/sec941.html>
- Graham, I. D., Logan, J., Harrison, M. B., Straus, S. E., Tetroe, J., Caswell, W., & Robinson, N. (2006). Lost in Knowledge Translation: Time for a Map? *The Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 26, 13–24.
- Guzman, J. T. (1999). *Music Education in the Dominican Republic Schools: A Survey–Appraisal*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 9939284)
- Hahs-Vaughn, D. L., Onwuegbuzie, J.A., Slate, J. R., & Frels, R. K. (2009). Editorial: Bridging Research–to–Practice: Enhancing Knowledge through Abstracts. *Research in the Schools*, 16(2), xxxvii–xlv.
- Harrison, S. D. (Ed.). (2014). *Research and Research Education in Music Performance and Pedagogy*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Hattie, J., & Marsh, H. W., (1996). The relationship between research and teaching: A meta–analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 507–542.
- Hedden, S.K. (1979). Dissemination of music education research: Are researchers the problem? *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 59, 35–39.
- Hong-Yu, C. (2008). *A Survey of Board–certified Music Therapists’ Opinions Towards Research*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 1453160)
- Huang, C. J., & Goldhaber, T. S. (2012). Malicious meddling or transparent tracking? Telecare as a logical extension of modern communications technology. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 12(9), 45–59.

- Hutchinson J., & Huberman, M. (1994). Knowledge dissemination and use in science and mathematics education: A literature review. *Journal of Science Education and Technology* 3(1), 27–47.
- Jones, P. M. (2005). Music education and the knowledge economy: Developing creativity, strengthening communities. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 106(4), 5–12.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (1990). Philosophy and the music teacher: Challenging the way we think. *Music Educators Journal*, 76(5), 17–28.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2001). What are the roles of philosophy in music education? *Research Studies in Music Education*, 17, 19–31.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2010). School music education and change. *Music Educators Journal*, 96(4), 21–27.
- Kacanek, H. S. (1982). *A Descriptive Analysis of Wisconsin Music Educators' Agreement with Bennett Reimer's "A Philosophy of Music Education"*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 8301697)
- Kos Jr., R. P. (2007). *Incidental Change: The Influence of Educational Policy Implementation on Music Education Programs and Practice*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 3261425)
- Kotora Jr., E. J. (2001). *Assessment Practices in the Choral Music Classroom: A Survey of Ohio High School Choral Music Teachers and College Choral Methods Teachers*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 3036343)
- Kratus, J. (2007). Music education at the tipping point. *Music Educators Journal*, 94(2), 42–48.

- Krist, A. & Venezia, M. W. (2001). Bridging the great divide between secondary schools and postsecondary education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(1), 92–98.
- Lang, E. S., Wyer, P. C., & Haynes, R. B. (2007). Knowledge translation: Closing the evidence-to-practice gap. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 49(3), 355–363.
- Leonhard, C. (1999). A challenge for change in music education. *Music Educators Journal*, 86(3), 40–43.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Madsen, C. K.. & Furman, C. E. (1984). Graduate Versus Undergraduate Scholarship: Research Acquisition and Dissemination. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 21(4), 170–176.
- Mercavich, C. J. (1986). *Survey of Music Executives in Higher Education*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 8625258)
- National Institute on Drug Abuse. (1991). *Drug abuse technology transfer*. Rockville, MD: Backer, T. E.
- Nelson, R. N. (2011). *An Exploration of Secondary Level Instrumental Music Educators' Receptiveness to Select Philosophical Writings*. Retrieved from <http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-07052011-221923/unrestricted/nelsonthesis.pdf>
- Paney, A. S. (2004). *Educator Access, Awareness, and Application of Music Research*. Retrieved from: <http://repositories.tdl.org/ttuir/bitstream/handle/2346/18007/31295019381127.pdf?sequence=1>
- Phillips, K. H. (2008). *Exploring Research in Music Education and Music Therapy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Pithouse-Morgan, K., & Samaras, A. P. (Eds.). (2015). *Polyvocal Professional Learning Through Self-Study Research*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Poet, H., Rudd, P., & Kelly, J. (2010). *Survey of teachers 2010: Support to improve teaching practice*. Retrieved from http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/73945/1/teach_survey10.pdf
- Radocy, R. E. (1983). The research effort: Why we care. *Music Educators Journal*, 69(6), 29–31.
- Regelski, T. A. (1980). The Bee, the Ant, or the Spider? – Models for Music Research and Music Education. In *Contributions to the Symposium/80 the Bowling Green State University Symposium on Music Teaching and Research, Volume 1*.
- Regelski, T. A. (2007). Music education for society's sake: Music education in an era of global neo-imperial/neo-medieval market-riven paradigms and structures. *Action Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6(1). Retrieved from http://www.maydaygroup.org/ACT/v6n1/Jones6_1.pdf
- Regelski, T. A. (2013). Re-setting music education's "default settings". *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 12(1), 7–23. Retrieved from http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Regelski12_1.pdf
- Reimer, B. (1989). *A philosophy of music education* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Rosen, A. L., & Zlotnik, J. L. (2002). Demographics and reality. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 36(3–4), 81–97.

- Russell, J. A. (2007). I know what I need to know: The impact of cognitive and psychosocial development on undergraduate music education major's investment in instrumental techniques courses. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 171*, 51–66.
- Rynes, S. L., Bartunek, J. M., & Daft, R. L. (2001). Across the great divide: Knowledge creation and transfer between practitioners and academics. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(2), 340–355.
- Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H., Eds. (2010). *New Approaches to Qualitative Research: Wisdom and Uncertainty*. New York, NY: Rutledge.
- Schmidt, M. (2012). Transition from student to teacher: Preservice teachers' beliefs and practices. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 23*(1), 27–49.
- Snell II, A. H. (2012). *Creativity in Instrumental Music Education: A Survey of Winds and Percussion Music Teachers in New York State*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 3555065)
- Spencer, J. (2001). How relevant is university-based scientific research to private high-technology firms. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*, 432–440.
- Talbot, B. C. (2013). Discourse analysis as potential for re-visioning music education. *Action, Criticism and Theory for Music Education, 12*(1). Retrieved from <http://cupola.gettysburg.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=consfacpub>
- Thorpe, L. (1958). Learning theory and music teaching. In Henry, N. B. (Ed.), *Basic Concepts in Music Education, the Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, (163–194). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Tom, C. (2004). *A Survey and Analysis of Music Education in Elementary School Classrooms*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 3155486)
- Udo-Akang, D. (2012). Theoretical constructs, concepts, and applications. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(9), 89–97.
- Woody, R. H. (2007). Popular music in school: Remixing the issues. *Music Educators Journal*, 93(4), 32–37.
- Yarbrough, C., Price, H. E., & Bowers, J. (1991). The effect of knowledge of research on rehearsal skills and teaching values of experienced teachers. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 9(2), 17–20.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1995). Beyond the divide of teacher research and academic research. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 1(2), 153–172.