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ABSTRACT

INTERPRETATIONS OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN THE CONTEXT
OF THE ORFF SCHULWERK MUSIC CLASSROOM AT THE
DUBARD SCHOOL FOR LANGUAGE DISORDERS

by Anna Rebecca Bondurant Halliday

August 2012

The purpose of this multiple case study was to explore the lived experiences of four students with language disorders within the context of their Orff Schulwerk music class at the DuBard School for Language Disorders. In addition, the observational insights of their classroom teachers and the practitioner researcher were compared with the responses of the students in order to determine any discrepancies between the child’s awareness of his or her musical engagement and that of the observer. Using data collected from interviews, stimulated recall (Dempsey, 2010), and student generated artwork (Freeman & Mathison, 2009), I explored the lived experiences of the students as they were conveyed through their words and images. The participants’ classroom teachers participated in similar stimulated recall sessions using the same excerpts of video recorded music classes. A comparison of responses illustrated whether students, teachers, and I had the same or similar perceptions of the same event. Emergent themes were found in the areas of musical, social, societal, and physical engagement in the music classroom, and were related to the three research questions: (1) How do music students with language disorders interpret their own actions in the music classroom; (2) What, if any, discrepancies exist between teacher and student interpretations of student engagement in the music classroom; and (3) What choices regarding engagement do
music students with language disorders make in the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom?

Emergent themes were explored in relation to participants’ musical vocabulary, societal involvement, self-awareness, transfer of knowledge, music vs. classroom, discrepancies in student and teacher perception, kinesthetic engagement, instrumental engagement. After considering these themes in regard to the research questions, I asserted that the depth of meaning within their musical experience was largely superficial.

This study hoped to inform those who interact with children with language disorders as to their perceptions, their lived experiences, and their ability or inability to communicate their thought processes in regards to educational, specifically musical, school settings.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For the past three years I studied the use of words to convey meaning. The science of semantics led me to my thesaurus time and time again in search of the one word that would perfectly illustrate my intent. Unfortunately my thesaurus has failed me as I search for the perfect way to say “Thank you.”

I must first thank my husband, Jason, and my children, Emma, Jack, and James, who showed great resilience and patience through this process. Our families also showed great support through prayers and assistance.

There are no words to convey my appreciation for the support and encouragement given to me by my committee chair, mentor, and friend, Dr Jennifer Shank. In addition, I am indebted to my committee members, Dr. Edward Hafer, Dr. Joseph Brumbeloe, Dr. Anita Davis, and Dr. Steven Moser, whose mentorship enabled me to successfully complete this terminal degree. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Adria Hoffman, a gifted scholar under whose mentorship I acquired the necessary tools to undertake this qualitative study.

I must also thank the teachers, staff, and administrators at the DuBard School for Language Disorders. I consider myself truly blessed to have been a part of your program.

Finally, to my wonderful DuBard students: thank you for being willing to sing, move, and play with me for the past three years. I leave with you my love and prayers for the brightest, happiest future.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ......................................................................................................................... ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ........................................................................................................ iv

LIST OF TABLES .................................................................................................................. vii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS .................................................................................................. viii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION ............................................................................................................. 1
   Research Questions
   Orff Schulwerk
   DuBard Association Method
   Conclusions
   Definitions

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .......................................................................................... 13
   Introduction
   Music and Disorders of Language or Communication
   Teacher and Student Perception of School Engagement
   Parent Perception and Student Engagement in School
   Orff Schulwerk and Special Learners
   The DuBard Association Method®
   Summary
   Implications

III. METHODOLOGY ........................................................................................................ 31
   Preliminary Studies
   Theoretical Framework
   Methodological Framework
   Research Strategies
   Selection of Site
   Context
   Similarities between Orff Schulwerk and the DuBard Association Method®
   Differences between the Orff Schulwerk method and the DuBard Association Method®
   Selection of Participants
LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Similarities between Orff Schulwerk and the DuBard Association Method® ......42
2. Differences between Orff Schulwerk and the DuBard Association Method® ......45
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure

1. Student Generated Artwork, Lizzie .................................................................98
2. Student Generated Artwork, Gregory ...............................................................108
3. Student Generated Artwork, Stephanie............................................................142
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The DuBard School for Language Disorders is located on the campus of The University of Southern Mississippi. Since 1962, children with severe language disorders have been afforded an opportunity to receive intensive speech and language interventions in a full-time instructional setting. The pedagogical method used by the school is known as the DuBard Association Method®, “a phonetic, systematic, structured, incremental, and cumulative multisensory approach for teaching language and speech to children with multiple difficulties in language and learning” (Martin, 2012, p. 46). In 2009, the school implemented Orff Schulwerk music classes as part of its curricular offerings to its 80 students. For the past three years, I have served as the music teacher at the DuBard School.

My first weeks at the DuBard School led me to question how students with language disorders perceive themselves in the context of the music classroom, where the vocabulary is unfamiliar, the concepts are abstract, and they are asked to vocalize in new ways. I grew curious about how the classroom teachers perceived music classes, and especially about their responses to the pedagogical techniques associated with Orff Schulwerk. At first, the teachers who stayed with the classes seemed concerned about whether the children were doing what they were told. The Orff classroom “is a place where self-expression is encouraged and valued, musical experiments are carried out, and tolerance for differing views is practiced. Indeed, it is often untidy” (Frazee, 2006, p. 18). Over time, the teachers grew more familiar and comfortable with the lack of apparent organization to the music classes, and their concerned demeanor began to fade. In many
cases, student responses provided the impetus for musical creativity and served as an informal assessment tool.

Research Questions

The purpose of this inquiry was to unveil the lived experiences of the four participants as they were conveyed through various data sources. Additionally, the relationship between the students’ perception of their actions in music class and the reactions of the teacher were studied to reveal any variation between the parties involved. In particular, this study responded to three main research questions: (1) How do music students with language disorders interpret their own actions in the music classroom; (2) What, if any, discrepancies exist between teacher and student interpretations of student engagement in the music classroom; and (3) What choices regarding engagement do music students with language disorders make in the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom?

As an alternative school, the DuBard School setting was addressed through “a qualitative approach that emphasizes the perspective of teachers and the understanding of particular settings . . .” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 24). Providing an environmental context was extremely important, as students in this school did not have the same social and educational experiences as special learners in a public school setting. Some of the students at the DuBard School have been enrolled since they were four or five years old, now adolescents.

Maxwell (2005) asserts that three types of goals should influence the research study: personal, intellectual, and practical. He explains that “personal goals are things that motivate you to do the study, but are not necessarily important for others” (p. 16). In many public elementary schools, one music teacher serves most or all of the students in
the school, in most cases preventing in-depth knowledge of those students who have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). My objective for this study was to inform best practices of music educators in regards to special learners. In addition, this study contributes to the growing body of research within the Orff Schulwerk community of scholars, who are continually seeking a deeper understanding of its impact on young students.

A key intellectual goal to this type of research is “understanding the meaning, for participants in the study, of the events, situations, experiences, and actions they are involved with or engage in” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 22). Through transcription of interviews, collection of artifacts, and observations of the participants, an understanding of their engagement in the Orff Schulwerk music classroom was attempted through triangulation and analysis of data within a phenomenological theoretical framework. “Pedagogy requires a phenomenological sensitivity to lived experience” (van Manan, 1990, p. 2).

Orff Schulwerk

Carl Orff felt that music and movement are inherent in children. The Orff Schulwerk method is based on the concept of elemental music, that is, the primitive need we have to create and experience music through rhythm, chant, movement, and song. Nowhere is this need more apparent than in young children, whose impulsive musical play includes made-up songs and chants, rhythmic playground games, and spontaneous movement responses to music.

What, then, is elemental music? Never music alone, but music connected with movement, dance, and speech, not to be listened to, meaningful only in active participation. Elemental music is pre-intellectual, it lacks great form, it contents itself with simple sequential structures, ostinatos, and miniature rondos. It is
earthy, natural, almost a physical activity. It can be learned and enjoyed by anyone. It is fitting for children. (Orff, 1977)

The belief that the rhythm of language provided a solid foundation for musical experience drove Orff to explore the use of literature and poetry in the development of his musical ideas. For example, by using simplistic settings of children’s poetry for creative purposes, Orff exploited language as an important inspiration for musical discovery (Frazee & Kreuter, 1987).

The use of melodic and rhythmic speech patterns in the Orff Schulwerk method is one of the primary means of teaching musical ideas. The selection of this material is carefully aligned with the objective to be taught (Keller, 1963). Teachers of the Schulwerk may use singular words spoken rhythmically to highlight the duration of a note or pattern, or they may select a poem that becomes a rhythmic chant (Goodkin, 2008). The degree of flexibility is limited only by the creativity of the teacher and students.

The DuBard Association Method®

Teachers and staff at the DuBard School for Language Disorders receive intensive training in the DuBard Association Method®. In addition, the classroom teachers and outclient providers are “nationally certified speech-language pathologists and teachers of the deaf” (DuBard School for Language Disorders, 2012). Students are identified for the program based on formal assessments such as the Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language, the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals, and informal observations. The school’s curriculum strictly adheres to The DuBard Association Method.
Beginning at the most basic level of meaningful sound, the phoneme, students of the DuBard Association Method® are given the orthographic symbol for the sound, written in cursive. The DuBard School uses the Northampton symbols, also known as the Yale Chart Spellings (Martin, 2012). The student then reproduces the sound with attention to precise articulation and a slow temporal rate. Utilizing a specific set of activities, teachers reinforce oral and written recall of sounds, the goal being 90% accuracy and automaticity. Whether classmates are at the same level is of no regard; the child’s pace drives instruction. However, students with similar abilities may work in small groups as needed, and peer tutoring is a method used to help lower achievers while reinforcing the skills of children at a higher level.

Similar steps are taken to move the child through the next phase of the method, known as Drop Drills. Using careful combinations of phonemes to ensure initial success, the teacher directs the students in learning these syllabic units. They are written in the child’s book as they are introduced, and the two phonemes are written in different colored ink. Drop drills are introduced first as consonant-vowel (CV) or VC combinations using primary Northampton spellings. When ten drop drills have been mastered, the child will move on to cross drills. It should be noted that at each stage of the DuBard Association Method®, the same set of procedures are utilized for repetition and reinforcement.

Cross drills expand on the idea of drop drills and prepare the student for vocabulary words. Color differentiation, using only two colors, continues to be used as a visual cue for the students, and cursive writing of Northampton symbols persists. Students are now introduced to secondary spellings and begin practicing reading left to right. The vocabulary word is introduced last. Noun introduction is accompanied by
carefully selected pictures, all of which are entered into the child’s book. Reinforcement activities remain very similar to previous steps.

The Repetitive Sentences and Question Language phase is introduced when the student has mastered fifty nouns. Basic sentences are used to introduce articles (a, an, some) and simple verbs. This step is a very important transition to combining words into sentences, and to utilize questions. The child is first given the sentence, for example: “I see a bird.” A picture card is used to reinforce the noun in the sentence. Two different colors are utilized, with the verb being the contrasting color. When the student masters the sentence, the question is then introduced: “What do you see?” After a time, these sentences will also include numbers. In the initial stages, the only capital letter used is for the word “I;” all other letters are written as lower case, including proper nouns.

Moving beyond repetitive sentences and questions, students begin to write stories, again with questions. They begin with animal stories and progress to inanimate objects and personal stories. Mastery of these types of stories determines the subsequent stage, prepositions, followed by descriptive stories and beginning usage of higher grammatical concepts such as present progressive and past tense, all within the structure of the sentence/story with questions.

It bears repeating that throughout the method, the same repetitive procedures are used to teach and reinforce each concept. Each step of the program is carefully entered into the child’s book by the teacher, with attention to proper manuscript and selected pictorial representation of nouns. Students are taught to write in cursive, contributing to the multisensory component of the Method. Northampton symbols are used because of their similarity to the spellings used in the English language. There are no unusual shapes
to symbolize phonetic sounds, so students have an easier time associating the sound with the written word (DuBard & Martin, 2000).

*Reinforcement Activities for the DuBard Association Method®*

1. **Writing** – focuses on proper pencil grip, proper construction of cursive letters; this is part of the multisensory focus of the program. Students are using fine motor skills to draw each letter or syllable, and at higher levels they are separating words with spaces. This way they can focus on each word in a sentence, as the letters in cursive writing are connected. The child does not lift the pencil until the letters are formed, so he is focusing on one word at a time.

2. **Concentration Game** – similar to the “memory game” – the child matches written letters, then says each letter with attention to proper articulation.

3. **Oral recall** – using flash cards, students are asked to say each sound. The focus is on precise articulation and automaticity in recognizing the written phoneme or syllable.

4. **Written recall** – begins at the noun level – The students sees a picture of the noun, says the noun with attention to precise articulation, then writes the word. This is sometimes done at the chalkboard, which gives the student additional multisensory practice by writing on the board and pointing. This is sometimes done in front of the class which increases the child’s self-confidence.

5. **Dictation** – students first repeat, then write what the teacher says. This starts at the phoneme level and continues throughout the program.

6. **Review in structure** (also called phoneme review, noun review, etc.) – this process has several steps:
a. Reading – the teacher is silent in this step. She points to the phoneme, drill, cross drill, or whatever is being covered. The child reads, then points and reads, then turns away and says the material from memory.

b. Auditory-visual (lipreading for hearing impaired) – With the material listed on the board, the teacher says the stimulus out of order without pointing and the student repeats her, then points and reads, then turns away and speaks from memory.

c. Auditory training.acoustic (child’s back to teacher) – First the teacher says the stimuli in order while pointing, repeated by the student. Next the teacher does the same thing without pointing while the student repeats. Finally, the teacher reads out of order and the student repeats, points and repeats, then turns and says the item from memory. In this step, the teacher covers her mouth so the child cannot detect sounds with bursts of air. (DuBard School for Language Disorders, 2008, pp. 3-11)

The DuBard Association Method® is an individualized program in which each child progresses according to mastery of each stage of the process. Because it is tailored to each student, there is not a printed curriculum traditionally used for group instruction; rather, each child creates his own book with the help of his teacher. The child’s book reflects mastery of the specific sounds, words, and stories, and allows teachers and parents to track progress through the method.

Conclusion

Through a practitioner research study design based in phenomenology, musical engagement within the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom at the DuBard School for Language Disorders was examined from the perspective of the student, the
classroom teacher, and my own observations. Practitioner research “connotes ‘insider’ research done by practitioners using their own site ... as the focus of their study” (Anderson, et al, 2007, p. 2).

Phenomenology served as a means through which the lived experiences of these children were explored in the context of their Orff Schulwerk music setting. Qualitative research techniques of data collection that best align with the phenomenological framework were utilized.

In addition, student responses were compared with the practitioner’s and those of the participants’ classroom teachers. Discrepancies in data between primary and secondary participants shed light on ways to better relate to students with language disorders by comparing the words and actions of the students to the interpretations of the classroom teachers and my observations as the researcher. Adults who interact closely with the students were asked to examine student actions and behaviors in music class and respond.

The inclusion of classroom teachers provided a means of triangulation, thereby contributing to the overall trustworthiness of the asserted outcomes. Anderson et al. (2007) assert that “democratic validity ... refers to the extent to which research is done in collaboration with all parties who have a stake in the problem under investigation” (Anderson, et al., 2007, p. 41). Their participation plays a large part in data triangulation, and engaging them in member-checking tasks can add trustworthiness to the quality of the data and the subsequent assertions put forth by the researcher.

Definitions

“Diversity of terms [and] constructs ... pervades the study of language and its disorders” (Bernstein & Tiegerman-Farber, 1997, p. 4). In an attempt to clarify
vocabulary used within this paper, I offer a brief explanation of key words. Although to
the general population many of these terms are used interchangeably, within the
community of speech-language pathology, there are specific, albeit seemingly minor,
differences.

Definitions of specific language disorders are found in a resource compiled by
Nicolosi, Harryman, and Kresheck (1996):

*Aphasia*: Communication disorder caused by brain damage and characterized by
complete or partial impairment of language comprehension, formulation, and use;
excludes disorders associated with primary sensory deficits, general mental
deterioration, or psychiatric disorders. Partial impairment is often referred to as
dysphasia. (p. 14-16)

*Apraxia*: . . . 1. Disruption in the ability to transmit or express a motor response
along a specific modality; involves disruption of voluntary or purposeful
programming of muscular movements while involuntary movements remain
intact; characterized by difficulty in articulation of speech, formation of letters in
writing, or in movements of gesture and pantomime. 2. In speech, a non-linguistic
sensorimotor disorder of articulation characterized by impaired capacity to
program the position of speech musculature and the sequencing of muscle
movements (respiratory, laryngeal, and oral) for the volitional production of
phonemes. 3. In a less severe form than above, apraxia is often referred to as
dyspraxia. Syn: oral, speech, or verbal apraxia. See also aphasic phonological
impairment (p. 17-18)

*Cochlear implant*: An electromagnetic device, surgically implanted into the ear,
designed to stimulate sensory components remaining in the cochlea of persons
with severe or profound hearing impairment who cannot use hearing aids effectively. An electrode array is inserted into the inner ear by a mastoidectomy through the round window. An externally worn signal processor interfaces with the cochlear implant at the signal coupler. (p. 63)

*Communicative disorder*: Impairment in the ability to: (a) receive and or process a symbol system; (b) represent concepts or symbol systems; (c) transmit and use symbol systems. The impairment may be observed in disorders of hearing, language, and or speech processes. Syn: communication disorder. See also language impairment, speech impairment (p. 68)

*Dyslexia*: see alexia (p. 94)

*Alexia*: Inability to read; may be the result of neurological impairment; in a less severe form, often referred to as dyslexia. Syn: word blindness (p. 7)

*Hearing impairment*: Hearing losses which may range from slight to deafness. See also deafness.

*Language disorder*: 1. Any difficulty with the production and or reception of linguistic units, regardless of environment, which may range from total absence of speech to minor variance with syntax; meaningful language may be produced, but with limited content; e.g., reduced vocabulary; restricted verbal formulations; omission of articles, prepositions, tense and plural markers; paucity of modifiers. 2. Inability or limited ability to utilize linguistic symbols for communication. 3. Any interference with the ability to communicate effectively in any community as dictated by the norms of that community. Syn: deviant language; language impairment. See also communicative disorder; speech disorder. (p. 149)
Speech disorder: 1. Any deviation of speech outside the range of acceptable variation in a given environment. Speech may be considered defective if it is characterized by any of the following to a significant degree: (a) not easily audible; (b) not readily intelligible; (c) vocally or visually unpleasant; (d) deviates in respect to specific sound production; (e) labored in production; (f) lacks conventional rhythm or stress; (g) linguistically deficient; (h) inappropriate to the speaker in terms of age, sex, or physical development. Syn. Deviant speech; speech defect or impairment. 2. Interruptions in the production of voice, phoneme, or rhythm. See also communicative disorder, language disorder (p. 256).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

When a student requires special accommodations, it is especially important for those working with the child to educate themselves on the specific issue facing him or her. Educators who are conscious of the issues facing students with exceptionalities are better equipped for effective instruction. Hammel and Hourigan (2011) emphasize the need to understand students who have language and communication impairments, stating that “students who struggle to communicate may express themselves to you as their music teacher in ways they may not express in any other class they attend” (p. 15). They go on to suggest that “music educators will find it very helpful to talk with other team members and colleagues to define a set of expectations and possible consequences prior to the first day of school” (Hammel & Hourigan, 2011, p. 100). Likewise, educators may look outside their school to the expansive body of educational research which may inform their instructional strategies, making them more efficient and effective.

Many scholars have explored music and its effect on and function within the lives of individuals diagnosed with autism, dyslexia, apraxia, aphasia, attention deficit disorder (ADD), and attention deficit hyperactive disorder (ADHD). This research can be found in the fields of neurology, neuropsychology, psychology of music, speech/language/hearing communities, music therapy, and music education. In this chapter, literature will be reviewed that directly informs the understanding of language disorders and elementary school music. While a significant body of research literature exists under the broad topic of music and special education, this review of literature will not include studies of learning disabilities other than language disorders.
Some researchers have investigated ways that musical experiences and training may be beneficial to those with impairments in speech, hearing, literacy, and receptive and expressive language. “In assessing the teaching and learning relationship, music teachers must gather and examine information regarding how students hear or receive music, remember musical concepts and understandings, and express themselves musically” (Hammel & Hourigan, 2011, p. 13).

This chapter provides an overview and review of literature within the major diagnoses of language disorders, including dyslexia, apraxia, and hearing impairments. This will also include a discussion of music and autism spectrum disorders, which are marked by disorders of expressive and/or receptive language disorders.

Music and Disorders of Language or Communication

A search of the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database using the terms “music” and “language disorders” returned only two dissertations, neither of which was deemed relevant to the purposes of this study. Changing the search term from language to communication yielded one dissertation that explored the influence of music on early childhood special learners, comparing one class that was exposed to intensive musical instruction to another with less exposure (Frick, 2000). In this study, data was collected on four participants over the course of 38 days in their “musically rich early childhood special education classroom” (Frick, 2000, p. 15), where the researcher was also the instructor. Data were collected via audio and video recordings, field observations, and parent interviews. She also reviewed IEP goals and her own lesson plans, which were based on the IEP goals. “Looking at instructional goals helped me to formulated the description of the Support to Teaching data category” (p. 86). Frick found that creating a musically rich environment for her students caused an increase in their musical and
communicative responses, aided in transition times during the day, and added “a support to teaching” by reinforcing “information, . . . pre-academic skills, children’s individual goals, and concepts in instructional units” (p. 103). She also noted that using music as a communicative element in her classroom provided “a valuable means of socialization for children who were otherwise seldom communicative with their peers” (p. 109). In addition, she observed an increase of spontaneous music from her students. Overall, she found that introducing the High/Scope music and movement curriculum into her early childhood special education classroom had a positive effect by increasing musical, spoken, and non-verbal communicative behaviors, creating cues for transition, and transferring academic information. Her study also serves to inform mine in its structure, methodology, and its exploration of music and communication.

Further exploration into refereed journal articles revealed a study of the “performance of children with language impairments and their typically developing peers on . . . recognizing facial expressions of emotion and identifying musical expressions of emotion” (Spackman, Fujiki, Brinton, Nelson, & Allen, 2005, p. 132). In this inquiry, the authors compared the responses of 43 participants with language impairments who were matched to 43 typically developing peers, grouped by ages 5-8, 9-12. The children were asked to perform two different tasks. The first was to identify the emotions they associated with various facial expressions based on pictures shown to them by the researchers; the second was to identify the emotions associated with various pieces of classical music, tasks that “require minimal language” (p. 139). Their findings, that “language and emotion understanding cannot be viewed as independent of one another” (p. 142), inform the field of speech-language pathology about the ability to express “emotion understanding in children with LI, . . . also to determine intervention methods
that will help these children enhance both their language ability and their understanding of various expressions of emotion” (p. 142).

Although there seems to be a scarcity of literature within the broad topics of music and language or communication disorders, more exploration has been done within the specific diagnoses.

*Dyslexia*

Overy, Nicolson, Fawcett, and Clarke state that the major theories regarding dyslexic phonological difficulties agree that “timing skills, and particularly rapid timing skills (and to some extent motor timing skills) are a fundamental problem area in dyslexia” (Overy, Nicolson, Fawcett, & Clarke, 2003, p. 19). This group of researchers, therefore, created a Musical Aptitude Test for use with this population of special learners, in an attempt to determine the extent of “dyslexic children’s difficulties with musical timing…in order to identify whether there is a particular area in which music remediation should concentrate” (Overy, et al., 2003, p. 20). The data supported the claims that “dyslexic children can experience difficulties with musical timing skills” (p. 33). Other notable findings included a small number of children “who experienced severe difficulties on a test of rapid temporal processing” (p. 33), leading the researchers to encourage further inquiry into this occurrence with a larger number of dyslexic children. Additionally, a correlation was found “between spelling ability and the skill of tapping out the rhythm of a song, both of which rely to some extent on phonological segmentation skills” (Overy, et al., 2003, p. 19).

*Hearing impairments with assistive devices*

Approximately 30% of the students at the DuBard School for Language Disorders are hearing impaired and use assistive hearing devices such as cochlear implants or
hearing aids. These students benefit from the specialized method of instruction offered at the school because of its focus on improvement in written and spoken language. “Since hearing impaired children lack the basic knowledge of linguistic communication and linguistic development, it is little wonder that they have . . . difficulties [with reading] . . . Hearing-impaired children do not have command of the oral language symbols. They have little or no symbol system to associate with the symbols of the written language” (DuBard & Martin, 2000, p. 13). The laboratory school focuses on written and oral language skills grounded in phonemes which are presented to the students as the Northampton Symbol system. These phonemic representations are based on the English spelling of phoneme sounds, creating “a relation between the language the child is being taught and that which he/she sees in its frequently written form. This provides an immediate application to the environment” (DuBard & Martin, 2000, p. 55).

The study of music with persons who use assistive hearing devices largely explores the ability to process musical stimuli, particularly pitch. Moore & Shannon (2009) assert that “[cochlear] implants are known to not provide the fine structure information required for harmonic pitch” (p. 689). Research in other areas of assisted hearing technology is ongoing, as mild to moderate hearing loss is often treated by behind-the-ear (BTE) hearing aids; however, the participant in this study who is hearing impaired has been implanted with a cochlear device. For this reason, research involving other types of devices will not be explored.

In a 2011 study, Arioz, Arda, & Tuncel introduced technological improvements for those with high-frequency hearing loss by manipulating amplification, compression, and transposition within the mechanism of the hearing aid, in order to better fit the needs of the individual user (Arioz, Arda, & Tuncel, 2011).
Another study of assisted hearing technology explores recognition of speech patterns and discrepancies in sung pitches by normally hearing and implanted individuals. Looi & Radford (2011) assert that “speech processing strategies used in the current generation of cochlear implants . . . provide little representation of individual harmonics, and do not adequately convey F0 [fundamental frequency] information, adversely affecting pitch perception” (p. 472). Their findings were largely inconclusive; however, they discovered that users of a cochlear implant device scored far lower on assessments of pitch perception, suggesting the need for improvement to the devices in that regard (Looi & Radford, 2011). Because technology in this field is constantly improving, this discussion of relevant literature will only cover the past five years.

A large part of research involving the effectiveness of cochlear implants is aimed at the evaluation of musical perception in participants of various ages. *The Appreciation of Music in Cochlear Implantees* (AMICI) test was developed to address this issue. Initial versions of the test were administered to adults with an average age of 57.4 years who were CI users with less than one year of experience, and to adults with normal hearing with an average age of 33.3 years. Findings revealed that “despite the complaint that CI users may assert to their clinicians, music does not appear to sound the same as noise as determined by this task” (Spitzer, Mancuso, & Cheng, 2008, p. 63). Participants classified various sounds as noise or music, and identified musical instruments, styles, and pieces through listening examples. A further search into literature regarding the ongoing use of AMICI revealed an additional study using a clinical test entitled “Predicting Music Enjoyment in Cochlear Implant Users” (Bradley, 2010). The author administered a battery of musical tests, including AMICI among others such as the Montreal Battery for Evaluation of Amusia, and the University of Washington Clinical
Assessment Of Music Perception. The author also asked participants to complete a musical background questionnaire. Again, tested subjects were of adult age with a mean of 60 years, compared to normal-hearing adults with a mean age of 31 years. Her results were largely inconclusive, and she asserts “that good predictors of musical enjoyment are still unidentified” (p. 18).

Other studies seek to evaluate children’s ability to recognize and produce melodic patterns. Scholarship in this area includes a series of studies in which children and adolescents with cochlear implants are evaluated based on their ability to recognize music from their favorite television shows or popular media (Nakata, et al., 2005; Vongpaisal, Trehub, & Schellenberg, 2006). The first study, which was conducted with Japanese children, evaluated their ability to identify familiar television theme songs and popular music. The participants, all of whom were congenitally deaf and had been implanted less than one year, listened to three different recordings of each song: the original version, the instrumental (karaoke), and a synthesized flute playing only the melody. Their findings showed that the children were able to recognize only the original version “that featured words and instrumental accompaniment (Nakata, et al., 2005, p. 31). In a replication of this study which took place in North America, children were asked to identify television theme songs popular in their culture. The cultural shift between studies addresses the issue of consistency of music within a children’s show. “In Japan . . . the theme songs of children’s programs typically change after 3-12 months” (Trehub, Schellenburg, & Nakata, 2008), which contrasts with the long term availability of popular recordings or theme songs from children’s TV programs in North America” (Vongpaisal, Trehub, & Schellenberg, 2009). This may account for the increased ability among the North American participants to identify the songs from the instrumental versions as well as the
original versions, due to the fact that they “probably had greater exposure to the target TV programs and accompanying music than did Japanese implant users, which may be the principal source of these performance differences” (p. 22). This body of research informs the understanding of the limitations of music perception within the community of those who have cochlear implants. Because of the design of the study, researchers concluded that musical timing precludes melodic contour in the implanted participants’ recognition of the music.

Further research into the melodic processing of musical material includes a 2009 investigation of the development of singing skills in children with cochlear implants who were prelingually deafened. Because cochlear implants are designed to maximize users’ perceptions of speech patterns (Nakata, et al., 2005), “music perception in cochlear implant recipients typically show deficient performance in pitch-related tasks” (Xu, et al., 2009, p. 129). Participants in this study were 7 prelingually-deafened children between the ages of 5.4 and 12.3 years who were compared to a control group of 14 normal-hearing children, ages 4.1 – 8. The study was conducted individually, with each child asked to sing a song of his or her choice. While the results of the study showed “that the children with cochlear implants showed significantly poorer performance than the normal-hearing children on almost all pitch-based assessments of singing, . . . the rhythm-based measure . . . revealed no differences between the two groups” (Xu, et al., 2009, p. 133). This study was limited in size, and did not control for other factors, identified by the authors as “chronological age, duration of implant use, nonverbal intelligence, gender, age at implantation, or educational settings” (Xu, et al., 2009, p. 134).
Other scholars have explored the enjoyment and participation of implanted children in musical activities. In one such inquiry, parents of children with cochlear implants were given a questionnaire to determine the extent of the child’s musical background and current involvement. The age range of the children was ages 4-20, with a mean age of 11. Results of the questionnaire showed that many of the children were involved in musical instruction at some point in their lives, and that they seemed more interested in music post-implant. The authors also noted responses that indicated personal preference toward familiar songs, factors which elicit positive responses to music, such as a quiet environment and high quality sound equipment. This study informs the field of music education with regards to best practices in providing improved instruction for children with cochlear implants (Gfeller, Witt, Spencer, Stordahl, & Tomblin, 1999).

A more recent multiple case study of three prelingually deafened children with cochlear implants in a preschool setting investigated participants’ musical, social, and emotional responses during musical activities. Qualitative research methods were used, including videotaped observations and field notes, and findings were organized by musical responses, including singing, movement, and playing instruments; social responses; and emotional responses. Each section contained a description of each child in the context of the objective, and a cross-case analysis was offered. Findings showed that the three children in this study responded in unique ways within the various categories. The authors assert that “teachers need to trust in the musical potential of children, modifying the design and musical content of lesson plans to meet the needs of their students” (Schraer-Joiner & Chen-Hafteck, 2009, p. 796). This study also addressed the length of time the child had been implanted, pointing out that “differences will exist for each child as a result of their experience with the cochlear implant” (p. 796).
A search of ProQuest for dissertations inquiring into the lived experiences of users of cochlear implants revealed only one study from the past five years, a longitudinal case study of a deaf woman. The researcher followed the woman for 19 years, from 12 months of age until she was 20 years old. Her findings revealed many factors which encompassed the lived experience of this young woman, including the support of friends and family and mentors combined with her own ambition (Getty, 2009).

However, going back three more years reveals a hermeneutic phenomenological study of three preschool children with cochlear implants in their educational setting, a preschool that had never before enrolled deaf children. The researcher is also one of the founders of the preschool, and through this study, she hopes to shed light on “what it means to have profoundly deaf children using a cochlear implant in a preschool setting” (Coulson, 2004, p. 22).

Autism

While autism spectrum disorders in and of themselves are not language disorders, “a primary indicator of ASD is behavioral language impairment with respect to social communication” (Russo, 2008, p. 3).

Shore asserts that “music has many benefits in working with learners on the autism spectrum. Music provides an alternative means of communication for those who are nonverbal, and for others it can help to organize verbal communication” (Shore, 2003). In addition, DeVito’s 2003 dissertation sought to

Enhance the quality of classroom instruction by better understanding the manner in which students with autism participate in music lessons. This study will assist music educators to better understand the communicative function of behaviors related to musical preference by students with autism. His findings inform the
educational community about effective strategies for including children with autism in the music classroom. (DeVito, 2003)

Additional research in the area of music and autism explores the effect music may have on the social and emotional responses of autistic individuals. Adolescent participants in one such study were asked to view animated videos, some of which had an accompanying musical soundtrack; the rest were silent (Bhatara, Quintin, Heaton, Fombonne, & Levitin, 2009). This study showed a discrepancy in appropriate responses between videos with a musical soundtrack and those without. In another study, children with autism and Down’s syndrome listened and responded to excerpts of orchestral music meant to convey particular emotions. Again, this study showed that “sensitivity to music’s connotations generalizes across categories of musical meaning, and that such sensitivity may be limited by verbal mental age rather than diagnostic category” (Heaton, Allen, Williams, Cummins, & Happé, 2008, p. 180).

Recent scholarship investigates the use of music as a didactic device with autistic children and adolescents (Simpson & Keen, 2010), as a neurological trigger for social skills and communication (Finnigan & Starr, 2010; Wan, Demaine, Zipse, Norton, & Schlaug, 2010), and neurological sensitivities to musical attributes (Heaton, 2003; Heaton, 2005; Heaton, Williams, Cummins, & Happé, 2007). In addition, the music therapy research community has studied various interventions for those within the autism spectrum (Wigram & Gold, 2006). Several of these studies pertain to social aspects of the child’s environment (Finnigan & Starr, 2010; Kern, 2007). Another body of research addresses improvisational music therapy (Jinah, Wigram, & Gold, 2009), which has “long been noted for its efficacy in engaging autistic children at their level and interest,
and helping them to develop spontaneous self-expression, emotional communication and social interaction” (Kim, Wigram, & Gold, 2008).

**Lived experiences of autistic children.**

While a great deal of research has explored the complexities of autism spectrum disorders, few studies attempt to describe lived experiences of autistic children in their own words, and no studies were found that explore the autistic child’s experience in the context of an elementary music classroom.

As increasing numbers of children are being diagnosed with autism (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011), educational scholars hope to uncover generalized attributes of these children which will lead to more effective interventions in order to better accommodate the special needs of students on the autism spectrum. Searches performed through Academic Search Premier and JSTOR using the terms “autism” and “lived experience” yielded only two results, both concerning the experience of the mother (Gill & Liamputtong, 2009) or the parents of autistic children (Farrugia, 2009). However, several dissertations from the past two years were found through a ProQuest search that examined the lived experiences of parents of children with ASD (Barclift, 2010; Beteta, 2009; Brace, 2009; Busillo-Aguayo, 2010; Heslip, 2009; Hill, 2009; Lendenmann, 2010; Markoulakis, 2009; Posavad, 2009; Reed, 2010). Likewise, substituting “autism” with “learning disabilities” returned no studies investigating children’s lived experiences. However, using the terms “children” and “lived experience” returned 189 results. Within this group were several studies of the lived experiences of parents with children who have chronic illnesses or learning disabilities, e.g. (Björk, Nordström, & Hallström, 2011; Gill & Liamputtong, 2009; Wennick & Hallström, 2007). Other studies were aimed at
children with chronic illnesses, such as epilepsy (Chen, Chen, Yang, & Chi, 2010) and end-stage renal disease (Nicholas, Picone, & Selkirk, 2011).

*Childhood Apraxia of Speech (CAS)*

In searches of Academic Search Premier, JSTOR, RILM, and ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, few articles were found concerning music and childhood apraxia of speech. Scholarship in this area explores deficits in timing or prosody of speech which mirror musical attributes of rhythm and pitch. One intervention that addresses this intersection is Melodic Intonation Therapy (MIT), developed in the 1970’s and used mainly with adult aphasics. However, children with childhood apraxia of speech also benefitted from the use of MIT.

The object of MIT is to sequence sounds and words taking advantage of the prosodic elements of speech: melodic line, tempo, rhythm, and stress. The verbal output is supported by intoning utterances; in song-like speech the tempo of phrases is slower than normal speech, the range of pitch variation is reduced, and rhythm and stress are exaggerated. (Martikainen & Korpilahti, 2011, p. 11)

Martikainen and Korpilahti (2011) explored the use of MIT in combination with the Touch Cue Method (TCM) through a case study of a 4.7 year old girl with childhood apraxia of speech (CAS). Over the course of six weeks, the participant received interventions in MIT and TCM, and was then evaluated as to the effectiveness of each treatment. The authors acknowledge that “the study was non-controlled and concerned only a single participant” (p. 18), and that more research is still needed.

Impaired prosody of speech is a primary marker of CAS, with deficiencies in timing as a major concern. A 2005 study of children with suspected CAS (sCAS) as they
engage in musical tasks such as singing and echoing rhythm patterns hoped to point to possible musical interventions for children with CAS (Beate & Stoel-Gammon, 2005).

In another study, timing skills were studied in children exhibiting childhood apraxia of speech in an attempt to reveal an association with a “central deficit in timing accuracy, observable in speech-related as well as in music-related tasks and in different types of timing measures” (Beate & Stoel-Gammon, 2008, p. 175).

Teacher and Student Perception of School Engagement

Much of the literature in the area of teacher expectations explores critical reflection on the part of the educator in the areas of race, ethnicity, gender, and disability. “Central to much of this work has been the idea that reflection gives attention to one’s experiences and behaviors, and meanings are made and interpreted from them to inform future decision-making” (Howard, 2003, p. 198). These studies have included not only practicing teachers, but pre-service teachers and teacher preparation as well.

A considerable body of research exists in the area of teachers’ expectations regarding academic outcomes according to race, ethnicity, and at-risk status. In one such study, a survey instrument was used by researchers in New Zealand asked what their expectations were in reference to reading achievement in Maori, Pacific Island, Asian, and New Zealand European students (Rubie-Davies, Hattie, & Hamilton, 2006). At the end of the school year, a second survey was administered that asked the teachers to identify the actual reading results for the school year. Researchers compared the two survey responses and found that teachers’ expectations were much higher than the actual results, and that Maori children made the least progress through the year.

In another study, investigators expectations of success based on student/teacher relationships in at-risk students (Muller, 2001). In this longitudinal inquiry, both students
and teachers were surveyed. Teachers responded to items concerning the “ability level of their mathematics classes and whether students were at risk of dropping out of high school” (Muller, 2001, p. 245). The student survey included questions related to the student/teacher relationship, including their perception of whether their teacher cares about them. In this study, findings show that teachers make judgments about student actions “in a context of the students’ previous work” (Muller, 2001, p. 248). Student achievement is reported throughout the study; students who report their perception that their teacher cares about them show a greater effort.

A similar study of students with learning disabilities and their teachers “compared students’ perceptions with their teachers’ judgments of their level of effort, strategy use, and academic performance” (Meltzer, Katzir-Cohen, Miller, & Roditi, 2001, p. 85) in various academic subjects. Results showed that while student responses of those with learning disabilities revealed a positive sense of self and high expectations for their academic success, their teachers expected more negative results. However, teacher responses regarding students without learning disabilities showed higher academic expectations.

Parent Perception of Student Engagement in School

An exploration of literature regarding direct observation by parents of their child’s engagement in school uncovered one article published in this area. This study involved observations of video recordings that were edited by the researchers to show particular instances of engagement in the students’ classroom. Parents provided feedback in the form of an observational feedback instrument. Researchers reported “many positive outcomes from this videotaping project” (Hundt, 2002, p. 41), including a better parental understanding of activities the child experiences in school and the material covered in
parent-teacher conferences, an increase in student attendance by those involved in the study, and information about child engagement outside of the context of the home environment. Challenges addressed in the article included scheduling, funding, and time consumed with editing.

**Orff Schulwerk and Special Learners**

Scholarly inquiries into existing literature regarding Orff Schulwerk contain very little reference to special learners. In her doctoral dissertation, Corrine Smith (1981) examined the self concept of children who were instructed over a period of a few weeks, using a pre- and post-test method with an experimental group who was given Orff-based music instruction and a control group who experienced traditional music education methods. Another study explored the cognitive responses of students who were instructed in an Orff-based music classroom, again with a pre- and post-test model of investigation (Persellin, 1999). These studies seem to be the most applicable to the special learner in the Orff classroom; however, they were the only studies in this area that were found.

**The DuBard Association Method®**

Very few refereed journal articles exist regarding the use of the DuBard Association Method; only two were found within the last 10 years, and none that addressed music-related topics. The first, a case study of an 18-year-old man with autism, describes his communication issues and the various interventions employed by the private school that he attended. Academic time during the day included “language components from the Association Method . . . to increase verbal communication,” which was provided by speech and language pathologists in collaboration with classroom teachers in order to address his “specific needs and learning process” (Shoener, Kinnealey, & Koenig, 2010, p. 550). The second article provides an overview of the
DuBard Association Method®, including its history, defining characteristics, and descriptions of the three schools in which it has been implemented. Also discussed are various diagnoses for which the DuBard Association Method® is an appropriate intervention (Sullivan & Perigoe, 2004).

Four schools in the United States currently use the DuBard Association Method® as a primary intervention for children with language disorders. Of the four schools, three offer music instruction during the school day. Of these, one is the DuBard School for Language Disorders, where this study took place. Another is the ACCESS Group in Little Rock, Arkansas. According to its web site, success at the school is attributed in part to enrichment experiences including “music, art, drama, and technology” (Access Group, Inc., 2011). Likewise, the web site for the Magnolia Speech School in Jackson, Mississippi states that “computer instruction, physical education, and music are provided to every child.” The web site for the TALK Institute and School in Newtown Square, PA does not list music as one of its offerings.

Summary

The intersection of music and language has been widely explored in the fields of neurology/cognitive sciences, anthropology, and ethnomusicology, among others. Although some debate exists regarding which evolved from the other, it seems empirically clear that there are fundamental parallels between the two: for example, timing (rhythm) and pitch (frequency). Therefore, music educators and music therapists have found creative and beneficial ways to use music to enhance and improve language skills.

An exploration of the literature regarding music and the four major diagnoses found at the DuBard School for Language Disorders reveals numerous writings in the
areas of autism, assisted hearing devices (largely cochlear implants), and dyslexia. These studies come from many different disciplines and cover topics such as music therapy, enjoyment of music, benefits of singing, and perception of music. However, in the area of childhood apraxia of speech, little research was found.

Of the articles reviewed, most are focused on either attributes of children who have diagnoses which place them in the area of special education or the education of these children from a practitioner perspective. Research into the social context of the music classroom from the perspective of the special learner is scarce. In the Orff Schulwerk music classroom, it was not found; however, one study in this area explored the effect of Orff processes on self-concept in students with learning disabilities (Barker, 1981).

Implications

In examining the vast body of research already undertaken by scholars in the areas of music education, music therapy, musicology, anthropology, neuroscience, speech-language pathology, I found that examinations of autism, dyslexia, and cochlear implant users had many ties to music and its effective practices by the individual with the disorder. However, the piece that seems to be lacking is the child’s point of view. Teachers and parents have been studied from a qualitative standpoint, but a gap exists where the child’s voice should be. The aim of this study is to adequately portray the lived experiences of a few students with language disorders within the context of the music classes taught at the DuBard School for Language Disorders.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The focus of this study was student engagement in music classes through the lens of four students with language disorders enrolled in The DuBard School for Language Disorders, from the perspective of the primary participants (the students) and secondary participants (practitioner researcher, teachers, and parents). A phenomenological approach provided the underpinnings for this study, in hopes of uncovering the lived experiences of these students. The input of their teachers as secondary participants was included to further illuminate the meaning behind their responses in interviews, video stimulated recall, observed behaviors, and artifacts. Collaboration with other adults who have frequent personal contact with each child not only provided a different point of view, but also added trustworthiness to the inferences drawn at the conclusion of this study.

The primary research questions developed for this inquiry were: (1) What are the lived experiences of music students with language disorders in the setting of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom; (2) How do music students with language disorders interpret their own actions in the music classroom; and (3) What, if any, discrepancies exist between teacher and student interpretations of student engagement in the music classroom?

Preliminary Studies

Two separate pilot case studies informed the methodological framework for this inquiry. The first was a multiple case study involving pre-service teachers in the first semester of classes toward their music education degree. The participants were chosen
based on their enrollment in a class entitled Music Major Success. A major component of the class was a series of reflective writing assignments that were based on philosophical, ethical, and practical issues in teaching, as well as observations of in-service music educators in different grade levels and ensemble types. These writings were collected as artifacts and analyzed next to field notes and interview transcriptions. Participants were interviewed two times and observed in class. This study was executed by a research team, each of whom was responsible for collecting data on one participant. My participant, who for the purpose of the study was named Marie, was a freshman trombone player from a small town approximately 90 miles north of the university’s campus.

The results of this case study yielded several emergent themes, which were then compared with case studies conducted by other members of the research team. The process of cross-case comparison provided additional depth to the data collected by the team of researchers, leading to the decision to similarly investigate a few select students enrolled in the DuBard School (Appendix B).

The second inquiry was a single case study completed over the course of 5 weeks using a music student at the DuBard School who has been diagnosed with an autism spectrum disorder. This inquiry most closely resembles a traditional pilot study, investigating the actions of the student in the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom, with the researcher as practitioner. The methods of data collection used in this study included common qualitative techniques such as recordings of music classes, one-on-one interviews, solicitation of student-generated artwork, and stimulated recall. This experience generated new ideas for data collection with students who have language disorders, such as using descriptive word cards, focus groups, and unstructured time engaging in the music space (Appendix C).
The data from both preliminary studies were examined using NVivo 9 software, which increases the trustworthiness of the findings by organizing documents, storing other media such as videos, recordings, and scanned artwork, and aiding the researcher in locating frequently used words and phrases. In addition, NVivo 9 provides the researcher with a centralized location for data, therefore increasing the efficiency of data analysis.

Theoretical Framework

*Phenomenology*

Given the nature of the research questions posed by this study and the methods chosen for data collection, a hermeneutical phenomenological approach best fit the purpose of this inquiry:

Phenomenology because it is the descriptive study of lived experience (phenomena) in the attempt to enrich lived experience by mining its meaning, hermeneutics because it is the interpretive study of the expressions and objectifications (texts) of lived experience in the attempt to determine the meaning embodied in them. (van Manan, 1990, p. 38)

Through research strategies drawn from ethnography, such as interviews, observations, and stimulated recall from student and teacher participants, this study aimed to accurately convey meaning behind the choices students with language disorders made when engaging in music class, as well as possible discrepancies between student and teacher perceptions.

*Lived Experiences*

The aim of phenomenology is to transform lived experience into a textual expression of its essence - in such a way that the effect of the text is at once a
reflexive re-living and a reflective appropriation of something meaningful. (van Manan, 1990, p. 36)

By looking at the lived experiences of a few select students in their music class at the DuBard School for Language Disorders, this study aimed to discover universality to the phenomena of music making through the eyes of not only the student, but also the classroom teacher and the practitioner/researcher. A comparison of responses provided a deeper understanding of how music students with language disorders make meaning of their role in the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom.

**Methodological Framework**

*Practitioner Research*

Participants’ actions in their Orff Schulwerk music classes were documented by the practitioner/researcher, drawing on ethnographic methods that went beyond the phenomenological long interview (Moustakas, 1994). This allowed the child with a language disorder different ways of expressing his or her perspective with the hope of uncovering a deeper meaning within the lived experience of that participant.

“Ethnography provides the opportunity to explore actions in their wider context and thus to describe the real-world complexity of human behavior” (Anderson-Levitt, 2006, p. 282). These methods typically include observation, open-ended interviews, and collection of artifacts (Anderson-Levitt, 2006).

*Multiple Case Study Methods*

The average number of diagnoses per child at the DuBard School for Language Disorders was approximately five, and may have included: attention deficit hyperactive disorder, autism, obsessive compulsive disorder, seizure disorder, dyslexia, apraxia, hearing impairment, among others. The language disorder that qualified them for
enrollment in the school became the common thread between students; however, each of
the major language disorders present in the student body carried its own set of unique
issues. Borman, Clarke, Cotner, & Lee (2006) assert, “Multiple cases allow for greater
opportunity to generalize across several representations of the phenomenon” (p. 123).
Using this methodology, this study sought “a better understanding, and perhaps better
theorizing, about a still larger collection of cases” (Stake, 2005, p. 447).

As Yin (2006) asserted, “The case study method helps you to make direct
observations and collect data in natural settings, compared to relying on ‘derived’ data”
(p.112). This study was informed by previous scholarship regarding the lived experiences
of children, specifically in the context of education. One such study examined the lives of
children who sojourned between Japan and the United States during the school year.
Using the theoretical framework of grounded theory from a constructivist point of view,
the researcher used qualitative data collection methods with the students such as
interviews, solicited art work, and observations. In addition, interviews were conducted
with parents and teachers in order to “portray different dimensions of children’s
sojourning experiences which could be revealed only by their classroom teachers, who
interact with them daily at school, and their parents, who knew them in a home
environment” (Koga, 2009, p. 83).

A 2010 dissertation by Martin-McCoy studied African American students at a
military school in hopes of addressing the higher academic achievement of these students
over African American students in public schools. The purpose of this phenomenological
study was to describe the “academic and social experiences of African American students
in military sponsored schools and . . . [to capture] the essence of these students’ lived
experiences” (Martin-McCoy, 2010, p. 71). Drawing from ethnographic traditions such as


interviews, focus groups, observations, and reflective writing, the researcher explored the lived experiences of these students. Credibility was achieved through triangulation of data through these multiple data sources. The author asserts that “the unique strength of this study is that it provides an examination of schools from the student perspective. Many studies that focus on elementary and secondary education give the vantage point of the teachers . . . within the school setting” (Martin-McCoy, 2010, p. 89).

Research Strategies

The goal of this inquiry was to unveil the lived experiences of the participants as they were conveyed through the various forms of data. Additionally, I hoped that a relationship would be discovered between the students’ perception of their actions in music class and the reactions of the parent and teacher in order to identify salient themes and reveal any discrepancies. Keeping in mind the theoretical underpinnings of phenomenology, I used ethnographic methods such as observation, interviews, stimulated recall, and student generated artwork to collect data from primary and secondary participants.

Many of the dissertations found regarding music and the lived experiences of participants in the music classroom were focused on the teacher rather than the students; however, some were student-based. In one such study, kindergarten classrooms that included music as part of daily instruction were studied in regards to the lived experiences of the teachers and the students. Through qualitative research methods, the researcher examined “when, how and why these teachers used music as well as how music played a role in the everyday life of the classroom” (Boyer-Wells, 2006, p. 65). An in-depth inquiry into the “background, past experiences and beliefs about music in kindergarten” of the two teachers, as well as informal interaction with the students,
sought to explore the “perspectives and worldviews of the kindergarten teachers and students” (p. 66). Though this study did not center on the lived experiences of the students, the voice of the students is deemed worthy of inclusion within the scope of the data. Boyer-Wells (2006) asserts, “Students and their involvement in the singing activities of the classroom formed an important part of the context of the classroom and of the triadic relationship between teacher, students, and classroom experience” (p. 100).

Another study explored the lived experience of students in a classroom using the Comprehensive Musicianship through Performance (CMP) model in ensemble settings. “CMP . . . is a planned process to guide instruction in cognitive, affective, and skill development for students in performing ensembles” (Sindberg, 2006, p. iii). This study’s relevance was found in its exploration of a specific pedagogical methodology, much as the classes at the DuBard School were framed in Orff Schulwerk; however, this study examined the specifics of the methodology, how it was implemented, and the perceptions of the students and teachers within the working framework of the CMP model. Elements examined included, but were not limited to, teacher planning, instruction within the model, transfer of knowledge, student insight into the music, and alignment of student and teacher expectations (Sindberg, 2006). Another example of a phenomenological study centering on a particular pedagogical technique explored the lived experiences of music teachers who implemented the Composers Suitcase® music curriculum. The researcher identified emergent themes that described the impact of curricular focus on positive outcomes (Banfield, 2003).

The lived experiences of students in a music education setting were also explored in a practitioner research study in which the author implemented a “working curriculum around the life and cultural representation of Tupac Shakur as a hip-hop text” (Prier,
The author asserted that this “helped them make sense of their own identities in relationship to their everyday lived experiences in schools and larger society,” with the aim of using hip-hop culture within urban school settings to create “progressive learning experiences for Black male youth that can be negotiated between schools and the community” (Prier, 2009, p. 3).

Other studies in the context of the music classroom examined the lived experiences of the teachers. One such dissertation focused on elementary general music teachers who were also active musicians. Using a grounded theory approach, the researcher examined data collected through common phenomenological methods such as interviews and observations over a three-month period. (Bernard, 2004). Several focused on pedagogical practices at various levels, including those of elementary teachers (Carlos, 2005; Dlouhy-Stevenson, 2007); high school band directors (Lamkin, 2003); high school jazz band (Goodrich, 2005); and lived experience of an elementary music teacher (Chen, 2000).

Selection of Site

The DuBard School for Language Disorders is located on the campus of The University of Southern Mississippi in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. Because of its affiliation with the university and the researcher’s position as music teacher at the school, this site was easily accessed through the IRB process.

The administration at the DuBard School consented to the inquiry. Student permission was obtained through consent forms signed by the parents and the child. The children’s teachers, as secondary participants, also completed a consent form.

The DuBard School is a unique alternative instructional setting that serves 80 full-time students. The building itself is a self-contained facility that is approximately six
years old. Two long parallel hallways stretch almost the entire length of the building. The eight classrooms are found on the north hallway, each housing a teacher, assistant, and up to ten children. The waiting list for this school is very long, so the classes are almost always at capacity. Pale green carpeting on the floors and walls mask footsteps and absorb sound, maintaining an environment with minimal aural distractions. Student work hangs on the walls outside the classroom in neat rows, but does not pervade the space. Visual distractions are also kept to a minimum throughout the school in an effort to keep the children focused during the day.

Stepping into a classroom, one is likely to see several of the reinforcement activities prescribed by the DuBard Association Method® happening at once. Some students may be sitting at desks working individually on writing activities, while some are at the chalkboard involved in small group work. Others might be working one-on-one with a peer, teacher, or volunteer. Teachers and assistants quietly facilitate these activities, and although many different things are happening, the room seems orderly and controlled.

In contrast, the physical environment of a typical elementary school is garish, with brightly colored art displays in the hallways and classrooms, tiled floors, and painted walls with little attention to acoustics. Hundreds of students occupy the building, creating at times raucous ambient noise throughout the school campus. For the children at DuBard, these visual and aural distractions are thought to inhibit learning.

Context

The DuBard School

The DuBard School for Language Disorders was founded in 1962 and serves students who have been diagnosed with some type of severe language disorder, which
may include dyslexia, apraxia, or language disorders associated with autism or hearing impairment. Teachers include “nationally certified speech-language pathologists and teachers of the deaf. In addition, some hold certification in learning disabilities and reading, as well as elementary education and school administration” (DuBard & Martin, 2000). Teachers and staff are trained in the DuBard Association Method®, an intensive instructional methodology developed specifically for improving linguistic skills of children with language disorders. Students are identified for the program based on formal assessments such as the Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language, the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals, and informal observations. The school’s curriculum strictly adheres to The DuBard Association Method®, which uses a very precise sequence of learning that progresses at an individual student’s readiness level. Instruction is prescribed by decades of experience developing this method.

In the fall of 2009, the DuBard School and The University of Southern Mississippi School of Music partnered to create a graduate assistantship for a music educator trained in Orff Schulwerk pedagogical practices. The administrators in both programs who created this graduate assistantship were of the opinion that a music program would serve to enhance the overall scope of the DuBard School curricular offerings. “It is the experiences that we provide to our students in the form of education and cultural access that enhance that potentiality. It is the pedagogical environments that we create that influence achievement” (Selden, 1999, p. 142). As the first music teacher to assume this position, I had the privilege of introducing many of these students to musical concepts including singing, moving, and playing instruments.
Orff Schulwerk

Carl Orff felt that music and movement are inherent in children. The Orff Schulwerk method is based on the concept of “elemental music”, that is, the primitive need we have to create and experience music through rhythm, chant, movement, and song. Nowhere is this need more apparent than in young children, whose impulsive musical play includes made-up songs and chants, rhythmic playground games, and spontaneous movement responses to music.

What, then, is elemental music? Never music alone, but music connected with movement, dance, and speech, not to be listened to, meaningful only in active participation. Elemental music is pre-intellectual, it lacks great form, it contents itself with simple sequential structures, ostinatos, and miniature rondos. It is earthy, natural, almost a physical activity. It can be learned and enjoyed by anyone. It is fitting for children. (Orff, 1977)

The belief that the rhythm of language provides a solid foundation for musical experience drove Orff to explore the use of literature and poetry in the development of his musical ideas. For example, by using simplistic settings of children’s poetry for creative purposes, Orff exploits language as an important inspiration for musical discovery (Frazee & Kreuter, 1987).

The use of melodic and rhythmic speech patterns in the Orff Schulwerk method is one of the primary means of teaching musical ideas. The selection of this material is carefully aligned with the objective to be taught (Keller, 1963). Teachers of the Schulwerk may use singular words spoken rhythmically to highlight the duration of a note or pattern, or they may select a poem that becomes a rhythmic chant (Goodkin,
The degree of flexibility is limited only by the creativity of the teacher and students.

**Similarities Between Orff Schulwerk and the DuBard Association Method®**

A comparison of major components found in the Orff Schulwerk and in the DuBard Association Method reveal several similarities (see Table 1).

**Table 1**

*Similarities between Orff Schulwerk and the DuBard Association Method®*

1. Sequence of learning
2. Distinctive components of lesson composition
3. Teacher training
4. Repetition and recall
5. Multisensory elements

**Sequence of learning.**

Musical concepts addressed by Orff Schulwerk pedagogy are taught in a sequence that allows the learner to feel success throughout the lesson. Instructors lay a foundation using a simple beat, song, or rhythm pattern that is accessible to all students. The teacher can then evaluate readiness to include the next component, which typically adds on to the previously learned material. As each layer is added, students who are not at ease with the progression can continue at a simpler level.

Likewise, the DuBard Association Method® begins at the smallest meaningful level of sound, the phoneme. Students first work on phoneme recognition and production. When mastery of these sounds is achieved, syllables are introduced and reinforced. This stage is followed by nouns, sentences with questions, and increasingly complex
sentence/questions which eventually become stories. The student progresses according to mastery of a skill; there are specific guidelines for their advancement.

Distinctive Components / Teacher Training.

The DuBard School utilizes unique tutorial elements to reinforce each concept, listed previously in more detail. Because the structure of the program is prescribed, it is important for teachers to be well educated and prepared. The teachers at the DuBard School are certified in the DuBard Association Method®; a process that requires intensive training by highly qualified instructors (DuBard School for Language Disorders, 2012).

The pedagogical components in the typical Orff Schulwerk lesson are also the result of intensive training. Teachers of the Schulwerk can participate in three levels of training and additional advanced classes on more specific topics, such as curriculum or movement. The training levels are designed for music teachers who wish to focus their curriculum around the premises of the Schulwerk; therefore, the features of the method are reinforced, such as improvisation, movement, tonality, rhythmic structure, and structure of the finished musical product. These have been described in greater detail previously, but it should be noted that although these musical skills are taught outside of the Schulwerk, the process of teaching them is unique to the method (American Orff-Schulwerk Association, 2012).

Repetition and Recall

Children with language disorders have difficulty in other cognitive areas such as memory, comprehension, prediction, sequencing, and predictability. Because of these limitations, it is very important that their learning environment include a great deal of repetition and recall. The DuBard School operates on an 11 month calendar to improve
retention over short breaks. Using a variety of structured activities, students receive ample opportunities for precision and mastery of language skills while maintaining an engaging atmosphere in the classroom (DuBard School for Language Disorders, 2012).

Orff Schulwerk educators frequently use repetition and recall as pedagogical tools. Students rehearse difficult sections in repetition in order to achieve mastery. In an ensemble situation, the group learns to perform in synchrony with each other utilizing group practice techniques. The use of ostinato as a foundation, then layering other patterns around it to create a performance is a typical use of repetition in the Schulwerk. The idea behind this is to create a sense of security for the student learner who is able to achieve automaticity of his part of the performance (Frazee & Kreuter, 1987).

**Multisensory Approach.**

Teachers of the DuBard Association Method® employ a multisensory approach to learning, recognizing that “the systems/avenues for learning utilized by the human being are interrelated; they do not function for maximum learning as independent phenomena” (Martin, 2012, p. 20). In doing so, they begin to associate the mechanics of proper speech with the actual written word. Students pay particular attention to the movement of their lips, tongue and air as they speak. Cursive writing is employed to visually and kinesthetically differentiate between words. Pictures are used as visual cues, and physical production of sound provides an aural and kinesthetic element. Activities used by teachers of the DuBard Association Method® are carefully structured so that the multisensory components happen simultaneously, according to the guidelines of the International Multisensory Structured Language Education Council (DuBard School for Language Disorders, 2008).
The Orff Schulwerk approaches musical learning as a combination of movement, speech, rote learning, and instrument playing to create a final product. On a smaller scale, Orff participants use body percussion (tactile), handheld instruments and mallet instruments (kinesthetic), rote learning (aural), and movement (kinesthetic, tactile). Students visually experience movements associated with instrumental performance, such as mallet and hand movements when playing some percussion instruments. Musical notation and graphic organizers also provide visual cues. Incorporation of speech and singing is central to the methodology. Students must also employ listening skills: as individuals critiquing their own performance, as participants in an ensemble who must listen in order to stay together, and as critical listeners to the performances of others.

Differences between the Orff Schulwerk Method and the DuBard Association Method®

The Orff Schulwerk method and the DuBard Association Method® differ in certain key areas as well (see Table 2).

Table 2

*Differences between the Orff Schulwerk method and the DuBard Association Method®*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orff Schulwerk</th>
<th>DuBard Association Method ®</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student-directed; teacher as guide</td>
<td>Teacher-directed at the student’s rate of mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Loosely structured; large-group instruction</td>
<td>Strict structure; individual or small group instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Centralization of student involvement is a major difference between the two approaches to learning. The DuBard Association Method® is very individualized and teacher-directed; the Schulwerk provides the students an opportunity to influence the direction of the music class. Although the music teacher is guiding the process, the students’ input becomes the impetus for decisions regarding the outcome. Thus, mastery is a secondary goal; the primary goal being the successful musical experience.

Teachers of the DuBard Association Method® are focused on ensuring the progress of each student in their classrooms; they keep very accurate and detailed data on a daily basis. Schulwerk teachers are also concerned with assessment; however, it is largely observational and its purpose is to evaluate the curricular progression of the group. Individuals who are struggling musically are accommodated through immediate intervention; for instance, a simpler musical part or a role in the movement component (DuBard & Martin, 2000; Frazee, 2006).
Complementary characteristics

The individual needs of the language impaired child align very well with concepts taught in the Orff Schulwerk classroom. Children with language disorders are identified as having the following limitations:

- Perception – the child has trouble processing language at its normal temporal rate.
- Memory – not enough short-term memory is available for effective communication
- Comprehension/Discrimination – difficulty visually processing words and understanding meanings of words
- Sequencing – difficulty putting items in order
- Predictability – cannot reliably guess what will happen next
- Associative skills – not able to relate a written word or idea to its meaning

(Martin, 2012)

Musical learning and perception involves all of these skills. Students use rhythmic speech through chant and song, and the vocal material is taught by rote in many instances. Through dramatization, the content of these poems, songs, and chants can be better understood. Many songs and chants may also contain unfamiliar words or unusual phrasing, exposing children to new ways of using language. Folk dances provide students opportunities to experience musical form, which addresses sequencing and predictability aurally and physically.

The DuBard School for Language Disorders and The University of Southern Mississippi provide a wide variety of pitched and unpitched percussion instruments for use in the music classes. Xylophones, metallophones, and glockenspiels have removable
bars, allowing the instructor to configure them for the students’ success. For instance, if a child is playing the steady beat on the “c” bar, all the others can be removed. When improvising, dissonant bars can be removed to create a pentatonic scale, providing a pleasing sound no matter what bars are struck.

Selection of Participants

Purposeful sampling of maximum variation (Creswell, 2007) from students enrolled as full-time students at the DuBard School for the 2011-2012 school year allows an exploration of the “widest possible range of the characteristics of interest for the study” (Merriam, 2009, p. 79), namely, the various major diagnoses represented within the school. Four to six students with diagnoses including autism, dyslexia, hearing impairment, and apraxia, who can clearly articulate and are willing to participate were selected. An additional parameter was the willingness of the classroom teachers to collaborate with the researcher as participants (van Manan, 1990).

Data Collection Methods

Data were collected from students and teachers through observations, video stimulated recall sessions, field journals, and interviews over the course of 6 months. Each participant participated in four 20-minute interview sessions. These sessions consisted of both verbal and nonverbal tasks, including drawing (student participants only), video stimulated recall, and semi-structured interviews. Students also participated as a group in two 20-minute focus group sessions. Teachers were shown the same excerpts from music class as each student, and then were asked to give responses to the student’s demonstrated behavior.
Observation

Observations were conducted through video recordings. As Erickson (2006) states, “Fine-grained information about the actual conduct of social interaction comes best from making audiovisual recordings of it from which either detailed transcriptions of the interaction can be prepared and analyzed or careful moment-by-moment coding can be done” (Erickson, 2006, p. 177). In addition to the researcher reviewing the recording, the students and their teachers were asked to view and reflect on relevant or intriguing excerpts from the class sessions. This variety of perspectives regarding specific events was a critical element to the triangulation and analysis of data.

Students were also observed in their regular classroom and in less formal settings such as lunch and recess. A reflective journal was maintained of teacher “experiences, observations, questions, and interpretations” that were then compared with other sources of data in hopes of producing a “more richly detailed and complex analyses of teaching and learning than those available to outside researchers” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, p. 511).

Video-Stimulated Recall

Allowing the participant to view and respond to their own actions on video gave the researcher additional insight into “diverse motivations, understandings, and strategies engaged by people who participate in a particular community or activity” (Dempsey, 2010, p. 353). Because of characteristically poor memory in children with language disorders coupled with the inability to interview participants immediately after music class due to school dismissal time, stimulated recall was a valuable technique for garnering reactions to the events of a given music class. As an additional advantage, the
researcher could focus on the phenomena occurring in the class in a way that was not possible as the teacher of the class.

This technique was also used in the pilot study conducted as a single case study in the spring of 2011. The participant was shown video excerpts from his music class chosen by the practitioner researcher.

*Interviews*

Data collection also involved participants’ responses to open-ended questions in semi-structured interviews. An adaptation of the interview procedures in the 2004 study by Owen, et.al will involve not only traditional questioning, but presentation of objects such as instruments used in music class, pictures and videos meant to prompt a response. Participants in this study were described as children who took part in speech-language pathology programs in their school setting. Each child participant was interviewed by his or her speech language therapist. These sessions consisted of semi-structured interview questions centered around familiar objects such as toys and books, and pictures of children in various environmental settings such as at home or on a playground. The purpose was “to elicit children’s descriptions, feelings and views about their experience of therapy and communication” (Owen, Hayett, & Roulstone, 2004, p. 60). Because of limitations which may be present due to receptive and/or receptive language disorders, interviews with student participants must be carefully planned yet remain flexible.

The interview questions evolved as the study progressed; each session had a particular focus. The first interview session with primary participants was structured as an icebreaker, giving them the task of drawing a picture of music class, then eliciting responses from video excerpts taken from music class. In the second interview, questions were focused toward their social behavior in music class; excerpts were chosen based on
peer interaction observed in the videos taken from music class. In the third interview, I questioned students and teachers about the musical concept addressed by asking questions such as:

- What we were doing?
- What were we learning?
- How did you feel during that activity?
- What did you like about that activity?

The fourth interview was similar to the third, with additional focus on questions that arose through preliminary examination of data collected from the first three interviews. These questions were specific to the participant as I sought clarification of previous statements.

*Student Generated Artwork.*

In addition, students were asked to generate drawings, using prompts such as “Can you draw a picture of our music class?” “Can you draw a picture of yourself in music class?” or “Can you draw a picture of your favorite instrument?” Students were given the opportunity to respond to their artwork verbally.

Eliciting student artwork provides children with difficulty communicating an additional avenue for nonverbal expression. With the drawing in hand, the researcher can formulate pointed questions for clarification in a follow-up interview. “Children, just as adults do, use representation to express an emotion, idea, or experience in creative, playful, or abstract ways” (Freeman & Mathison, 2009, p. 113).

*Participation in focus groups*

“Interviewing children in groups may also reduce the researcher’s power within the research context, because the presence of peers will typically take precedence over
the presence of the researcher” (Freeman & Mathison, 2009, p. 88). Participants met as a group twice during data collection: Once following the winter culminating concert to view a video of the performance and discuss/react, and a second time during the study to have unstructured use of instruments and other implements of music class, such as scarves and manipulatives, during which students were videotaped and observed in their interactions with each other and their actions within the setting. Directions were given regarding personal safety and proper treatment of the musical instruments. Each session lasted 20 minutes.

In addition, the teacher of each child was asked to provide feedback on video recordings made during music class, using the same videos shown to individual students. These videos included excerpts from their music classes which display phenomena of interest to the researcher, such as direct and indirect engagement in assigned activities, accurate and inaccurate musical execution, social behavior, and societal behavior.

Data Analysis

Data were organized using NVivo 9 software. Using this technology, participant responses were safely stored, organized, and analyzed for salient themes. This software was helpful in pinpointing words and phrases used by each participant by using word frequency, text, and node query searches. Codes were assigned to items of significance in order to determine emergent themes. Confidentiality and privacy was maintained through use of password protection.

Limitations

The phenomenological researcher must be aware of the concept of epoche, in which “we set aside our prejudgments, biases, and preconceived ideas about things” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 85). This is no easy task in practitioner research, given the degree of
familiarity a teacher has with the school, students, and fellow teachers. Moustakas (1994) asserts, “The challenge of the epoche is to be transparent to ourselves, to allow whatever is before us in consciousness to disclose itself so that we may see with new eyes in a naïve and completely open manner” (p. 86). He goes on to suggest that he approaches epoche as a process that “requires unusual, sustained attention, concentration, and presence.”

As the teacher of these students, I found it difficult to separate myself from the familiar surroundings of the school, my acquaintance with the students, and my own pedagogical undertakings. However, when observing the video recordings of classes, I realized that while the dynamics of each class and of the more outgoing or assertive students, I had not developed a close relationship with the individual participants. Therefore, focusing on them separately while watching the videos allowed me a sense of unfamiliarity with their actions, allowing me to ‘transcend the self’ (Huberman, 1996, p. 126).

After three years of teaching the students at the DuBard School, I am accustomed to slowing down my rate of speech and raising the volume of my voice in order to be better understood. In addition, because many of the students have been in my classes for the entire three years, and it is a small school, I have become familiar with their speech patterns. However, because these students have severe language disorders, their verbal responses seemed to be the weakest contribution to the data set. In their 2004 study, which involved interviews with children who have language or communication disorders, Owen, et al. (2004) noted that the children had a tendency to go off-topic:

These apparent digressions are sometimes, as indicated, part of their communication difficulties, for example in staying on topic. However, they may
also be symptomatic of the difficulties that these children were having in responding to the interview context, the requirement to reflect and report on their feelings and their ability to understand questions about the past or about more abstract constructs (p. 68).

This necessitated creative methods of nonverbal data collection, such as participant generated artwork; use of pictorial representations during interviews as demonstrated in the aforementioned work of Owen, et al. (2004); and third-party input from teachers, leading to the practical goal of meaningful collaboration with the classroom teachers and their relationships to the student participants.

Trustworthiness

Elucidating responses through ethnographic techniques (Freeman & Mathison, 2009; Silvey, 2002) and establishing trustworthiness through triangulation of data, quality of evidence, and member checking (Stake, 2010) enabled me to draw inferences about the lived experiences of students with special needs when participating in music class. In addition, the inclusion of classroom teachers as participants served to increase the trustworthiness of this study and provided additional points-of-view to that of the primary participants. Merriam (2009) asserts that “just as there will be multiple accounts of eyewitnesses to a crime, so too, there will be multiple constructions of how people have experienced a particular phenomenon, how they have made meaning of their lives, or how they have come to understand certain processes” (p. 214). Examining the input of those who observed the child’s behaviors and choices within the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom provided an additional level of credibility.

The practitioner researcher “simultaneously takes on the role of researcher,” and features the “collaboration among and across participants” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle,
This type of data triangulation is critical in qualitative investigation to lend trustworthiness to the study. “We triangulate to increase the confidence that we will have in our evidence” (Stake, Qualitative Research: Studying how things work, 2010). In this research study, the responses of teachers were compared against the student responses. In addition, records of the pharmaceutical history were examined in order to infer additional meaning on the data collected. This was only applicable to two participants, Landon and Stephanie.

Merriam (2009) posits, “One of the assumptions underlying qualitative research is that reality is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing; it is not a single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured . . .” (p. 213). The lived experiences of the students chosen for this study were postulated through analysis and triangulation of interviews, artwork, and observed behaviors. In addition, classroom teachers contributed their unique perspective, as did I in the role of their music teacher. The temporal aspect of data collection also served as a form of trustworthiness, as the study took place over a six month span of time, during which two-four hours per week data collection, including observations, focus groups, and interviews, were completed.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

In the typical Orff Schulwerk classroom, students experience singing or chanting, playing instruments, and moving. The choice of engagement is largely theirs. This chapter identifies participation in the categories of musical, social, societal, and intrapersonal engagement. Within the musical engagement description, subcategories of instrumental, vocal, and physical engagement are discussed. The information is organized by participant, using data collected from field journals and interviews with the student and his or her teacher. Participant responses are recorded verbatim to truly depict their patterns of speech. “By cleaning up their words, the potential for an accurate portrayal might diminish because we lose the way in which children use language” (Hoffman, 2008, p. 107). All names were changed to preserve confidentiality; however, the school and university names are disclosed.

Social engagement is defined in this study as direct interaction with peers or adults, verbally or non-verbally. Societal engagement refers to compliance with general directions and expectations, such as classroom rules and procedures, or large group activities. In many cases, this line seemed blurred for the participants; their peer interaction often related to compliance with directions and abidance with rules and procedures.

Musical engagement refers to a participant’s response to instrumental, physical, and vocal activities in class. General responses to music class are discussed, including an analysis of the participant’s artwork, his or her statements of preferences for activities, and behaviors observed by the classroom teacher and myself.
Intrapersonal engagement refers to the participants’ embodiment of music; the thought processes, emotions, and observations exhibited and expressed by the participant. This is a term borrowed from Howard Gardner, who describes “a person [who] has a viable and effective model of him- or her-self - one consistent with a description constructed by careful observers who know that person intimately” (Gardner, 2006, p. 17). Trustworthiness of my assertions was achieved by triangulation of data between researcher field notes and interviews with the student and his or her teacher.

Stephanie

Stephanie is a six-year-old girl diagnosed with childhood apraxia of speech and, more recently, an anxiety disorder for which she takes medication. Early in the study, she stated, “I . . . not nervous at school any more. I take a brand new medicine in the morning” (focus group interview, 12.16.2011). Her medication did not change through the course of the study: 28 milligrams (mg) of Daytrana, 0.1 mg of Clonidine, and 5 mg of Zoloft. She has attended DuBard School for three years; when I came to DuBard, she only stayed for part of the school day because of her young age. She usually wears a long blonde ponytail that is disheveled by the time I saw her at the end of the day. Despite her difficulty with speech, she exhibits patience when others struggle to understand her. For example, in music class one day:

We start talking about favorite food and she patiently raises her hands. She tells us her favorite soup, and no one can understand what she is saying. We all try to figure it out until she finally says ‘I don’t know,’ with a nervous laugh (Field journal, 2.7.2012).
In addition, she participated fully in our singing activities, approximating some of the phonemic sounds automatically - a tendency that her teacher, Ms. Aimee, has noticed outside of music class:

In conversational speech she leaves off some of the sounds in the words, and so she’s saying just the word by itself. She may get all the sounds in the word or she may not, it just depends on if there are blends, and so the more she tries, the more she puts in sounds, but they may not be the exact sounds she’s targeting, because of the apraxia. She’s throwing in f’s at the ends of words, she’s throwing in these other letters so you don’t know if they’re really a part of the word that she’s saying; is that her approximation of that blend … it makes it even harder to understand her. (Interview, 2.7.2012)

Ms. Aimee is in her fifth year teaching at the DuBard School. She holds a Certificate of Clinical Competence for Speech-Language Pathologists (CCC-SLP) and she is a Certified Academic Language Therapist (CALT), in addition to the necessary credentials to teach in the state of Mississippi. This is the first year that she has taught Stephanie; however, two years prior, Ms. Aimee was the math teacher for a small group of students that included Stephanie.

*Social Engagement*

Stephanie was friendly with her peers but rarely engaged socially during music class. On the other hand, during our unstructured focus group time, she followed Landon during the majority of the 20 minute session, watching what he was doing and engaging him verbally and non-verbally.

She and Landon start following each other around, using the large space in the room to march around. They play together, marching the length of the room and
back. They come back close to the table and play their drum. She is not playing a particular rhythm; rather, she is just playing randomly on her instrument. She comments, ‘It sounds like a band. It sounds like a band.’ (Focus group 1.27.2012).

Her peer interaction during music class was mostly indirect. She observed the actions of her classmates and at times took musical or social cues from them. Her participation in music class seemed to be a personal, rather than social, effort. She interacted with her classmates at times, laughing at silly things they were doing, or conversing with them briefly.

She asserted herself if another student was preventing her from participating or encroaching on her personal space. For example, Stephanie’s class performed the song “London Bridge” and played the accompanying game. Two students made a “bridge” by facing each other and holding both hands in the air. The other students went under the bridge, and one was “captured” when the song was over and the two making the bridge lowered their arms. Stephanie became upset when she did not get a turn to be captured. She crossed her arms over her chest and knitted her brow, and when I asked if everyone got a turn, she replied, “No!” By chance, she was chosen on the next turn and her teacher and I breathed a collective sigh of relief when we watched it together on the video clip. After seeing the video recording, Ms. Aimee remarked:

I thought she was going to say something about wanting to be ‘locked up,’ you could tell because she kind of did her arms like that [crosses arms across her chest], which is typical for her . . . I was like, ‘ooo, I hope she gets locked up’ because you know, sometimes she gets caught in that and can’t go on with the activity . . . And it seems you read that really quickly and said something about it
like ‘did everyone get a turn’ and she quickly said ‘no, no’ like she was making it known that that’s what she was upset about (Interview, 11.15.2011).

Societal Engagement

She followed rules and procedures and was often the recipient of positive reinforcement for her compliance in music class. She also encouraged compliance from her classmates. Ms. Aimee expressed that for Stephanie, a departure from rules and procedures was a source of anxiety that manifested itself in extraneous movements. If she gets nervous…she likes things just so. She normally works with Roger in another group, so if something’s not even on the board, or if something’s not exactly where it’s supposed to go, she’ll start with all these movements of her hands and I say, ‘That’s bothering you, huh?’ and she says, ‘yes, it’s bothering me’ (Interview, 2.7.2012).

At times, she sought her teacher’s intervention in regards to the lack of compliance from others.

Ms. Aimee: If it’s something that is upsetting her that relates to her or what they’re doing, then she’ll come and tell the teacher, ‘Roger’s not doing whatever.’

ARBH: Is it usually like, ‘Rogers’s not following the rules,’ or ‘Roger’s not playing with me?’

Ms. Aimee: No, it’s usually ‘he’s not following the rules’ or ‘he didn’t do this right’, . . . she gets stuck, sometimes, with that” (Interview, 2.7.2012)

Musical Engagement

Much of the time, Stephanie’s musical engagement seemed to align with societal engagement, in that she was complying with rules and directions and was therefore participating in class. At other times, she seemed more invested in the musical
experience, anticipating her musical cue to play or participate and making efforts to perfect our musical product by practicing during down time or otherwise attentively engaging.

Instrumental Engagement. Stephanie was an attentive student who caught on quickly to instruction. She was typically accurate with rhythmic instrumental activities and seemed to enjoy playing different kinds of instruments. During the 20 minute unstructured focus group with the instruments, she gravitated toward the vibraslap and the buffalo drums, marching around with Landon and commenting that they sounded like a band.

In choosing instruments, she seemed to have a slight sensitivity to timbre. She expressed this as “too loud” in the following interview, when in fact the instrument she preferred, the vibraslap, was actually a bit louder than the offending kokoriko.

ARBH: And you remember I offered you one instrument and you said you didn’t want that instrument? Can you tell me why?
Stephanie: It was too loud,
ARBH: It was too loud…
Stephanie: It hurt my ears.
ARBH: Oh, ok What about the other instrument, the one that hit like that [mimes vibraslap].
Stephanie: Better.
ARBH: It was better? What was it like to play that instrument?
Stephanie: It not sound loud.” (Interview, 11.18.2011)
Her teacher saw the refusal as a behavioral issue:

Ms. Aimee: I’m not surprised that she complained about the instrument and wanted something else [laughs] that’s just typical for her of what I see in the classroom. I mean, I almost could have predicted that she would have an issue with whatever you handed her and wanted something else …

ARBH: So, … she doesn’t have a sensitivity with hearing … I mean, that instrument does have a loud clacking and I kind of played it right in her ear; that wouldn’t have bothered her, you don’t think?

Ms. Aimee: I’ve never noticed it in the classroom, now I did look over today and see her holding her ears for a certain thing, so that may be the case, but, yeah, I kind of was waiting for her to say something [laughs], like ‘I wanted something different.’ (Ms. Aimee, 11.15.2011)

However, in my field journal, I transcribed the exchange as follows:

She refused [the kokoriko], and I gave it to the next person. Her [teacher’s assistant] pointed out that I just said that they couldn’t refuse an instrument, and I explained that she seemed sensitive to the sound of the instrument because she held her ears when I brought it to her. (Field journal, 10.25.2011)

During the study there were other instances in which she seemed sensitive to the sound of an instrument. During our instrumental focus group, I noted in my observation that “when Lizzie starts to play the ratchet, [Stephanie] puts her hands to her ear and moves away, looking at the instrument” (Focus group, 1.27.2012). Another time, she told me that the vibraslap she was playing was not loud after I commented that the ratchet is a loud instrument (Field journal, 10.25.2012).
In a later interview, she again described the vibraslap as “not loud” when asked why she liked it. This line of questioning was in reference to the instrumental focus group in which she returned to the vibraslap several times during the 20 minute session. In that same focus group, Landon came up to her and played the small crash cymbals right next to her ear, and she laughed. This could indicate that she is misusing the word “loud”; perhaps she is associating “loud” with “timbre”; however, on a different day, she remarked, “that hurt my ears” in response to hearing a small group of students playing the wood blocks and claves (Field journal, 11.8.2011). In yet another instance, she was playing a borgun on the xylophone, using parallel motion to play the double stop. At the end of the song, she commented, “Ow! Too loud!” while holding her ears (Field journal, 3.6.2012).

*Vocal Engagement.* When questioned about activities in music class, Stephanie expresses a preference for singing:

ARBH: So when you come to music class, what do you hope we will do?

Stephanie: Um . . . play a game.

ARBH: . . . What else do you hope we’ll do?

Stephanie: Um, hmm . . . sing a song! [after she says this, she puts her hands over her mouth] (Interview, 3.9.2012)

At the DuBard School for Language Disorders, teachers looked for precise articulation whenever a student was speaking. On many occasions, I observed Stephanie very carefully pronouncing words, sounding out each phoneme. However, when she was speaking about a topic that excited her, the words tumbled out quickly and less accurately, making her more difficult to understand. She patiently corrected me until I either understood her or one of us gave up, and she rarely showed frustration when she
was not understood. After observing a video of Stephanie’s class during a singing activity, her teacher noted that her

singing is just like the speech, where you have sounds that are left off. With her speech she leaves out the ends of the words, and she does the same thing when she is singing, leaving off those sounds, like chop is not chop, it’s chah chah chah (Interview, 11.15.2011).

When choosing a song for use in music class at the DuBard School, I looked for repetition and opportunities for movement. The song, “A Sailor Went to Sea, Sea, Sea” had four repetitive verses; I suggested movements for each verse (see Appendix O).

When introducing the first verse of the song to Stephanie’s class, I demonstrated the movement and sang the words simultaneously. For “see, see, see,” I put my hand above my eyes as though shading them from the sun. For the second verse, I left out the words “knee, knee, knee” and touched my knees instead, letting the students guess what word belongs there. “She guesses an answer but it is incorrect.” I did the same for “chop, chop, chop,” making a chopping motion with my right arm over my left arm, which I held straight in front of me. “She says the ‘chop’ part, and moves her mouth with the other words. She is not smiling; she appears to be concentrating.” (Field journal, 11.8.2012) For the last verse, I show them a hip movement while singing the words, “shoo-bop, shoo-bop,” causing her to laugh with the rest of the class.

In a later interview, I questioned her about this song. She remembered especially the repetitive words:

ARBH: Tell me about that. Did you like singing that song [“A Sailor Went to Sea, Sea, Sea”]? Do you remember the words?

Stephanie: Sea sea sea
During a video stimulated recall session in which we were watching a music class from Valentine’s Day, she began to sing along with the students on the video. In this transcription of her spontaneous response, she combines the musical concept from the lesson with the lyrics of the song.

While watching the video, she says: ‘Love somebody, yes I do, one, two, three [we were counting how many times the phrase ‘love somebody’ occurred in the verse.] She watches the video, and as the students start to sing, she looks at me and says the words to the song, skipping ahead in the song: ‘I not tell who.’ She keeps singing along with the video, and when we get to the end, she looks at me and sings the last line. (Interview, 2.24.2012)

When I ask her about a particular song, Stephanie did not respond by telling me the title of the song. In this case, she did not sing the words to the song; rather, she told me the flower names we used to make rhythms that accompanied the song, “All around the Buttercup” (see Appendix L).

ARBH: Do you remember the song?

Stephanie: Rose, buttercup, daisy, um, daisy, butter-tup, ti-er liddy [tiger lily]

(Interview, 2.24.2012).

Physical Engagement

The Orff music classroom is an active environment in which students are encouraged to participate in structured and unstructured musical tasks. When possible,
the students may choose whether or not to move.

For example, our Halloween song (Appendix N) had 3 verses: skeletons, witches, goblins/ghosts. For each verse, I asked for volunteers to improvise movements for these characters. She volunteered for the skeleton verse, but when we actually performed the song, she jumped up for the second verse (witches). She also offered a suggestion:

She interjects that she can “do a zombie,” then she demonstrates with arms outstretched in front of her . . . . .[Later], while I’m preparing to pass out instruments, another girl asks why we don’t have a verse about zombies. I respond that maybe goblins/ghosts are like zombies, but she said that they don’t look anything like zombies, and proceeds to demonstrate how zombies walk.

Stephanie says “not like that, like this” and stands up to demonstrate, arms out ahead of her body. She gallops across the circle . . . (Field journal, 10.25.2011)

We later spent a class period focused solely on building a repertoire of movement. I began by showing the students pictures of dancers in various, somewhat convoluted poses, then I asked the students to try and mimic the pictures. She put forth the effort, and I recorded in my field journal her smiles and exclamations of “I can do it!”

To use a previous example, when we performed the game for “London Bridge,” Stephanie became upset when she did not get a turn. She was focused on the semantics of the game rather than the musical movement that corresponded with lyrical cues (for example, “take the key and lock her up” indicates capturing the player) or moving with the beat.

In the spring semester classes recorded for this study, scarves were used as part of the movement activities that accompanied flower and rainbow songs. In one instance, students were instructed to find a movement with their scarf to perform with their flower
name. Hers was “rose” and she initially wanted to copy the movement of another group. With a slight redirection, she came up with her own group.

She starts with it on her head and then flips it down in front of her. The next time we do it, she adds a spin to her movement . . . the next time she adds a jump to her spin . . . she tosses her scarf, jumps in the air, and says “rose”. (Field journal, 2.28.2012)

When speech rhythms were used in combination with movement, Stephanie struggled. Her teacher explains, “Children can have apraxia of the limbs too; can’t coordinate that muscle movement with the saying it.” We often clapped or played speech patterns while saying the words; I observed Stephanie experiencing difficulty with this. For example, when creating rhythm patterns with flower names, she labored to pronounce “tiger lily.” It came out “ti-er lid-dy,” and she said it slowly, concentrating on each syllable. Therefore, when she clapped while saying the syllables, the rhythm was not precise (Field journal, 1.31.2012). Likewise, when we were stamping and singing at the same time, “She watches me and really struggles to do the movement correctly while singing . . . her movements are labored” (Field journal, 3.6.2012).

Ms. Aimee noticed the problem of coordinating speech with movement during one video segment in which the class was stamping feet with the steady beat while saying “rose.” She noted, “You were doing the stomping, and if you look, she was . . . trying to, like, she could not do the two, could not coordinate the saying it with the stomping.” Later in the interview, she viewed another segment from the same music class in which Stephanie sang the song without movement, then we added a movement part. “I notice she didn’t say it that time, with the motor movement, she didn’t sing it, which every other time she’s said the part” (Interview 3.6.2012).
Her extraneous movements provided an indication of her anxiety level. Her teacher was sensitive to this, stating:

She has a lot of other movements that I see in the classroom, like almost nervous movements, like picking at her lip, or pushing at her lip . . . movements of her arms and fiddling with things, instead of just looking at you. (Interview, 11.15.2011)

She went on to say in a later interview, “She does move a little more . . . when she seems more nervous” (Interview, 2.21.2012). By the end of the study I was told that Stephanie had been diagnosed with an anxiety disorder.

Ms. Aimee noticed Stephanie’s nervous movements during a video segment in which Stephanie was paired with another girl. They were working together to create rhythm patterns from flower names. Each pair was given five index cards with pictures of flowers on them. The names of the flowers were written underneath (see Appendix L). They were to arrange the pictures in different orders to create different rhythms. Ms. Aimee noticed “a lot of movement with her hands and things” while the two were placing their cards in a row. The other student was taking more of a leadership role, and Ms. Aimee “saw a little bit of that [movement] when Carrie took . . . whatever card [Stephanie] put on the end” (Interview, 2.7.2012).

*Intrapersonal Engagement*

Stephanie used positive expressions when she talked about activities in music class, such as “happy,” “fun,” and “exciting.” When questioned about her favorite activities, she mentioned games, singing, and playing instruments. Her behavior during idle time in music class was indicative of her desire to complete the given task appropriately; for example, in one field observation I noted, “I can see from time to time
that she is practicing one of the words [“protection”] by repeating it to herself” (Field journal, 10.18.2011).

When she felt a sense of accomplishment, she proudly stated her excitement. For example, during one video stimulated recall session I showed her an excerpt from class in which she created rhythm patterns with individual 3x5 note cards that featured either a quarter note (ta), two eighth notes (ti ti), or one half note (ta-a). The half note card was twice the length of the other cards. While she was watching, she told me that she remembered her rhythm pattern:

Stephanie: I spread it out.

ARBH: You did? Now look, you scooped up your cards.

Stephanie: See, I knew it!

ARBH: You know it.

Stephanie: Uh huh - I memorized it, I memorized it. I memorized in my brain.

ARBH: You memorized your rhythm? Wow!

Stephanie: I remember it. It “ti.ti.ti.ta.ta” and put out “ti.ti.ti.ta-a”

ARBH: Wow, did that make you feel proud?

Stephanie: Uh huh! (Interview, 2.24.2012)

When shown the same segment of music class, Ms. Aimee noted that Stephanie seemed confused, like she wasn’t sure what she was supposed to be doing at what time, kind of looking around for cues from other children, and she said, “I can remember it” and moved all of her cards, and then kind of seemed to overestimate her ability of being able to do…and then she said, “I’m not done yet; y’all were on a different one, so . . . it was more like confused. So I guess emotionally just, not upset but,
‘Oh, let me figure out what to do and let me do’ and trying to busy herself.

(Interview, 2.21.2012).

Summary

Overall, Stephanie participated in music class by complying with instructions and abiding by the class rules. She was pleasant, attentive, and eager to contribute to the musical outcome. While she was not shy to interject comments and ask questions in class, she was not disruptive and rarely needed redirection.

Musically, Stephanie was rhythmically accurate on most occasions, save for when combining speech rhythms with body percussion or rhythm instruments. Her difficulties with speech exacerbate any difficulties she may have had with control of her motor skills due to apraxia of the limbs; however, when speech and movement were attempted separately, the outcome was usually successful.

Despite her language disorder, Stephanie learned the words to songs quickly and vocalized energetically when we sang in class. While some inflection can be heard, to say that she sang on pitch would be inaccurate.

As mentioned previously, her physical engagement in music class was more successful when she did not combine it with vocalizing. She enjoyed playing games, such as “London Bridge” and “All around the Buttercup,” both of which were action games involving gross motor movements that she could easily execute. She was also successful at playing rhythm instruments; because she paid attention and followed directions, she seemed to have an age-appropriate awareness of beat and rhythm.

Stephanie was aware of the collective rules and expectations of the school and the music classroom, and she willingly complied. Beyond compliance, Stephanie exhibited behaviors that supported the assertion that she was eager to learn and that she enjoyed
music class. When in class, she was attentive and obedient, watching her classmates and me for musical, social, and societal cues. When she was confused, she redirected her attention so that she was still involved in the task at hand.

Landon

Landon is a nine-year-old boy diagnosed with autism, attention deficit hyperactive disorder (ADHD), expressive and receptive language disorders, and a visual perception disorder. He was prescribed 15 mg of Daytrona, a patch to control the ADHD symptoms. This medication regiment changed twice during the course of the study. When the study began, Landon was taking 10 mg of Daytrona. The first change in medication happened on 1.27.2012; he was placed on 5 mg of Ritalin. His classroom teacher, Ms. Wendy, stated, “We thought the other medication was inappropriate, and this is even more inappropriate . . . It’s been difficult in the classroom . . . his attention is just so poor that he needs that one-on-one attention that we can’t provide for him all day” (Interview, 2.7.2012). On 2.22.2012, he was put back on the Daytrona patch at the higher dosage. Ms. Wendy states that “it’s still not appropriate . . . he’s not as silly, like when he was on Ritalin . . . but he’s still not 100%” (Interview, 3.6.2012).

Landon attended the DuBard School for three years and was placed in a lower level class. Such placement depended on factors such as progress through the DuBard Association Method ® and chronological age. He was a handsome boy of average height and an athletic build, with dark brown hair and eyes. Because the data collection period of this study took place during the colder months, he mostly wore sweatpants or jeans with long sleeved shirts. His clothes were oversized and his shirt sleeves provided him with a tactile distraction. As Ms. Wendy described it, “[laughs] Those sleeves. Now that he has long sleeves, by the end of the day they’re like stretched out down to here [she
gestures that the sleeves are stretched past his fingertips]” (Interview with Ms. Wendy, 2.7.2012).

Ms. Wendy is in her first year as a classroom teacher at the DuBard School. She is a young, petite woman with long straight blonde hair. Her voice is light and high, and she has a pleasant demeanor. She has worked at the school in various capacities for 4 ½ years.

I have my educator’s license, and I am certified through American Speech Hearing Association . . . I’m in my clinical fellowship year, so I’m still certified, but I’m working under Mary [a Speech Language Pathologist (SLP) on staff at DuBard]. (Interview, 11.18.2011)

She hopes to have her Certificate of Clinical Competence (CCC) the following May.

Landon was in Ms. Wendy’s class. She described him as having “such a good disposition” (Interview, 2.7.2012); when she commented on his emotional range, she noted, “He always seems content, it’s just, there’s never the sadness or anger or anything like that” (Interview, 2.21.2012).

In my first interview with Landon, I approached the subject of music class with him as a broad, open-ended question, “Tell me about music class.” He responded by telling me facts such as the day we have music, what materials we use, the movement used to play an instrument, or the sound it makes.

Landon: Music class is, ‘cause it’s not a holiday anymore.

ARBH: It’s not a holiday?

Landon: No, it’s Thanksgiving. So, on December, um, on Christmas will be on December . . . Does that have ornaments? Does it have candy canes?

ARBH: Ornaments and candy canes. So, we don’t have music over Thanksgiving.
We will have music when we get back. What do you think we will do in music when we get back from Thanksgiving?

Landon: We will have Wednesday.

ARBH: Tuesday.

Landon: We will have on Tuesday.

ARBH: Right, and what will we do? What do we do in music class?

Landon: Well, we have um, carpet squares?

ARBH: Tell me about the carpet squares.

Landon: The carpet squares are um

ARBH: What are they for?

Landon: They are for music

ARBH: Do we make music with the carpet squares?

Landon: Yes

ARBH: The carpet squares are like instruments?

Landon: Yes.

ARBH: Yeah?

Landon: They are.

ARBH: OK, what other instruments do we use?

Landon: The tambourine?

ARBH: Show me how you use that.

Landon: Like this [demonstrates hitting the tambourine]

ARBH: What else?

Landon: And that one goes pshew… [demonstrates, clapping hands and pulling
them apart quickly] How you do that? Can you hit it like this? (Interview, 11.18.2011).

In our final interview, I asked him, “When you come to music class, what do you think we are going to do?” He answered by saying names of flowers, “It is cornflower, buttercup, daisy” Over the last few weeks, we have been using flower names to create rhythm patterns (Appendix L). I asked, “What else do we do?” and he again said flower names, and then quickly moved to another subject, “Look at my rainbow [points to a St. Patrick’s Day hat he is wearing].” I tried to redirect him back to the subject of music, but he went on to yet another subject. Again, I tried to steer him back by asking, “Do you love to play instruments?” to which he replied, “Yeah, instruments because, hey, do you want to listen to the video?”

Social Engagement

While ever aware of his classmates, Landon’s engagement with them was largely proximate. He observed their actions and often watched them for cues regarding participation in music class, but he rarely addressed them directly.

During our unstructured focus group session with the musical instruments, he interacted with the other participants several times. Stephanie immediately went to him and followed him down the row of instruments. “He tells her to pick any one. She picks up a cabasa and he says, ‘Do you like that one?’” (Field journal, 1.27.2012). She continued to follow him and they traded instruments a few times. He also asked me questions about the instruments, and a few times went to Gregory to show him different instruments.

When we watch video clips from music class, he was very aware of the other students, and excitedly pointed to them, calling them by name in the form of a question
(“Is that Peter? Is that Carl?”) He sometimes identified them by the color of their shirt, again in the form of a question. According to Ms. Wendy, this is a typical mode of conversation for Landon.

I don’t think he knows how to verbalize, ‘Remember when we went, remember when we did the Halloween performance? It was fun, I was a ghost, and so and so was a goblin.’ You know, I think that’s . . . his way of having a narrative.

(Interview, 2.7.2012)

He often watched other students for musical and social cues. For instance, when he was in the audience of our group performance, he watched other students’ reactions to funny parts of the upper level performance, and he laughed along with them. Musically, he looked to others to see how they were engaging in my directions.

For the most part, Landon’s social awareness seemed superficial. His teacher explained that when he joined in games on the playground,

he’s playing tag but he’s just running around with them. I mean, they might tag Landon and he might go tag somebody, but he’s not the initiator . . . he’s just following what they’re doing, what their interactions are. (Ms. Wendy, int 2, 2.12.2012).

When mentioning his classmates, he usually identified them by the color of their shirt. At times he will try and recall the last name of the individual, but when questioned about being friends with his classmates, he avoids answering.

ARBH: Are you friends?

Landon: Know what happened, me and Johnny are, we’re just started sitting.

ARBH: Are you friends with Johnny?

Landon: Hey, what color shirt? What is that color? [not sure who he is looking at]
Later in the interview, I ask:

ARBH: Is Johnny your friend?

Landon: There’s me, I’m with Johnny!

ARBH: Do you like sitting next to him?

Landon: Where’s, where’s that one? Peter? (Landon, 2.10.2012)

*Societal Engagement*

In music class, Landon followed instructions and observed procedures. When seated he attended to directions and instruction with some extraneous movement such as wiggling a leg, fidgeting with his clothing, or shifting seated positions. When we stood, he typically moved more, shifting his weight from foot to foot, wandering away from his carpet square, and turning around. He handled down time in music by watching other students and making small movements. He had a good disposition, was well-mannered, and helped with tasks such as picking up carpet squares or putting away instruments.

Procedures in music class included holding instrument mallets on shoulders when not playing, sitting still and quiet when others were talking, and stopping when the song or phrase was complete. Landon had been in my music class for three years and he responded to these procedures almost automatically. He rarely participated in the spontaneous off-task behavior shown by some others in his class, although he was observant of the behavior and participation of his peers. “While other boys in the class are acting impulsively, he does not emulate their behavior. It is when the classmates are told to do a particular activity that he watches them to see what they do” (Field journal, 11.1.2011).
Musical engagement

Vocal engagement. Landon almost always sang when instructed, but he used little inflection when vocalizing. He had a deep voice for a boy his age, and he could usually be heard over the others in his class. He generally knew all the words to the songs and did not seem self-conscious about singing. For example, I began one of our music classes by singing a song from a prior week.

He does not look at me when we start singing, and he seems disengaged for the first phrase of the song, but when we get to a part that he recognizes, he turns quickly, smiles, and joins in singing. His voice is deep, loud, and monotone. He gives me two thumbs up and a smile. (Field journal, 2.28.2012)

Instrumental Engagement. Landon talked about instruments frequently in our interviews, but didn’t always remember their names. Rather, he mimed playing them and vocally approximated the sound.

ARBH: Can you draw a picture of the instrument that you are talking about? The one that does this [demonstrates]. What does it look like?
Landon: I can’t how to draw it.
ARBH: What part do you hit in your hand? What does that look like?
Landon: It’s a noise.
ARBH: A what?
Landon: A noise . . . It makes a chhhhhh
ARBH: Does it last a long time?
Landon: Yeah.
ARBH: That’s called a vibraslap.
Landon: What’s a vibraslap?
When playing an instrument, Landon held the instrument correctly and usually played with the proper technique. He showed attentiveness to the phrasing of the song and musical cues that marked where he was to play. While he might ask for a certain instrument while I am distributing them, he did not complain if he got a different one.

During our focus group session in which the four participants were given 20 minutes of unstructured time with the instruments we use in music class, I noted a few instances in which he played an instrument then quickly put it next to his ear. I saw him do this with finger cymbals, claves, maracas, and six-inch crash cymbals. When I mentioned this to his teacher, she remarked, “He doesn’t seem to have, like the sensory with the hearing issue, you know how autistic children sometimes . . . you know, loud noises bother them, and he doesn’t seem to have that aspect” (Interview, 2.7.2012).

One of the instruments that drew his attention during the focus group session was the contra bass bar, a large xylophone bar that sits on a resonator box. He went to this bar repeatedly, picking up the mallet and playing it with large strokes. In our culminating performance for fall semester, Landon played this instrument during a Halloween song (Appendix N). He was to play eight steady beats while other students performed movements that portrayed characters from the song: witches, ghosts, skeletons, etc. Typically Landon chose movement over instruments, but in this case, when I asked who wanted to do a skeleton dance, he replied, “Not me, I’m doing 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8” (Field notes, 11.29.2012). Later, the student who was performing the witch movement left, and when I asked someone to take over, he raised his hand (he was originally going to be a witch, and had created a movement to go with the part). However, I reminded him that his part was to play the contra bass bar, and he suggested that the other students do his dance.
When performing his part, he demonstrated anticipatory movements such as rising onto his knees when it was time for him to play. During a class period when Landon was assigned to play a particular part that was designated “purple,” he exhibited this type of behavior. Ms. Wendy made note of this in her interview:

…with Landon I see that he understands that he’s purple and he’s supposed to play on purple ‘cause when you said “purples play”, his ears perked up, he got his thing, and he played while watching what everybody else was doing (Interview, 2.23.2012).

**Physical engagement**

Landon was a very active child who responded well to tactile and kinesthetic tasks. He could often be seen fidgeting with clothing, loose threads on the carpet squares, or shoelaces. When seated, he sometimes rocked or shifted positions, but remained on his carpet square and usually did not disrupt music class. When standing, however, he often wandered away from his self-space; again, he was not disruptive but he was more active when standing.

Landon showed the greatest positive emotional reactions to music tasks that were movement-based. As previously mentioned, he typically chose movement over playing instruments if given the choice. When first learning our Halloween song, Landon was the only student who stood when asked to do a witch dance, and he improvised movement “in which his legs were apart and he rocked from foot to foot” (Field journal, 10.25.2011). The next week, I brought in pictures of dancers in various positions and asked the students to imitate the dancer. This time, he wandered away from the class when we were standing. He became preoccupied with looking out the window and at a map on the wall. The class was then directed to act out the motion of hammering,
When I walked away to put the picture [of the hammer] on the marker board, he opened his arms wide and began slowly spinning, his sleeves completely covering his hands. He spun for 17 seconds, his gaze moving to the ceiling.

For the next few tasks, he remained disengaged, “sitting on his carpet square, legs crossed, motionless except [for his] fingers rubbing together.” However, when instruments were distributed, he perked up: “‘I want this one. I want this one.’ . . . When he is told to make pounding movements with a small group of children, he participates enthusiastically” (Field journal, 11.1.2011)

Ms. Wendy and I both noted the lesson that was most visibly engaging for Landon over the course of the study. In this music class, I had five cards with flower names on them: buttercup, daisy, rose, tiger lily, and cornflower (Appendix L). In the weeks prior, the lower level classes did a variety of activities using these cards to create rhythm patterns. During this particular lesson, each child had a scarf that correlated to a certain flower. Landon’s scarf was blue for cornflower, and he was to hold it up every time I pointed to the card with the cornflower on it. We then make this into a rhythm game.

We sing “All around the Buttercup.” While we are singing, I arrange four of the five flower rhythms on the board. When we finish singing, they play the rhythm, but only the people who have been assigned the flower play when I point to their card. The idea is to keep the beat steady as we play. The students must watch for their turn. (Field journal, 2.28.2012)

Landon showed great excitement during this music lesson; I noted in my field journal that despite his heightened level of arousal, he was quite attentive and executed
the task properly. When I shared portions of this video with Ms. Wendy, she remarked on his engagement as well.

I think whenever there’s a movement involved and especially like an instrument, or the scarf, where he could associate the two, and I think there was a good flow, you know? And he was really paying attention to what was going on. That to me was the most successful clip, or one of the more successful music times where his attention was there, he wasn’t staring in the kitchen or moving around, it seemed like most of the time his attention was there ‘cause he had like a specific part to look forward to, you know? So, I thought that was impressive . . . But this, it was like, he was alert because he knew he had a role to play, or a job to do, so he was more attentive.

Intrapersonal Engagement

I had four interviews with Landon, each approximately 20 minutes in length. In addition, Landon participated in two focus group sessions with the other three participants, each approximately 20 minutes long. Meeting with Landon in these settings gave me an opportunity attempt discernment of meaning behind his actions in music class.

In his interviews, Landon proved to be a talkative boy whose conversations twisted and turned according to his stream of consciousness.

ARBH: I have brand-new colored pencils here…would you please draw a picture of music class for me?

Landon: Last time, um, last time Aiden got me.

ARBH: He got you?

Landon: Yeah, and I didn’t … Jumping jacks
ARBH: Have you ever gotten him?

Landon: I got hit. [rolls pencils across the desk back and forth]…tagged me in the leg.

ARBH: What does that mean?

Landon: That means I got 10 jumping jacks.

ARBH: So if you get tagged you do jumping jacks?

Landon: 10 jumping jacks.

Later in the interview, I was still attempting to elicit artwork from him:

ARBH: Well, what color do you want to use? I want you to draw a picture of music class for me.

Landon: How do you spell it?

ARBH: How do you spell music?

Landon: How do you spell music? (Interview, 11.17.2011)

During video stimulated recall sessions, his unsolicited reactions often involved the identification of other students by asking, “Is that (name)?” or by asking what color shirt they were wearing. His teacher noted that his narrative was usually in the form of questions that he “already knows the answers to.” She goes on to state:

It’s just him repeating what we’re saying in question form…I would say 90 percent of the time he knows the answer to the questions…When it comes to complex instructions, he doesn’t ask those questions, he just sits there and looks around to figure out what’s going on, so he doesn’t really know an appropriate time to ask questions, I guess. (Interview 11.17.2011)

He did not describe our activities in terms of learning musical concepts or even in terms of what particular skill we were using (singing, moving, playing instruments).
Instead, he focused on the concrete, such as the actual rhythms we spoke:

ARBH: What do we do in music?
Landon: It is cornflower, buttercup, daisy.

ARBH: So we say flower names? What else do we do?
Landon: And it’s uh, tiger lily buttercup, daisy.

ARBH: Right, we do that. What is this called? [taps fist on table]
Landon: It’s called tiger lily.

ARBH: Do we call it the, do you know the music word for this?
Landon: How do you hear?

ARBH: Rhythm (Interview 4.3.2012)

Later in the interview, I asked,

ARBH: What are you doing in this video?
Landon: I was doing that [mimes shaking a musical instrument called a maraca].

ARBH: What do we call this in music?
Landon: I don’t know, ti ti/ti ta/ti

When I asked Landon about his favorite experiences in music class, or how he felt when participating in various activities, he usually changed the subject. For example, after viewing a video clip of singing activities, I asked:

ARBH: So what were you doing?
Landon: I was singing.

ARBH: Do you like to sing?
Landon: Um, …What color shirt do I have on?

ARBH: I can’t tell from here.
Landon: I have a yellow shirt on. (Interview, 3.9.2012)
During another interview, I asked him a broad question that he dodged with an unrelated response:

ARBH: What is your favorite thing in music class?

Landon: I slapped and then I popped him ‘cause uh, you know I was on base.

ARBH: You were on base? [pause] . . . What is your favorite thing in music class?

Landon: Um,

ARBH: When you come to music, what do you hope we will do?

Landon: Hey,

ARBH: Do you hope that we will sing?

Landon: When will you be here?

ARBH: Well, don’t worry about that right now. Let’s talk about music class.

But he does answer one question:

ARBH: Do you love to play instruments?

Landon: Yeah, instruments because . . . hey, you want to listen to the video?

(Interview, 3.9.2012)

Later in the same interview, Landon explained his reaction to a moment on the video in which his class was laughing:

ARBH: So why did you all think “rose” was so funny?

Landon: ‘Cause it “rooooose” [he uses a silly voice and adds a clap to demonstrated the rhythmic duration]

ARBH: Why did you get so silly about rose?

Landon: ‘Cause I was, … look this is my hat. (Interview 3.9.2012)
If I asked him a direct question, he was more likely to give me a response:

ARBH: What do you think about having that scarf?
Landon: ‘Cause I’m doing this [squeezes eyes shut, clasps hands together, and shakes them up and down quickly, turning his head to the side, making a kkkk sound] I’m going to go faster.
ARBH: Did the scarf make you sad?
Landon: No.
ARBH: Did the scarf make you mad?
Landon: No!
ARBH: What did the scarf make you feel like?
Landon: Um, let’s see [taps forehead with finger], how ‘bout, made me happy!

(Interview 3.9.2012)

Ms. Wendy provided some insight into Landon’s emotional range. She explained:

It’s hard to describe emotions with Landon because they don’t seem to be on target anyway. Like, he shows . . . extreme excitement, when it’s not appropriate, but he never shows anger, or sadness; I never see those feelings. . . (Interview, 2.21.2012)

In other observations of Landon, it seemed that he disengaged from the lesson. While watching a video clip, Ms. Wendy stated, “I just always wonder what he’s looking at, you know? He is just constantly looking, and scanning, and seeing what’s going on around him, even though nobody’s really moving and there’s nothing going on” (Interview, 2.21.2012).

In many instances, however, Landon’s emotional response in music class is positive. In one observation, I noted:
He comes in a lot more energetic today, smiling and moving around more. He jumps over a glock and goes to sit on a carpet square next to another glock. He calls to the boy next to him, then gets his mallets and bounces him on his knee. He is moving his mouth and bouncing. I ask where mallets are supposed to be and he says ‘Shoulders.’ He puts them on his shoulders and shrugs to hold them there. I start singing the Halloween song and he sings along, smiling. He rocks forward, and then drums his fist and hands on his knees. He is looking across the room, moving around and changing positions. He has been smiling since he walked in. (Field journal, 11.29.2012)

During the course of this study, his medication changed twice. In her first interview, Ms. Wendy explained that “he’s on the patch …it’s like a time release thing, and sometimes we can’t even tell if it’s on, and if mom forgot it we can tell ... So, I don’t think that medication is appropriate for him” (Interview, 11.18.2011). By the time of her next interview, Landon’s medication changed:

Well, they’ve changed meds, so behavior has been…we thought the other medication was inappropriate, and this is like, even more inappropriate. It is difficult in the classroom but…I know that they’re going to continue to try to make it work but right now he’s only on like 5 milligrams of Ritalin, which isn’t a lot…and that’s not a time release, so by the afternoon, it’s like, gone.” (Interview, 2.7.2012)

When watching a clip from a video made after the first medication change, Ms. Wendy noted:

I just don’t think he focuses and listens when there’s commotion going on and you know, in previous videos he’s been watching other students, and in this one
he wasn’t watching what J. was doing; he was just kind of zoning out.

(Interview, 2.7.2012)

Later, Ms. Wendy reasons why Landon appears at times to disengage from music class, “I wonder if there’s like, so much noise and directions at the same time that he is just over stimulated.”

At another point, Ms. Wendy notes an improvement in his attention and attributes it to his physical involvement in the activity.

With moving, his attention span is a little bit longer because he has an activity that he’s doing, versus just sitting there and waiting for like an auditory cue… he followed directions that whole time that there was that movement involved - he did it every time, versus whenever he was sitting there, he was kind of looking around, …he was kind of all over the place. (Int 3, 2.21.2012)

And in a later interview she noted:

It seems like whenever he does movement, his attention is there. He understands, it’s like he understands what he’s supposed to be doing when there’s a movement involved. So even if it is getting up and being silly, he’s still paying attention. It’s like that extrasensory information, you know? He’s so smart, he can do it, it’s just the attention is so poor. (3.6.2012)

However, in a couple of instances, he had a surprising response to social situations when working with a partner. One had an instrument and the other had a scarf. Later they were told to trade:

ARBH: Why does he have a scarf now?
Landon: ‘Cause we’re the yellow one’s daisies. [they are blue buttercups]
ARBH: Why does he have a scarf and you have an instrument?
Landon: ‘Cause he wanted my scarf [makes pouty face].

ARBH: He wanted your scarf?

Landon: [serious voice] He wants my scarf.

ARBH: Oh, ok. What’s he going to do with it?

Landon: He was taking my scarf; he’s got my scarf.

ARBH: OK, were you upset about the scarf? Did you look mad or sad?

Landon: No, I was mad.

ARBH: You were mad? That he had your scarf?

Landon: But he won’t give me my scarf. (Interview, 3.9.2012)

When participating in musical tasks, Landon typically watched other classmates for cues. One instance of this was noted in field observation:

There are two metallophone players, Landon and Carl, who was told to only use one mallet to play [the steady beat]. Landon decided he only wanted to use one mallet too. When Carl picked up his other mallet to use two, Landon quickly grabbed [another mallet]. When Carl sat down, Landon quickly sat down too. When Carl leaned on a chair, Landon did too. Carl again started playing with 1 mallet; so did Landon. Carl picked up his other one and so did Landon. Landon watched Carl closely to see when to play. (Field journal, 10.18.2012)

In another instance, I noticed that he was watching other classmates to see their response to my directions.

He watches - the first time he does nothing, then the next time he watches other students and copies what they are doing - drawing a spiral in the air. We start playing the all around the buttercup game and he watches silently, without moving. He has a serious expression on his face. He is the fourth person chosen
and must put his hand on the shoulder in front of him because that boy has a broken arm. He is smiling now and his neighbor links pinkies with him. He is walking in an exaggerated step, like the boy in front of him. (Field journal, 1.17.2012)

Ms. Wendy noted this as well; it was something she has noticed in her experience working with Landon. She stated, “He does like to see what other children are doing and then . . . follow along with that” (Interview, 2.7.2012).

Summary

In the Orff Schulwerk music setting, students are taught instrument parts, movement parts, and a chant or song; they may then choose their level and form of participation. Landon almost always participated in the vocal part of the song or chant, and when given the choice between instruments and movement, he usually chose movement. Two instances that demonstrated a high level of engagement included the flower rhythm/scarf/instrument activity that we did toward the end of the study, and the contra bass bar part he was given with the Halloween song.

Landon interacted with his peers at a proximate level. He was aware of them socially, and he was interested in what they were doing. He watched them for musical and behavioral cues, but he did not usually interact with them directly during music class or in other settings, according to his teacher’s description of his social behavior.

At a societal level, Landon complied with rules and procedures in music class and in other school settings. He followed directions and rarely complained. His teacher described him as having a “good disposition” (Interview, 2.7.2012) and she told me, “He’s an interesting one. You picked an interesting one” (Interview, 2.21.2012).
When attempting to elicit intrapersonal responses from Landon, he generally deflected questions by changing the subject. Field observations, however, revealed that Landon’s emotional responses to music class were often positive.

Lizzie

Lizzie was an eight year old girl in her fourth year at the DuBard School who used an assistive hearing device known as a cochlear implant. She was a shy girl with long curly red hair that was usually pulled up in a ponytail with a bow that matched her clothing. Her glasses had fashionable blue plastic frames, and she typically dressed in colorful shirts and blue jeans. She was diagnosed with a hearing impairment, expressive and receptive language disorders, and an articulation impairment. She takes no medication.

Ms. Gail was an upper level teacher who taught at the DuBard School for 17 years, starting as a lunchroom worker when she was in graduate school. She was a Speech Language Pathologist (SLP), certified by the American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA) and Mississippi Speech Hearing Association (MSHA), the Mississippi organization for SLP’s. She also held a licensure for the state board of health as well as other “credentials to [her] teaching license, such as the elementary education, K-6 regular ed, and special ed . . .” (Interview, 11.15.2011). This was the first year that Lizzie was in her class.

In our first interview, my objective was to discover what general beliefs the students held about music class at DuBard. To achieve this, I asked participants to talk with me about music class, then to draw a picture having to do with music class. In her interview, that conversation follows:
ARBH: And what do you do in music?

Lizzie: Sing

ARBH: What else?

[Lizzie shrugs]

ARBH: What other things do we do in music, than sing?

Lizzie: Play the drum.

ARBH: What other instruments do we play? You don’t know the names? If you don’t know the names, can you draw them?

[Lizzie shrugs]

Later in the interview, I elicited artwork from Lizzie:

ARBH: Draw for me something about music class. Anything you want . . .

[Lizzie picks up a red pencil and begins to color a circle. Then changes color to brown, then yellow. She places the yellow pencil down and looks at me.]

ARBH: I like that. Do you know what this is called?

[She shakes head]

ARBH: Tambourine. Do you want me to write it?

[She nods]

ARBH: Tam…bo…rine

[She repeats me]

ARBH: Tambourine

[She repeats me]

ARBH: I like that drawing a lot. Now, is there anything else you want to draw from music class? You can draw another one of you want to.

[She reaches for a pencil]
ARBH: Want to? Ok, go ahead.

[She looks at me when she is finished. She has drawn a shape and written the word “drum” underneath.]

ARBH: Drum, right, good. Are there any others that you want to draw or tell me about?

[She fidgets with the pencils and carefully pronounces guitar]

ARBH: Do we have guitars in music?

[She shakes her head]

ARBH: We don’t, do we? I have a guitar but I don’t bring it very much . . .

Lizzie: Do you know that [mimes playing sticks or claves]…the sticks?

ARBH: The sticks? Can you draw it? I have a couple of instruments that do that, so if you draw it I will know which one you are talking about.

[She draws]

ARBH: So the sticks like this? [mimes claves’ movement] I think you are talking about claves, which look like this [draws] so they are claves. [writes the word] and they click. (Interview, 11.17.2011)

When asked to identify activities in music class, she first identified playing instruments, then singing:

ARBH: So, when you come to music class, what do you think we’re going to do? What kinds of things do we do?

Lizzie: Instruments.

ARBH: Ok, what else do we do?

Lizzie: [long pause, very soft response] Sing. (Interview, 3.9.2012)
After viewing an excerpt from music class in which the class was singing she identified the activity we did (playing instruments), but not the concept (playing on the steady beat) or the correct song.

ARBH: What were we doing?
Lizzie: Playing instruments.

ARBH: That’s right. Do you know the name of your instrument?
[She shakes her head]
ARBH: It has a weird name. It’s called a glockenspiel. You don’t have to remember that, but it’s the little one here [pointing]. But you have played some of these other ones before, haven’t you?
[She nods]
ARBH: Good. How were we playing the instruments? . . . What were we learning?
[She shrugs]
ARBH: In music.

Lizzie: Um, the song of [inaudible]
ARBH: The song…
Lizzie: [inaudible]
ARBH: The brickyard?
[Lizzie nods]
Social/Societal Engagement

For Lizzie, there seemed to be a blurred line between social and societal engagement. She demonstrated awareness of her peers by noting their compliance with classroom rules and procedures. For example, when observing a video of music class, she wondered why two of her classmates were not participating in the same way as the rest of the class.

Lizzie: Kara’s not playing.

ARBH: Where’s Kara? Here?

Lizzie: Yeah. Why is she not playing?

ARBH: I don’t know.

Lizzie: And Tina?

ARBH: I think they have a different part to play.” (Interview, 11.18.2011)

Many times this awareness led to direct interactions with her classmates in which she clarified a directive or a musical cue. During a video stimulated recall session, Ms. Gail noticed Lizzie giving her partner a nonverbal cue to play. In this instance, her partner was a girl with a severe hearing impairment.

She’s telling Ella to play now. It was nonverbal; it was [demonstrates with her elbow; laughs] . . . ‘You’re supposed to be playing!’ When you said green, she punched Ella [laughs] . . . That’s kind of what I see from her in the classroom; it’s like, ‘You, you ought to be paying attention!’ more the nonverbal language, but probably more so with Ella, because she knows that Ella doesn’t understand as well as some of the others. She may, she probably realizes that and she may be doing more nonverbal with Ella than she would normally do. (Interview, 3.8.2012)
This could perhaps be attributed to the strict adherence to rules and procedures that teachers encouraged at the DuBard School. A 5:1 student ratio allowed teachers to ensure that students were behaving appropriately and following directions. During activities that were less structured, like music class, Lizzie was aware when other classmates are not following the directions or abiding by the class rules. I observed:

As students come in to sit down, she moves to sit next to the friend she came in with last week, who is already seated. That friend jumps up and moves away with another classmate, and they head to the other side of the room. Lizzie follows after them, and they find seats next to each other. Her teacher has just told one of the girls not to let the boy next to her get her in trouble by being silly. Lizzie stands and calls to her teacher. She points at her empty chair and her teacher and I ask her to sit there. She gestures to the two students, then at her seat. Her teacher then tells her, ‘Don’t worry about them. I will worry about them. You just listen to Ms. Becky. I’ll handle them.’ (Field journal, 2.16.2012)

Ms. Gail, notes:

I think in familiar things, like in structured activities, she wants everybody to comply and do things the right way, so she’ll point out those things like … telling somebody else that it’s their turn to go get their snack, or telling them that I’m trying to call their name because they need to come talk to me about something, … if she thinks it’s their turn to go to the board; … kind of doing like you’re saying, and touching and gesturing and maybe saying ‘Go to the board’ or something, maybe even being a little verbal with it, but when it comes, when it’s familiar routines or following rules, when it comes to like just playing on the playground, or engaging in conversation at snack, …I don’t think she takes the
initiative very much with something that’s unstructured. (Interview, 2.24.2012)

Through my observations, I noted several instances in which Lizzie positioned herself near friends at the start of music class, but only one included a significant verbal interaction:

Her friend sits down in the chair next to her and Lizzie says, ‘Me and you are wearing pink.’ No response from the friend. They have a brief conversation, then she says, ‘can I play with that one?’ gesturing to one of the girl’s mallets. They trade one mallet, so now they have mismatched mallets. Her friend puts her mallets on her head like antennae, and she laughs. They start poking each other with the mallets, laughing. She says her friend’s name then turns her mallets around so the ends are up on her shoulders. (Field journal, 3.8.2012)

When observed with her friends, Lizzie is more talkative but is likely to be listening more than talking. Ms. Gail states,

She’s not real chatty with children, but she may talk to children a little bit more. Probably if she initiates the conversation, … she’ll initiate conversation with me, like she said something about going to the skating rink on Saturday, and …she didn’t use the right words but something like, ‘It was only a little people that came to my party on Saturday’, and I said, ‘Oh, only a few people could come?’ and she talked about where she had it and I asked her who came and she answered those questions once she had initiated the conversation, so probably if she initiates it and it’s her topic, she’ll tell you a little bit more, but she’s not very eager to answer questions. (Interview, 1.31.2012)

Although Lizzie had a few girls with whom she frequently interacted, it was Lizzie’s attention to her teacher’s assistant, Ms. Larissa that I found remarkable. Ms.
Larissa was a warm, friendly woman who involved herself in the music class for the benefit of the students. I saw her demonstrating my directions to Lizzie by “explaining to her to play when I pat my legs . . . then she tells her ‘You did it! You did it!’” (Field journal, 10.20.2012).

When I observed Lizzie in her classroom, Ms. Larissa was helping her group. As I watched, Lizzie repositioned herself several times in order to keep Ms. Larissa’s attention.

She returned to her desk and faced her teacher. I think she was supposed to be paying attention to the board. She called her teacher’s name and laid her head on the desk her teacher was using . . . she tapped her teacher on the hand . . . Clearly Lizzie was attached to this teacher and wanted her attention, but she didn’t “act out” in order to get it. (Field journal, 11.17.11)

Musical Engagement

Lizzie was attentive in class, and watched the other students and me for cues regarding when to sing or play her instrument. Typically, she sang along but her mouth was barely moving. In our first interview, I asked Lizzie, “What do you do in music?” She thought for a moment, and then softly said, “Sing.”

ARBH: What other things do we do in music, than sing?
Lizzie: Play the drum.
ARBH: What other instruments do we play? You don’t know the names? If you don’t know the names, can you draw them?
[Shrugs]
ARBH: Or just show me how to play them? Do we pay one that looks like this [mimes tambourine]?” (Interview, 11.18.2011)
I then gave Lizzie some colored pencils and a notebook of drawing paper and asked her to “take these and draw for me something about music class. Anything you want.” She immediately began to draw a tambourine.

![Student generated artwork - Lizzie.](image)

**Figure 1.** Student generated artwork - Lizzie.

ARBH: Do you know what this is called?

[Shakes head no]

ARBH: Tambourine. Do you want me to write it?

[Shakes head yes]

ARBH: Tam…bo…rine [while writing]

Lizzie repeats me.

ARBH: I like that drawing a lot. Now, is there anything else you want to draw from music class? You can draw another one if you want to.

[Lizzie reaches for a pencil and starts to draw]

Later in the interview, she added musical notation:

ARBH: Can you draw these notes? … Do you remember how I draw those on the board? Ta ta tiri tiri ta?

[Lizzie starts to draw the stick notation seen at the top of the page]
ARBH: That’s exactly right. Very good. I put two bars across the top to show it’s a tiri.tiri. What does a .ti ti. look like? Like if I said ta.ti ti.ta.ta? Can you draw a ti ti? . . . there’s the .ti ti. It just has one bar . . . Well, is there anything else you want to tell me about music class right now?

Lizzie: You know that thing that’s [mimes cymbals]?

ARBH: The cymbals?

[Lizzie draws]

ARBH: Now, are those the little ones [finger] or the big ones?

Lizzie: Little ones.

ARBH: Want me to write that?

[Lizzie writes on her paper]

ARBH: Do you know how to write cymbals? It’s weird, let me show you . . .

[She copies the word] (Interview, 11.18.2011)

Instrumental Engagement. Lizzie’s sense of steady beat does not seem to be well-developed. Her rhythmic execution is rarely accurate; however, she begins and ends at the appropriate times by attending to her classmates or me for visual, aural, or musical cues.

When given the choice of pitched percussion, she does not seem to be drawn to any particular instrument. Unpitched percussion instruments are usually assigned according to what we need for that particular piece. In the following instance, we were using hand drums to create repetitive rhythmic patterns. “Others start playing their instruments but Lizzie holds hers in her lap, turning it over and resting it on her knee. She taps it on her knee absentmindedly and watches as others receive their drums” (Field journal, 11.17.2011).
During our 20 minute focus group session, Lizzie had the freedom to play any of the instruments that were made available. For this session, I started with the instruments they see the most in music class, then later I pulled out instruments we didn’t use as much - the conga drum and the buffalo drums, for instance. Like the other three, Lizzie spoke very little during this time, focusing instead on playing the many instruments that were available to her. Although she tried almost all of the instruments, she kept returning to the ratchet and the contra bass bar; the ratchet seemed to be the favorite. She was not playing in a particularly musical way, for the most part, and she rarely interacted with the other 3 students. However, at one point she came face to face with Landon and Stephanie, and without saying a word, they played three large mallet strokes on their buffalo drums simultaneously, then they wandered away from each other.

Although Lizzie was consistently rhythmically inaccurate, she was attentive to visual and perhaps aural cues that indicated when she was supposed to play. “This time she is to go first, and again plays the appropriate time, but randomly. Her partner doesn’t play at her designated time, so Lizzie elbows her and gestures toward her instrument” (Field journal, 3.1.2012). She also had a good understanding of rhythmic notation, and could identify and draw stick notation.

**Vocal Engagement.** Lizzie could usually vocalize along with the songs we were singing in music class. However, I could not hear her light, soft voice and when she sang she barely moved her mouth. However, she participated in vocal activities, and when prompted to tell me about songs we’ve sung, she could quote the lyrics more quickly than she could provide the title. She could also express the content of a song or chant. Here, we discussed a poem that we used as a chant in music class:
ARBH: What other songs do you like in music?

Lizzie: The ice cream

ARBH: What does that go with? What else is in that song?

Lizzie: Pile up the plate.

ARBH: Right - pile that plate

Lizzie: Peanut butter and jelly jam

ARBH: That’s right. And the lemon

Lizzie: And the pickle

ARBH: What did they do?

Lizzie: They went to the grocery store?

ARBH: And then what happened?

Lizzie: The lady shoot the lemon and pickle. (Interview, 11.17.2011)

*Physical engagement*

During the course of this study, there were no structured movement activities, such as folk dances or prescribed sequences of movement, during the observed music classes; rather, movement was elicited as improvisatory, meant to dramatize the song or poem we were learning. For instance, we added movement to our Halloween song to illustrate the witches, goblins, ghosts, and skeletons mentioned in the song itself. We also dramatized a poem entitled “A Lemon and a Pickle”; this poem told a story, and students volunteered to portray the specific characters in our dramatization. For the Halloween song, Lizzie volunteered to sing, and for “A Lemon and a Pickle” she played an instrument. She showed no interest in being an actor for either piece.
When the class did a group movement activity, Lizzie participated enthusiastically in a group of 4 girls. They were to act out games that could be played outside.

Lizzie’s group is all girls . . . when I tell them to start, her group turns together and they start to chat . . . She does not offer any suggestions. I walk away, and they start playing tag. They run from each other and tag each other, giggling and smiling. She utters a few exclamations, dodging out of the way of others trying to tag her. (Field journal, 1.26.2012)

Intrapersonal engagement

When questioned about her reaction to musical activities, she typically gives one word responses or answers nonverbally by nodding or shrugging. As I became aware that she was not vocalizing her reactions to certain musical activities, I began my next interview by reviewing with her some feeling words. Even in this instance, though, I found myself prompting her:

ARBH: What are some feeling words?
Lizzie: Um, easy.
ARBH: Easy. OK, what are some other feeling words?
Lizzie: Hard.
ARBH: Hard?
Lizzie: Fun, funny.
ARBH: Angry
Lizzie: Angry
ARBH: Sad
Lizzie: Sad.
ARBH: Excited? Are those some good words? How about bored?
Lizzie: Nervous.
ARBH: Nervous. Ok. Those are good words to use for feelings.
Lizzie: Good, bad. (Interview, 2.24.2012)

Lizzie’s music class came at 1:30, one hour before dismissal. In the majority of the field observations I conducted over the course of the study, I described her demeanor in terms such as “distracted,” “tired,” or “yawning.” She complained of a headache and twice she slipped out of class (with her teacher’s permission) to use the bathroom or get a drink of water. When in music class, she slumped down in her chair; however, she watched me and followed directions. Typically, she was not overly involved in our activities; for instance, when we were singing or chanting, I could see her mouth moving but just barely, and I could not hear her. She was participating, but with little observable energy or enthusiasm. When given a handheld instrument to play, she held it quietly, perhaps tapping on it gently without disrupting the class, and played when directed. When playing one of the barred instruments, she was standing for several minutes. It was during this time that she tended to complain of being tired.

Ms. Gail observed that Lizzie does not complain of being tired at the end of the day in her classroom, but she asserts that it is not because Lizzie doesn’t enjoy music class.

ARBH: I watch her and I think, “Is she bored? Is she…”
Ms. Gail: I don’t think she’s bored.
ARBH: So what -- how can you tell, just from knowing her? If she were bored, what would she be doing?
Ms. Gail: She might say, you know, ‘what are we going to do next’ or ‘when can
I play that instrument?’ Or whatever, but then again, she’s not going to exhibit
that kind of behavior; she knows that you’re in charge right now and she should
be quiet, she should be listening. So I don’t know. But she seems happy, she
seems like she enjoys music; I never hear her say that she doesn’t or she always
seems like, ‘Today’s the day we have music’ like, it’s positive. Um, but now that
other day when she was saying, ‘how much longer till we go back to the room?’
I think, I don’t know if that was just bored, or that day I do see more of that but I
still think it’s more tired. I don’t know. She is hard to read.

ARBH: Mm hm, she is. Do you ever see in your classroom, when she’s
struggling with something, does she -

Ms. Gail: She cries when she thinks she can’t do something… If she can’t
remember how to spell a word, she can’t remember a new math fact, so that’s
another reason I don’t think she realizes that she’s not getting everything,
because I think she’s really not showing signs of frustration…So, I haven’t seen
any of that. She’s upright, she, to me she looks like she’s wanting to participate
and happy, not ‘I don’t know, I don’t know what I’m supposed to do.’… She’s
always one of the first to finish her assignments, and she’ll say, ‘what may I do
next?’ or she’ll ask if she can go on to the next assignment, or she’ll say, ‘Do
you want me to get a book?’ or she’ll ‘can I read a book, can I color in this?’… I
don’t really see her, like, letting herself get bored, I guess? … I’m not sure what
she would look like if she were bored…But in here, she’s not going to jump up
and say ‘Becky, what else can I do? I don’t want to do this.’ So I don’t know
how I would see that. That’s a good point. (Interview, 2.24.2012)

Gail also states that Lizzie’s crying typically happens toward the end of the day:
I’ve seen it especially during math class when we’ve done some math concepts that she hadn’t been introduced to before . . . I’d say once or twice a week, maybe. And once she gets in that ‘I can’t do it’ mode, it’s really hard to bring her out. Luckily most of the time, our math is in the afternoon, so most of the time that has happened, it’s been in the afternoon. (Interview, 11.15.2011)

Early in the study, I observed Lizzie in a moment that seemed to cause her some disquiet. We were playing a repetitive pattern on the pitched percussion instruments, and she was having trouble playing it correctly. I came and worked with her, and she became visibly frustrated.

She stopped and shook her mallets, then sat back in her chair. Her teacher came behind her and hugged her. She seemed to be frustrated, and I could hear the teacher telling her they only have 5 more minutes. Lizzie pointed to her head . . . I saw Ms. Larissa (her teacher’s assistant) . . . tell her that she will help her . . . She held Lizzie’s mallets and showed her when to play, then told her to play on ‘BOO.’ Then she tells her, ‘You did it! You did it!’ Lizzie looked frustrated. Her teacher started rubbing Lizzie’s head lightly and saying that she had a headache. … We played it again, and she watched me very closely . . . Her teacher loudly praised her, and she smiled. Her teacher tells her that she hardly needed to help her, that Lizzie did it on her own. Lizzie’s accuracy improved very much, and she seemed to be concentrating more. (Field journal, 10.27.2011)

The fact that Lizzie seemed so tired at the end of the day (I also noted her yawning and being distracted in our interviews, also in the afternoons) may correlate to her emotional reaction to frustration during math class.
Summary

Overall, Lizzie was an agreeable student. Not a demonstrative child by nature, she rarely contributed to music enthusiastically, but she did participate. Most of the time she could be seen moving her mouth along with the words to the song or chant we were performing, and when given an instrument, she responded at the correct times. Her execution of rhythmic tasks was inaccurate, however, and her voice was so light and soft that she could not be heard when singing.

From my point of view as an observer, I felt that Lizzie was not fully engaged in music class. She followed directions and complied with the rules, but I did not see an emotional response to very many of the activities in which she participated. On the other hand, her teacher commented many times that she felt Lizzie was “happy,” “following directions,” or “engaged.” Ms. Gail also distinguished times when she thought Lizzie understood the task and times when she felt that Lizzie was confused.

Gregory

Gregory was an 11-year-old boy in his fourth year at the DuBard School for Language Disorders. He was a handsome, athletic boy whose teacher described him as “very courteous, takes his turn, allows others to go first, has good manners, says thank you when you help him with his work, that kind of thing” (Interview, 11.18.2011). Because of his personality, “he does seem to attract more people around him” (Interview, 2.9.2012); she said in a later interview that he was “well-liked” (Interview, 3.8.2012). His records indicated diagnoses of dyslexia, expressive and receptive language disorders, and a visual perception disorder. None of these diagnoses required medication. His classroom teacher was Ms. Evelyn; however, for this study I interviewed his math teacher, Ms.
Meredith, who he saw each day for an hour. Ms. Evelyn was on maternity leave for the majority of the data collection period.

Ms. Meredith held a specialist’s degree in educational leadership and a master’s in speech-language pathology. In addition to holding teaching credentials from the state of Mississippi, she held a certificate in special education, another in hearing disability, yet another in mild and moderated disability, and a state board of health license. She was also a certified Speech Language Pathologist who worked with children of all ages for 16 years, the last 10 of which were at the DuBard School.

Despite the fact that Gregory was an outgoing, confident boy, he struggled with idiomatic speech. Ms. Meredith identified some of Gregory’s subtle mannerisms that indicate his search for the appropriate word or phrase needed to properly respond in a conversation.

Meredith: There was probably more he did know to answer, or wanted to answer but he was unsure and scared to make a mistake so he just made it short and sweet . . . he chose [the word] ‘exciting,’ so he must have decoded that enough to get it, but then he didn’t use that word in the sentence, he reverted back to ‘fun.’ So some of that you see the language disorder . . . He was unsure of what you were asking of him to do, so he didn’t know….

ARBH: So what told you that he was unsure…?

Meredith: It was ‘umm,’ you hear the ‘Uh,’ and . . . the hesitation, searching for words to find, wanting to make sure it was the right thing . . . He tries to hide it. He compensates well for his disorder. (Interview, 2.9.2012)
Social/Societal Engagement

There was no question that Gregory was a popular student. Through observations and interviews with Ms. Meredith, the subject of his personality and his rapport with other students and teachers was a frequently recurring topic. Ms. Meredith states, “He is a leader, but not the point of being pushy . . . you don’t hear him saying ugly things or mean things.” She went on to state that in class, “You don’t have to repeat directions to him. He’s quick to follow directions” (Interview, 11.18.2011).

Of the four participants in this study, Gregory was the only one to draw people in his picture.

![Student generated artwork - Gregory.](image)

In studying Gregory’s picture, I noticed that some of the people were sitting and some were standing. When he drew it, he voiced his dissatisfaction with the scale of the drawing, claiming, “I put the tables too high.” I commented that some of his people did not have a chair, and asked if it was because they were tall. He replied, “Some people, they like to be in a chair” (Interview 11.18.2011). This statement showed his attunement to the others in his class; this was reinforced by another conversation we had regarding a visual aid I used in class:

ARBH: Did that help, sort of, make sense to you to have the cards different lengths? To show the different lengths of the notes?

Gregory: Yes, yes, that really helped other people too.
Gregory’s peer interaction went beyond merely socializing. He was helpful to his classmates during music class, nudging them when they missed musical cues and assisting them with tasks. On one occasion, the students were arranged into pairs. Each pair had a set of index cards on which were written musical notes. They were to arrange them into a pattern. One of the boys in the pair next to Gregory was supposed to arrange his cards, but he was not paying attention, so Gregory reached over and arranged his cards for him. When I questioned him about this incident, he had the following to say:

ARBH: Did you do it because you didn’t want him to get in trouble, or did you do it just because you wanted it to get done? Do you remember?

[Gregory shakes his head]

ARBH: Like, if that were happening now, would you think, “Oh, I don’t want Walter to get in trouble for not doing this”, or . . .

Gregory: Yeah, I guess

ARBH: Would you think, “Oh, this just needs to get done so we can keep moving in music class”

Gregory: I like, so he won’t get in trouble. (Interview, 3.9.2012)

When I showed the same video segment to Ms. Meredith, she had a different perception of Gregory’s intentions:

ARBH: And I don’t know, do you think that’s more like wanting it to be just right, or more being a good friend?

Meredith: I think that plays into it. I think it’s more wanting to be right.

ARBH: And is that more of a “so we don’t get in trouble” or just so it’s satisfying.

Meredith: Yeah, I think it’s more satisfying. Must be some little OCD stuff there, or perfectionism, or something. (Interview, 3.8.2012)
While Gregory was compliant with directions and abides by classroom and school rules, he also exuded a confidence that might earn him the title Class Clown. He focused on the task at hand but did not shy from the opportunity to amuse his classmates. For example, during a music class in which the class was playing a steady beat on pitched percussion instruments, the tempo began to accelerate - a typical occurrence with this type of activity; however, as the speed increased, Gregory perpetuated it. This prompted his classmates’ amused response, recorded in my field journal:

He realizes that the beat is getting faster and he perpetuates it, giggling with his neighbor. He plays his last few notes faster and faster, and he laughs and tells his partner something about “speeding up.” The partner tells the next girl, “Greg lost it” and she gasps. His neighbors tell on him as I am complimenting the group on a good job. His neighbor says, “and Greg…,” then the girl next to him says, “Greg.” Someone else says “Greg had to ruin it” saying “Greg had to speed it up;” “He ruined it” he just smiles and shrugs, shifting his weight. They are clearly teasing him, and he is a good sport about it (Field journal, 2.9.2012).

In another example that took place during the aforementioned activity in which he chose to be a cheerleader,

Another boy in his group asked him what he was doing, and he responded, ‘I’m a girl.’ The boy made a surprised face and went to his teacher, saying, ‘Gregory says he’s a girl.’ His teacher responded that he was a cheerleader (Field journal, 1.26.2012)

Ms. Meredith saw his quick decision to act the part of the cheerleader to his group’s football team as a show of independence, not defiance. “He followed directions, he didn’t have to follow the crowd; he was a leader” (Interview, 2.9.2012).
Musical Engagement

Gregory had a penchant for musical activities. In the past he sang with his church choir, and he told me that he had a piano at home. He also described an internalization of music and the enjoyment of expressing it: “I like to beat on stuff” (Interview, 2.10.2012).

He had a strong sense of beat and rhythm, and self-corrected when his musical responses were inaccurate or incorrect. During one of our interviews, we discussed his attention to musical errors:

ARBH: . . . You started here: G.A, and then you stopped, and started again, and started the correct way. So do you remember thinking through that?

Gregory: Yeah, I remember I kinda messed up like when I (mimes mallet movement)...I accidentally hit it twice, and then I had to start over.

ARBH: You had to start over.

Gregory: I would get out of rhythm (Interview, 11.18.2011).

This sensitivity to musical cues could be seen in other instances as well. In one example, Gregory’s partner was supposed to repeat a four-beat rhythm pattern first played by Gregory, and he missed his cue several times. Gregory began prompting him to play. I asked him how he knew when the other boy was supposed to play, and he said that it “didn’t really sound right . . . you can tell there was a beat when he was finished so you could pick up where he was.” At that point in the activity, he was no longer referring to the index cards we were using as graphic organizers; he had internalized the phrase length.

Similar diligence with his work could be seen through his behaviors in his classroom. I observed him one morning during a spelling test. From watching the class, I could see that the teacher gave them strategies for working out the sounds in the words.
Gregory could be seen sounding out the word, and “seemed confident that he got it. He nodded his head affirmatively.” After the spelling tests, he moved to the chalkboard to write a sentence on the board. In doing so, he made a few errors which he caught and corrected without seeming frustrated or discouraged (Field journal, classroom observation 11.17.2011).

During “down time” in music class, he often practiced quietly on his instrument or talked to his peers on the topic of music. For example, one day while I was working with another group, “the boy next to [Gregory] began playing a dotted rhythm as opposed to the straight quarter notes they had been playing; Gregory also experimented with the rhythm” (Field journal, 11.10.11). This improvisatory experimentation was typical of Gregory’s instrumental engagement when he was not being directed to play something specific.

A particularly remarkable example could be seen in a focus group setting in which the four participants were given 20 minutes of unstructured time with the musical instruments commonly used in music class. The instruments were arranged in their usual places and the students were given no directions as to how to spend their time in the room. The pitched percussion instruments were lined up on the cafeteria tables, with glockenspiels on one end, followed by a soprano xylophone, three alto xylophones, and two alto metallophones. At the end of the table, a contra bass bar (pitched C) was placed on the floor. Unpitched handheld percussion instruments such as claves, rhythm sticks, hand drums, tambourines, finger cymbals, triangles, a ratchet, a cabasa, and a vibraslap, were also laid out on the tables within easy reach.

Despite Gregory’s demonstrated outgoing nature, he was very focused and quiet during this time, and as I observed, I could see him going through a process of musical
composition through improvisation on pitched percussion instruments whose bars were arranged in a C pentatonic scale. He started by playing short melodic patterns on la/sol/mi, moving between the alto and soprano xylophones. As he established a discernible rhythm, he began improvising melodically, playing an ascending pattern, then reversing it. His improvisations became less linear, and from time to time he switched instruments, staying mostly on the xylophones rather than metallophones. Later, I brought out a conga drum, and he “played his syncopated rhythm pattern on the conga repetitively, using alternating hands . . . he played the pattern forcefully and confidently, moving his body with the rhythm” (focus group, 1.27.2012).

When Gregory and I reviewed the video from the focus group, we discussed his thought process as he was able to recall it. I asked him why he moved from instrument to instrument, and then we went on to discuss his composition process in more detail:

Gregory: Yeah, I wanted to see what they sounded like with the same sound, like, what I’m doing that will sound the best.

ARBH: . . . Did you notice that you played the same thing on the drum that you played on the other instruments?

Gregory: I think so.

ARBH: When you got to the drum you went (drums on table) So that’s the same rhythm. Did you do that on purpose, or... do you remember?

Gregory: Um, I guess that’s the first thing that comes to my mind and I do it.

ARBH: So it’s just stuck in your head?

Gregory: Yes ma’am.

ARBH: Well, what did you think about as you played through all these instruments? Did you think one was better than the other?
Gregory: I think the wooden one [xylophone].

ARBH: . . . Why is that?

Gregory: It’s not so loud and um, it’s not like really soft, but it’s kind of in the middle, I like that it doesn’t vibrate really, like the metal ones.

ARBH: You did play [sings melody pattern] several times. You also played some different things . . .

Gregory: Yeah, I wanted to kind of switch it around see if I, if it sounds better than the other one.

Becky: What did you think?

Gregory: Mm, I think the second one I did was a little better. (Interview, 2.10.2012).

Instrumental engagement. In our first interview, I asked Gregory to “tell me anything you want about music class.” His immediate response was to mention instruments, “I like doing the drums, things, the, what’s it called (mimes mallets)?”

ARBH: The xylophones? What do you like about that?

Gregory shrugs.

ARBH: The way it feels to play them or the way it sounds?

Gregory: The way it sounds.

ARBH: What other instruments do you like in there?

Gregory: I think the buffalo drums.

His response, “The way it sounds” could be traced throughout his discussions of timbre; he seemed to judge instruments by their sound, rather than how they looked or the kinesthetic experience of playing them. For example, when I asked him whether he liked
the glockenspiel or the xylophone better, he said, “I kind of like, more the blockensmiel (sic) because the noise, it has a different noise” (Interview, 2.24.2012).

When I asked Gregory to “draw a picture of music class,” he took the directive literally, and drew the xylophones as they are typically arranged on the tables in the cafeteria. When I asked him about the picture, he explained “because it’s my favorite instrument, and I like playing it” (Interview, 11.18.2011). The dots on the bars of the instruments represent colored stickers that are used in music class to remind students which bars to play (see Figure 2).

His instrument choices during the unstructured focus group were random. I asked him if he chose instruments that he hadn’t played as much in class, and he responded, “Yes, ma’am. Some I like to play . . . but I don’t get to play the triangle a lot. I like the triangle.” He also expressed why he likes the vibraslap: “I like the rattling of the noise, and the shaking.” The majority of his time was spent playing pitched percussion instruments (xylophones, metallophones, glockenspiels), but he also returned to the contra bass bar several times. “I like the sound and how it goes with the beat of the song.” We have used this instrument to provide a steady beat for some of our songs, most recently the Halloween song that we performed in the fall semester. He also played the conga drum for a few minutes at the end.

Vocal engagement. During the fall semester, the upper level classes learned a song with a more complex melody than we have previously attempted. One afternoon, Gregory’s class arrived a few minutes before the other class, and as we were waiting I began to sing the song. At a certain point, the melody lingers on D5 for eight beats of eighth notes. The words are “she goes through sweetie biscuits at a most alarming pace.” Although he is not one to blurt out in class, he sang this part in a strong voice on the
correct pitch. The others in the room turned to look at him, and he shrank down in his seat a little, smiling. We sang the song again and this time I was standing closer to him. He did not repeat his performance, perhaps because “it sounds squeaky” (Field notes, 11.17.2011). From then on he sang the song more timidly and with less accurate pitch (Field notes, 11.3.2011). I wondered if his response in the following conversation would have been different if not for that incident:

ARBH: How do you feel about singing?

Gregory: Mm, I don’t really like it ‘cause um, when you’re a kid you have still that high pitch voice . . .

ARBH: You don’t like that? Why do you not like having that high voice?

Gregory: ‘Cause it doesn’t really sound good when you sing. (Interview, 2.24.2012)

On a different day, we sang this song again. When I asked for volunteers for singers, he did not offer to sing. I asked the boy standing next to him to be a singer, and he pulled on Gregory’s arm, encouraging him to come too. Gregory recalled:

Gregory: [He] was saying, ‘come on, come on,’ because since he didn’t want to be up there by hisself.

ARBH: Why didn’t you go?

Gregory: I don’t know.

ARBH: But yesterday when we did it, you did come and sing. What was the difference?

Gregory: Well, David [another student who usually volunteers to sing] didn’t . . . ‘cause of his sore throat, so I said I would do it.
ARBH: Oh, that was really nice of you. Did you like it, when you did it?

Gregory: Yes, Ma’am. (Interview, 11.18.2011)

His formal response to me at the end was not consistent with other comments he made about singing. This led me to believe that he may have been giving me the response he felt I wanted to hear.

Physical Engagement

Gregory seemed to be in constant motion. When he was playing a musical instrument, his body moved rhythmically; when we were not musically engaged, he shifted his feet from side to side or bounced his mallets on his shoulders. Ms. Meredith commented, “Sometimes that extra helps you, it kind of releases the energy so that you can concentrate. Almost like a self-stimulation kind of activity” (2.24.2012).

At times, Gregory had trouble remembering some of the instrument names. When this happened, he tended to mime playing the instrument to explain which one he meant.

When playing instruments, Gregory often moved in tempo with the rhythmic pattern, ostinato, or bordun that he was performing. He bounced his knees, slipped his hips, or bobbed his head. Ms. Meredith noticed this when reviewing a video:

He was very active. He seemed to have the rhythm, even with his body, because his foot was doing [taps her foot] you know, he was still doing that, and his little bounce, he had the same rhythm . . .

She then commented, “but he’s usually not that active, he’s not all over the place like that” (Interview, 3.8.2012). Because she had him in math class, where he was seated the majority of the time, she did not see the same level of extraneous movement that I saw. “I don't think he ever gets in trouble, as far as moving around, ‘you need to sit back down, you're out of your seat’ or anything like that” (Interview, 11.17.2011).
Ms. Meredith noticed his spontaneous rhythmic movement that he exhibited especially when playing instruments, “Ooh, he’s got a little groove with his [movement]!” (Interview, 2.24.2012). Over the course of the study, she commented several times on the role his kinesthetic involvement played in his musical execution. For example, she commented on an instance in music class when a kinesthetic demonstration seemed to facilitate his understanding:

With him, I saw, he started to do that and you said ‘No, just one, and then go back and forth’ but then you demo’d I saw . . . he had it . . . But once you put the motor with it, he got it, and once you put the visual, the multisensory, he could get it (2.24.2012).

When performing a rhythmic task, his body movements synchronized to the beat. In my field journal, I noted this on several occasions:

He bounces his mallets between strikes, which seems to help him keep from rushing the tempo . . . He almost always moves his head and body when he is playing, and he looks down at his instrument most of the time. His tempo is steady and accurate. (Field journal, 11.10.2011)

We . . . start a body percussion pattern . . . he moves his head and shoulders with the beat. . . . He is very attentive and he responds to rhythm with whole body movement as though he is internalizing the phrasing . . . (1.19.2012)

Ms. Meredith also noticed this physical manifestation of the beat: “He’s moving a lot…Feet are going; feet’s got the rhythm” (3.8.2012).

Gregory explains that this spontaneous movement serves a purpose:

ARBH: Do you notice what you do when you play?

Gregory shakes his head.
ARBH: You haven’t noticed what you do? You go like this [moves side to side]. Why do you do that?

Gregory: Um, so I won’t get off rhythm.

ARBH: Did you even know you did that?

Gregory: Yeah. (Interview, 3.9.2012)

During one music class, I assigned groups of four or five students the task of acting out an activity of their choice. My directive was to choose an outdoor activity or game. In my field journal, I recalled:

Gregory stands to the side of his group waving his hands in the air as though holding pom poms and kicking his feet. He does some jumps in the air and it is apparent that he is pretending to be a cheerleader. He is smiling and laughing, his jumps getting bigger and covering more area. The other members of his group are consulting with each other; they [decide to play] football. They look over at Gregory, but do not comment on his cheerleading choice. Two of the other boys whisper to each other, then the start bumping into each other. Gregory keeps cheering, shifting his feet from side to side and waving his arms around. (Field journal, 1.26.2012)

Gregory shared his idea about his role in the performance:

Gregory: All of us wanted to do football.

ARBH: . . . What made you want to be a cheerleader?

Gregory: ‘Cause I know nobody wanted to do that, that much, and it’s fun.

(Interview, 2.10.2012)

Gregory engaged in movement activities enthusiastically; however, when he performed for an audience, he shied away from his typical expressive performance. For
our culminating performance of fall semester, he elected to act as a witch during a Halloween song (Appendix M). He was to come in from the side with the other witches, “fly” around on his broomstick, then move to the instrument he was to play for the 2
nd song on the program. During rehearsal,

. . . he ran through open space as though he is riding a broom. His shoulders were hunched, and he was the most animated of the actors. He headed back around the instruments and I redirected him (he was supposed to). He came back around, making a funny face as he flew through. (Field journal, 12.13.2012)

We performed the song two days later, with the lower level students and teachers as our audience. Whereas in rehearsals he participated enthusiastically, in the performance, “He did not do any kind of acting, just walked through and didn’t even smile” (Field journal, 12.15.2012). I asked him in our first interview if it made him nervous to do something no one else was doing. He replied, “That depends if I’m like on a stage.” He then mentioned that he sang with a church choir when he “was, like, 8” (Interview, 11.18.2011).

Intrapersonal Engagement

As stated above, Gregory was a boy who exuded confidence, abided by school rules, and complied with directions. He was kind and well-mannered, and he almost always put forth an energetic effort. When he made mistakes, he was persistent in correcting them, but he remained calm. In answer to my question, “When you play something wrong . . . what do you think when that happens?” he replied simply, “Next time I’ll just do it right.” I then asked him if it frustrated him, and he stated, “I just keep on going.” Later in the same interview, we discussed his attempts at melodic improvisation over a given rhythmic phrase. As he was watching the video clip, he stated,
“Those last two tries I got it right.” We then discussed whether it was easier to improvise or to play a given phrase, and he stated that while it is more difficult to learn a given melodic/rhythmic pattern, he felt a stronger sense of satisfaction at mastering it: “Um, after I got it right, I like the one way” (Interview, 3.9.2012).

While viewing the same video excerpt, Ms. Meredith also noticed him practicing his part, “Looks like he’s a little frustrated with it. He keeps trying . . . Not quite…still not satisfied with it…ok, then he got it, so he’s happy.” She went on to note that he’s very kinesthetic, you can see, he would watch and then he’d want to try immediately; wasn’t much pause in between; he had to see it and try it and see it and try it. He kept doing it until he felt like he had it . . . (Interview, 3.8.2012)

In addition to practicing his instrumental parts, I also saw him practicing rhythm syllables, words, and phrases on a few occasions. For example, one of our songs contained the unfamiliar word, “whoop,” which required an explanation of pronunciation. “When we talked about the pronunciation of ‘whoop,’ he practiced to himself” (Field journal, 1.26.2012).

Gregory was demonstrative when attempting a new musical task. When he made a mistake, he put his hands over his face or said, “Dang!,” but he did not seem overly frustrated; true to his word, he simply tried again. When he was happy with his performance, his satisfaction was obvious. During class one day, he was learning a new instrument part. According to my field notes, “He said, ‘I totally got it.’ He did the pattern and gave a congratulatory fist pump” (Field journal, 1.19.2012).

After the fall performance, the participants for this study met to view the video recording and engage in a focus group interview. During the video, Gregory noted, “We did do a really good job stopping.” Later in the interview, I supplied the participants with
descriptive words written on index cards to help them express their personal reflections of the performance. When Gregory was asked to describe the event, he said,

Gregory: Uh, funny.

ARBH: What parts were funny to you?

Gregory: The shoo wop, shoo wop. (Focus group, 12.16.2011)

As a side note, he is referring to a song that was performed by one of the lower level classes. I prompted him to continue:

ARBH: This one says confusing, bad, happy, hard.

Gregory: Um, it was easy.

ARBH: OK, the whole thing? Or were there any parts that were…

Gregory: Like, being a witch was easy.

ARBH: What about the instruments?

Gregory: It was easy.

ARBH: And, singing? You did some singing, didn’t you?

Gregory: Yeah.

ARBH: … How would you say you did on the performance? Would you say great?

Gregory: OK

ARBH: Do you think you did great, or just OK?

Gregory (shrugs): OK. (Focus group, 12.16.2011)

Summary

Gregory seemed to have a natural predisposition for music. He caught on to rhythm patterns quickly, and his internalization of the beat manifested itself visibly through body movements. He could sing on pitch with a good tone quality and strength of
sound; however, when I called attention to him, he shied away from vocalizing. On the other hand, he responded well to positive reinforcement when he was playing an instrument. His teacher noted that “he responds well to verbal praise” (Interview, 11.17.2011).

Socially, his popularity among other students and teachers was unquestionable. He had a pleasant, friendly demeanor and a good sense of humor. His classmates clearly felt comfortable with him, teasing him from time to time and laughing at his antics in class. While I would consider him to be a “class clown,” he was not disruptive to instruction; rather, his humorous actions added a sense of levity to our class sessions.

As a student, he was conscientious and hard working, typically putting forth a good effort with a positive attitude. His confidence in his musical abilities only wavered when asked to vocalize. One-on-one, he was polite and well-mannered, addressing me as “ma’am” and thanking me at the end of our interview sessions. His answers to questions were sincere, if not eloquent, and as the study progressed he offered more information.

Ms. Meredith viewed a portion of our first focus group in which we watched then discussed the video from our fall performance. During the discussion he was fairly quiet, and Ms. Meredith noted that in his answers, he was “searching for words to find, wanting to make sure it was the right thing but ‘I don’t know what you’re wanting from me’” (Interview, 2.9.2012).

His musicianship seemed to come naturally, and he possessed the ability to self-assess and correct. When he made a mistake in the music, he attempted at the task again or he practiced quietly when I was busy working with another group. Music seemed to hold a certain significance with him; he stated, “Sometimes, like, at my house I just … some reason a beat just got to my head and never left …” (Interview, 2.10.2012).
Emergent Themes

Given the volume of data, the range of emergent themes was understandably wide. For the purposes of analysis, themes were grouped according to their relevance to the research questions.

*How do music students with language disorders interpret their own actions in the music classroom?*

This question was addressed through examination of their descriptions of musical activities, their actions and descriptions of the societal structure of the music classroom, their descriptions of their own engagement, and incidents in which they displayed knowledge transfer, relating musical concepts to other areas of knowledge or experience.

*What, if any, discrepancies exist between teacher and student interpretations of student engagement in the music classroom?*

The four teacher participants drew comparisons between the contextual structure of the music classroom and their own classroom. In addition, comparisons were made between student behavior in music and in the classroom.

When examining the data sources, I also found myself with a different perception of an action or event than that of the participant and/or his or her teacher. At times, the classroom teacher reasoned about the student’s action in a different way than the student explained it. At other times, I observed actions from the students that were inconsistent with what the teacher perceived.

*What choices regarding engagement do music students with language disorders make in the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom?*
Overall, I saw a strong sense of responsibility among the students to comply with classroom rules and procedures, not only in the music classroom, but throughout the school setting.

In addition, I observed the students experiencing music from a kinesthetic perspective, engaging in movement in several ways, described and defined as spontaneous, improvisatory, prescribed, and extraneous.

As expected, the students responded to instrumental activities positively and enthusiastically, but for differing reasons. Gregory, Stephanie, and Lizzie showed preferences for instruments with regard to timbre, Stephanie shied away from instruments that were too loud, and Gregory expressed verbal preferences for certain instruments.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Research Question One

*How do music students with language disorders interpret their own actions in the music classroom?*

Through the various sources of data, I investigated the lived experiences of the four participants. Their words revealed patterns of meaning that shed insight into their knowledge of music and how they applied that knowledge toward their engagement in music class.

*Musical vocabulary*

“You see that one go boom boom.” Taking into consideration the communication difficulties present in children with language disorders, I attempted to answer this research question by placing their verbal and observed responses in the context of the DuBard School for Language Disorders and the music class that operated within. Whereas interview responses from the four participants lacked in eloquence, deeper levels of meaning emerged when compared with observations made by their classroom teachers and myself.

Initial questioning of the participants regarding their impressions of music class brought forth superficial answers regarding activities such as playing instruments, playing games, and singing, rather than musical concepts. Communicating with the students individually, I became acutely aware of their language deficits as they struggled with musical vocabulary that was still only vaguely familiar to them. Each participant coped with this deficit of words in different ways. When Landon was unsure of an instrument’s name, he mimed playing it and made vocal sound effects.
You see watch this go boom, boom [mimes playing contra bass bar]. You see that one goes boom, boom [mimes playing drum]. That makes noise. That one doing this [makes sound effect and mimes playing kokoriko], you turn it this way you see that one go shhh, shhh [mimes cymbals rubbing]. That one’s turned this way. (Interview, 11.18.2011)

Gregory had a good recall of instrument names, but sometimes described them with movement and approximation of their sound as well. Stephanie used the same strategy for identifying instruments, but she did not provide a sound effect to accompany her movement. Lizzie barely spoke more than a one or two word answer during our interviews, but she drew beautiful pictures of the instruments, thereby expressing herself through her artwork with bold, colorful strokes. By drawing stick notation of ta (quarter note), ti ti (two barred eighth notes), and tiri tiri (four barred sixteenth notes), Lizzie showed that she absorbed some of the musical concepts presented during our music classes (see Figure 1). Eliciting verbal responses proved more difficult.

On the other hand, when I questioned the participants using broad, open ended questions, they became uncertain as to how to respond. In the DuBard Association Method, students are taught to generate questions and answers such as “Who is this?” “This is Becky.” “What is Becky?” “She is a lady.” In other words, they are accustomed to pointed questions with direct responses. When I asked them questions such as, “Why do you like that instrument?” the answer eluded them and they often reverted to noncommittal responses such as “I don’t know,” or “I can’t remember.”

In order to provide them with some vocabulary for our discussion, I began one interview session by reviewing some “feeling words,” such as “happy,” “sad,” “excited,” “mad,” etc. This seemed to help the students express their responses to musical tasks;
however, I did have the sense that I was leading their answers. Lizzie’s responses to open-ended questions were especially vague. In the interview in question, I asked her how she was feeling during part of the video; she shrugged. I asked her to recall the “feeling words” that we discussed a few moments before, and she said, “Um…”, biting her lip. I began to lead her: “Were you angry? [she shook her head] Were you sad? [shakes head], Happy? [nods], and it was fun? [nods]” Later in the interview, I believe she began to understand; I asked, “What did you think of that song?” She shrugged. “Can you use feeling words?” She answered, “It was excited” (Interview, 2.24.2012).

In our individual interview sessions, Lizzie seemed uncomfortable when being questioned. Her answers were brief and she seemed to withdraw physically, bunching up her shoulders and sinking down in her chair. She often answered nonverbally, shrugging her shoulders or nodding/shaking her head. In our final interview, she asked to go to the bathroom; when we returned and resumed the interview, she asked how much longer before we would go back to her classroom and repeatedly looked at the clock. This anxiety could stem from missing her math lesson; in the previous interview when I picked her up at her classroom, Ms. Gail stopped her and said, “Lizzie, it’s OK, It’s OK.” When I later asked Ms. Gail what she meant, she explained:

[Lizzie] had started on her math assignment and . . . I wanted her to know it’s ok that you’re leaving your math work . . . because sometimes in the past she could be like, ‘Oh, no, I don’t want to go right now, I know she’s going to make me do this later; I’m going to be behind’ (Interview, 2.24.2012).

Stephanie required less prompting for responses. Again, we reviewed some “feeling words” at the beginning of the interview, and then watched a video clip from her music class. I asked how she felt about doing rhythmic patterns, and she responded, “I
don’t know.” I asked her if there were a feeling word she could use and she paused. I asked, “Were you angry?” and she laughingly said, “No . . . I felt happy.” Later in the interview, we watched an excerpt from class in which we created rhythms from index cards with notes printed on them. She exclaimed, “See, I knew it! … I memorized it, I memorized it in my brain . . . I remember it. It ti ti/ti ti/ta and put out ti ti/ti ti/ta [half note].” I replied, “Wow. Did that make you feel proud?” to which she responded, “Uh huh!” (Interview, 2.24.2012).

Stephanie was also more apt to discuss musical concepts. Although her musical vocabulary was not sophisticated, she expressed her idea in context. For example, after watching a video in which we sang a Valentine’s song, then performed rhythmic movement in the form of a patticake movement with a partner, I asked her what she and her partner were doing. She replied, “Make a pa, make a…a…patticake [I helped her with this word]. And, and rhythms [she pronounces this very carefully] . . . and it make music with it” (Interview, 2.24.2012). By mentioning that the rhythm and the movement went together to make music, I could see that she somewhat understood the concept behind the lesson for that day.

Gregory was also more forthcoming with his feelings about musical engagement. Because of his age (11), I did not feel it was necessary to review feeling words with him, as I did with the others. Instead, we discussed his preferences in music. I asked him, “What’s it like, learning a new song?” He replied, “I liked it.” However, when I asked him how he felt about singing, he replied, “I don’t really like it ‘cause um, when you’re a kid you have still that high pitch voice.” I asked why he doesn’t like that high voice and he simply said, “’Cause it doesn’t really sound good when you sing.” He conceded that
he doesn’t mind singing, and has since volunteered to sing on our upcoming spring performance.

Communicating with Landon proved to be quite different than with the other three participants. This is not uncommon for a child with an autism spectrum disorder. “Impaired functioning in the areas of communication, social skills, and behavioral flexibility are central in the diagnoses of Autistic Disorder, Asperger’s Disorder, and Pervasive Development Disorder not otherwise specified (atypical autism), which comprise the construct of autism” (Chashin & Barker, 2009, p. 189). Landon’s answers were often unrelated to my questioning, and when watching the video recordings he tended to fixate on his classmates, particularly their clothing.

In our first interview, the first question I asked him was “What do we do in music class?” He answered, “Well, we have um, carpet squares?” I asked him why we use carpet squares, and he replied, “They are for music,” claiming next that we use them as musical instruments. His class uses carpet squares to sit on the floor and we often play musical instruments while seated. Next we talked about musical instruments, and he named the tambourine, demonstrating the motion used to play it. I asked him about other instruments, and he said, “the one that goes ‘pshew’ [mimes playing the small crash cymbals].” He also described the vibraslap: “It makes a chhhhh.” Whenever he referred to an instrument, he almost always mimicked the sound and movement associated with it.

Landon was a very tactile student, which might explain his interest in the way one moved when playing the musical instruments, and the way it felt to make the sound of the instrument vocally. Throughout the field journal I kept, I noted times when Landon was fidgeting with clothes (especially his long sleeves), playing with loose threads on the carpet squares, or feeling the object in his hand, be it an instrument or a manipulative
such as a rhythm card or scarf. When I mentioned this to Ms. Wendy, she noted the “busy-ness of him” (Interview, 2.21.2012).

At the beginning of my 3rd interview with Landon, I asked him to “tell me some feeling words that [he] could use.” Landon’s response was unrelated to my question: “Hey, you remember what happened? Let’s start the video.” When the video was over, I asked him if he liked doing the activity, and he responded in an unrelated way:

ARBH: What is happening in music?
Landon: What is Jackson doing?
ARBH: Um, you tell me. What was he doing?
Landon: I don’t know. He was um . . .
ARBH: What were you doing?
Landon: I wasn’t here.
ARBH: Well, you were right here. What were you doing this day?
Landon: I was looking. Hey, I wasn’t here.
ARBH: Well here you are, on the video.
Landon: I wasn’t here on Thursday.
ARBH: I know. So . . . did you like doing this activity? How did you feel when you were doing that?
Landon: Hey, hey. [he reaches across the table to me] I had tag, did you see? I just popped him.
ARBH: You popped him?
Landon: Because um, I was on base (Interview, 2.24.2012).
Societal involvement

The landscape of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom is one in which the underlying framework is laid by the teacher but the overarching musical product is driven by the students. Certain pragmatics must exist, not only for classroom management and organization, but to provide some structure within and continuity between the weekly class periods.

“...then we take a bow and we went to line up.” In my field journals, I noted that the students generally participated in the societal mechanism of the music classroom by following directions and abiding by the class and school rules. None of the four participants would be considered disruptive by my classroom standards; for the most part they are eager and willing participants.

Although Lizzie showed the least amount of enthusiasm in music class, she followed directions and participated. She was accustomed to the procedures used in music class each week, such as placing her mallets on her shoulders when not playing the instrument. During one of the video segments that we watched in our fourth interview, I praised Lizzie for having her mallets on her shoulders. When the clip was over, I asked her a broad, general question about what she was doing on the video. She responded by saying, “Singing the song and with the mallets on the shoulders.” In field journals, I noted several times during which Lizzie demonstrated patience and self-control while waiting for further instructions.

Lizzie also shows an awareness of her classmates’ engagement, and is quick to point out times when they are not following directions. Her teacher notes that “she wants everybody to comply and do things the right way” (Interview, 2.24.2012), and this is
evidenced by Lizzie’s attention to the behaviors of others. In another viewing of a class video, Lizzie notes,

Lizzie: Karla’s not playing.

ARBH: Where’s Karla? Here?

Lizzie: Yeah. Why is she not playing?

ARBH: I don’t know.

Lizzie: And Tabitha?

ARBH: I think they have a different part to play. (Interview, 11.18.2011)

In observations of Lizzie, her teacher and I noted instances in which Lizzie redirected other classmates or assisted with issues such as finding seats for everyone or helping others set up their instruments.

ARBH: Ok, so what were we doing there?

Lizzie: We’re trying to swing your partner, supposed to put the mallets on the instrument, and then we take a bow and we went to line up. (Interview, 2.24.2012)

Stephanie was a more eager participant in music classes. She seemed to enjoy herself while maintaining a sense of self-control. At times, she interrupted with comments and observations; however, her overall behavior was not disruptive. For example, during an activity in which students were creating rhythm patterns from index cards, she exclaimed, “We’ve, look! Me and Lacey got the same one!” (Field journal, 1.31.2012). When others in her class exhibited questionable behavior, she noticed and occasionally made comments about it. In one of our interview sessions, she noticed a classmate holding his scarf to his mouth.
Stephanie: Oh, ok, Randall tried to…

ARBH: Randall tried to what?

Stephanie: [Laughing] Tried to kiss it. I stayed my ‘way mouth, my mouth

ARBH: Yeah, you kept yours away from your mouth, but Randall put his on his mouth.

Stephanie: Mm hm. I see it closer. OK, Randall put his mouth again. [laughs loudly] Oh no, Randall! Not that, not touch that. [She has a serious expression on her face and she is gesturing at the monitor emphatically] (Interview, 3.9.2012)

Ms. Aimee concurred that Stephanie concerned herself with the behaviors of others, stating,

Now if it’s something that is upsetting her, that relates to her or what they’re doing, then she’ll come and tell the teacher, you know ‘Randall’s not doing whatever’. . . . he’s not following the rules, or he didn’t do this right . . . she gets stuck, sometimes, with that. (Interview, 2.7.2012)

In my field journal and in coding the data sources, I used the phrase “class clown” when referring to Gregory, who contributed to music class in positive ways musically and personally. According to Ms. Meredith, “He has his moments, and especially if it’s something funny, but he always raises his hand and waits his turn” (Interview, 11.18.2012). His congenial nature and calm demeanor suggested that he was at ease and confident in class activities; the only time I saw any timidity was when he was asked to sing. His rapport with his classmates was remarkable; as Ms. Meredith said, “He does seem to attract more people around him.” When I inquired why that might be, she simply stated, “His personality. Because . . . you don’t hear him say ugly things or mean things” (Interview, 2.9.2012).
Gregory’s pleasant demeanor and positive attitude carried over to his participation in class. For the most part, he actively engaged in the lessons, was respectful to others involved, and took care with the instruments. His compliance with rules and procedures seemed habitual; after being in my music classes for three years, perhaps he knew what to expect.

Landon was especially attuned to the rules and procedures associated with music class. “People with autism do not deal well with unexpected change and have a marked preference to do things in an ordered and, at times, ritualistic manner” (Chashin & Barker, 2009). While the DuBard School’s regimented structure allowed Landon a predictable routine to follow, when it varied he took note. In our third interview, he repeatedly told me about his absence from school that week. It happened to be the week of Mardi Gras, and the DuBard students were out of school on that Monday and Tuesday. I am not clear if he was actually sick during the week, or if he was reacting to the change in school schedule.

Landon: I wasn’t here yesterday.

ARBH: I know.

Landon: I wasn’t here in music.

ARBH: No, we didn’t have music this week because we were on break.

Landon: We didn’t, I wasn’t here, I was sick.

ARBH: Oh, I’m sorry to hear that.

Landon: I wasn’t here.

ARBH: I’m glad you’re here today.

Landon: Were you all at music? On Tuesday?

Later, in the same interview, he mentions his absence again:
ARBH: What were you doing [in the video]?
Landon: I wasn’t here.
ARBH: Well, you were right here [on the video]. What was, what were you doing this day?
Landon: I was looking. Hey, I wasn’t here.
ARBH: Well here you are, on the video.
Landon: I wasn’t here on Thursday.
Later: Hey I’ll come back on Monday and Tuesday. See, I wasn’t here. (2.24.2012)
Our next interview was held on the Friday before Spring Break, and he spoke to me about the upcoming change in his routine:
Landon: We don’t have no school Monday and Tuesday?
ARBH: You don’t have school Monday or Tuesday? Oh wow.
Landon: We don’t have school?
ARBH: That’s exciting. Are you going anywhere special? Do you know?
Landon: Um, I’m going to the beach.
Landon’s sensitivity to dates and schedules was reflected in his awareness of our Friday interview schedule, even though they were not held at consistent intervals. In our final interview, he demonstrated this awareness. It had been two weeks since our last interview, and he asked me why I didn’t come the week before.
Landon: You didn’t get me last time on Friday?
ARBH: I wasn’t here last Friday.
Landon: Where were you at?
ARBH: I didn’t come last Friday, I was at my house.
Landon: Were you sick?
ARBH: No, I just um, I just didn’t need to speak with anyone on that day.

(3.9.2012)

He also referred to class procedures, referencing his classmate, Tommy, whose parent checked him out of school during music class each week. In our interview, Landon asked to stop watching the video segment I was showing because he wanted to see the part in which Tommy got checked out for the day.

Landon: I want to see Tommy checked out. I want to see.

ARBH: That’s not Tommy is it?

Landon: I want to find Tommy that he checked out.

ARBH: Um, I don’t know where he is. No, that’s H.

Landon: That’s Carter.

ARBH: I don’t see Tommy. Maybe he has already checked out.

Landon: Do they need Tommy for check out?

ARBH: I don’t see Tommy. (2.24.2012)

*Self-awareness*

“Next time I’ll just do it right.” Of the four participants, Gregory seemed to be the most attuned to his own musicianship. When he made a mistake in execution of a musical task, he visibly reacted by shaking his head, muttering an exclamation (“Dang!”), or shaking his mallets in the air. He usually followed this by practicing or asking for clarification from another student or teacher. After a couple of tries, he usually mastered the task. Meredith noted this while watching him on a video: “He’d want to try immediately; wasn’t much pause in between; he had to see it and try it . . . he kept doing it until he felt like he had it” (Interview, 3.8.2012). When I questioned him about playing something wrong, he explained, “Next time I’ll just do it right . . . I just keep on going”
Throughout my field journal, I noted times that he practiced various musical tasks, vocally and instrumentally, on his own. In our final interview, he explained that he felt a sense of satisfaction from practicing a given part, even though he felt it was harder to learn a given melodic part than it was to improvise a melody.

ARBH: Remember the first time I said, “Move the rhythm around on different bars” [improvise] . . . and the second time I said, “Play these bars.” Which one is more difficult?

Gregory: I guess, like, there’s one way to do the right one, and the other way is any way you want.

ARBH: And which do you like better?

Gregory: Um, after I got it right, I like the one way.

ARBH: Oh, you like the way I told you to do it?

Gregory: Yeah, like, when I got it right (Interview, 3.9.2012).

Stephanie showed awareness of her musical abilities in several ways. In one class period, she visibly anticipated when to clap her hands by “sitting up straight and raising her hands in preparation to clap” (Field journal, 2.28.2012). Another example of her musical awareness could be found during a session in which the class was singing a short song while moving from one carpet square to the next. The carpet squares were arranged in a circle, and when they reached the next one they were to do a patticake pattern with their partner before sitting down. Early in the game, Stephanie’s partner sat down too early, but Stephanie remained standing and did the patticake pattern in the air as though her partner were standing as well. This shows her familiarity with the song, her attention to the form of the song, the rhythm of the patticake pattern, and the sequence of the game.
Another game we played in music class associated flower names with rhythms. I had five flower names on the board that we used as the basis for creating rhythm patterns. Each student was assigned a flower, and when I pointed to that student’s flower, he or she was supposed to play the rhythm associated with the flower name (Appendix L). Stephanie viewed a video clip from this class activity, and in her response she acknowledged that she was anticipating her turn.

ARBH: Did you play that time?
Stephanie: I play rose. I waiting.
ARBH: You’re waiting, why? Did we not say rose that time?
Stephanie: We say rose. On that pattern. (Interview, 3.9.2012).

Ms. Aimee noticed this as well, when viewing the same video that I showed Stephanie:

Well, I thought that she was anticipating . . . because you could sort of see it in what she was doing. Um, like getting her body ready to do whatever, like before it was almost like the third or fourth one; before she was the first one (Interview, 3.6.2012).

I also noted a few times when she corrected herself after singing or playing something incorrectly. When we were learning a song, she simultaneously imitated me while I am singing, even if she was completely unfamiliar with the song. She was mostly accurate with beat and rhythm tasks, and I did not see her become frustrated when she has trouble with an activity. I did, however, see her frustration when she was not chosen for a turn in a game.

Landon could also be seen anticipating his part in music class when he was attending to the task at hand. There were two music lessons in which he exhibited a
heightened level of participation. The first was a Halloween song that we were preparing for a performance on our fall concert. He was given a contra bass bar part during which he was to play eight steady beats while another group of students improvised character movements for the witches, goblins, ghosts, and skeletons mentioned in the song. He became very excited by this part, foregoing his original intent to dance like a witch in order to play. “Hey Becky, I’m going to play, to play the instrument . . .; hey, I’m going to do 1, and they’re going to do this [demonstrates the witch dance that he created the week before, arms wide and rocking side to side]” (Field journal, 11.29.11).

The Halloween song is in verse/refrain form; his part is the refrain. During our rehearsals, he sang during the verse, sitting up and preparing his mallet a few beats before it was time to play his eight beats. He played with steady precision, not once playing even one extra beat. I then asked him to strike the instrument once at the end of the song while the others in the class yelled, “Boo!” He remembered to do this each time, always at the correct time.

Perhaps the least conscious of her musical execution was Lizzie. While she picked up on musical cues, had a basic understanding of rhythmic notation, and seemed to have an adequate memory of song lyrics, her rhythmic execution was poor at best. While she began and ended her rhythm parts at the correct times, the actual playing of the instrument was random, with no relation to the beat. She often receives help from a nearby adult, usually her teacher’s assistant. At one point, she showed some frustration with a rhythm part, shaking her mallets, and then sitting down in her chair. “Her teacher came behind her and hugged her. She seemed to be frustrated . . . pointing to her head. Her teacher rubbed her head and told her that she had a headache” (Field journal, 10.27.2011).
Transfer of knowledge

“We sound like a band.” All of the participants showed to some extent that they were making connections between musical concepts and activities outside of music. For example, Gregory’s class learned an African-American play party game entitled “Way down Yonder in the Brickyard.” This song features syncopated rhythms and swing rhythms. When we first learned the song, Gregory “raised his hand to comment that it sounds ‘like jazz.’” Another time, Gregory compared a rhythm activity from music class with counting syllables in his own classroom. I showed him a video clip of a brief lecture I presented about rhythm, using index cards. Each card represented one beat in music, and his class counted how many beats (cards) I put in each rhythm pattern. After I asked him if my explanation made sense, he replied affirmatively, then explained, “Um, . . . it’s kind of like counting syllables . . . Like, how you said, like, there’s two and, like, you kind of read music like, it’s weird, like, can’t really explain it” (Interview, 3.9.2012).

In my observation of and conversations with Stephanie, I noted several instances in which she made connections between what we were doing in music class and other topics outside of school. She often talked about her older sister who attends a junior college in the area; at one point she told me that her sister has an interest in music as well. I asked, “When do you come to music?” and she answered “At lunch time. My sister has a guitar” (Interview, 11.18.2011). She goes on to tell me that she likes to play the guitar, but in a later interview she explains that she does not have one of her own. “I have no music. My sister has a guitar” (Interview, 2.24.2012). It is apparent that she is influenced by her sister; as a matter of fact, Stephanie responded to my request for artwork by referencing her sister:
ARBH: Do you think you could draw a picture of music class for me?
Stephanie: I - I don’t.
ARBH: Do you want to think about music class? Do you want to talk about it?
Stephanie: I can draw a tree.
ARBH: You can draw a tree? I would love to see a tree.
Stephanie: My sister teached me.
ARBH: Your sister taught you? Oh, I would love to see a tree.
Stephanie: My sister tree is not good at it.
ARBH: No? But are you?
Stephanie: Mm hmm (Interview, 11.18.2011)

Figure 3. Student generated artwork - Stephanie.

Stephanie also described an external connection to one of the songs we learned during spring semester. To accompany the song, we used flower names to create speech rhythms that we later transferred to pitched and unpitched percussion instruments. In our final interview, she tells me about flowers that grow at her house. “We have some flowers; we have some pink, some red ones, and one flower we have white.”

In another example, Stephanie was playing the buffalo drum during our unstructured instrumental focus group. She and Landon were marching around the open space, playing
the drum, when she commented, “We sound like a band.” When I questioned her about the drum, she said, “Like the big one . . . the really big one has [gestures to her waist] you can put on somebody” (Interview, 2.10.2012). Although she did not name the instrument, it was apparent to me that she was referring to a marching bass drum.

Many of Landon’s seemingly unrelated responses at first glance seemed random. Taking a closer look, I began to see threads connecting ideas. In a video stimulated recall session that took place in early February, I showed Landon a segment of the school’s December performance. When I began to question him about it, he made it clear that it was no longer seasonally appropriate to discuss it. He was more interested in our current topic of music class, which at this point in the interview we had not addressed.

ARBH: What did you say right there?
Landon: I don’t want to do that again.
ARBH: OK
Landon: I don’t want, is it buttercup, daisy. I can do that.
ARBH: Why don’t you want to do this?
Landon: Because I can do butterflower daisy.
ARBH: How is that different from this?
Landon: I don’t want to do that. It’s not Christmas, not anymore.
ARBH: Oh, I see. So you are ready to do some new things.
Landon: It’s not Christmas, not anymore?
ARBH: It’s not, it’s almost spring. Do you see flowers in the spring? (Interview, 2.10.2012).

Later in that same interview, Landon saw a brief clip from a recent music class in which students were using flower names to create rhythm patterns.
Landon: That’s me with the name tag on.

ARBH: That’s right. What are you doing?

Landon: I was um…you remember what happened? I was um, ... um, dai-sy
[claps rhythm along with the video] When they say daisy, buttercup, daisy
(Interview, 2.10.2012).

I brought the cards with me to the interview session, and I let him play with them for a short time. The flowers we used were rose, cornflower, tiger lily, daisy, buttercup (Appendix L). He used them to create a pattern.

ARBH: Tell me your pattern.

Landon: That says ‘corn-flow-er but-ter-cup dai-SY.’

ARBH: Let’s put them like this: corn-flow-er, but-ter-cup, dai-SY [he says this one with me], ti-ger li-ly. Do you want rose at all?


ARBH: OK, what instrument would you play this on? If you had an instrument here, what instrument would you use?

Landon: I use like this, go [brings hands together like cymbals and says Phhhst] (Interview, 2.10.2012).

I next showed him footage from our unstructured instrumental focus group session, in which he played various instruments during the 20-minute session. We were not discussing flowers or rhythms at this time, and they were not referenced on the video. After watching, he asked me about the name of one of the instruments, and I asked him why he picked it. He responded, “‘Cause I, because and it says but-ter-cup dai-SY’ This was one of the few times that he connected concepts beyond what he was immediately seeing on the video or experiencing in present time (Interview, 2.10.2012).
Lizzie also made connections between musical concepts and her own experience. In our first interview, I asked her to draw instruments from music class. At first she drew tambourines, finger cymbals, and drums. When I asked her if there were any other instruments she wanted to mention, she said, “Guitar.” I asked her if she played guitar and she nodded, but shook her head when I asked if anyone else in her family played.

In our final interview, the first video segments I showed Lizzie involved rhythm patterns and rhythm notation. She asked me if we could watch a different video; she wanted to see footage of the class learning the song “Way down Yonder in the Brickyard,” a song we had only recently learned. This song was not mentioned during this interview before she brought it up. I’m not clear on why she did not want to continue with the planned line of questioning, or why she seemed so eager to watch something else, but this shows that the musical activities from class are retained in her knowledge base (Interview, 3.9.2012).

Research Question Two

*What, if any, discrepancies exist between teacher and student interpretations of student engagement in the music classroom?*

To describe the different viewpoints brought forth by the teacher participants in this study, I begin by explaining their perceptions of the contrast between music class and their own classroom. I surmise that the student participants did not consider the structural or pedagogical differences between their classroom and the music classroom, but each of the teachers spoke about the structure of their classroom versus the flexibility and, at times, noisy disarray found in the Orff Schulwerk music classroom. Because the DuBard Association Method ® was regimented, teachers developed an orderly system for giving their students the individual attention required for successful application of the
reinforcement activities. During the school day, students had very little unstructured time; even their Physical Education (PE) time was directed by PE teachers and served as their recess time. They had a 20 minute snack break during which they were allowed to mingle and talk freely.

The DuBard Association Method® progresses according to the individual student’s acquisition of oral and written recall skills as indicated by concrete evaluation procedures, the goal being 90% accuracy and automaticity. As described in Chapter One, students of the DuBard Association Method® begin at the most basic level of meaningful sound, the phoneme. They are shown the Northampton symbol for the sound, written in cursive, and are then asked to reproduce the sound with attention to precise articulation and a slow temporal rate. They progress in the same way, mastering increasingly complex units of language. Whether his classmates are at the same level is of no regard; the child’s pace drives instruction.

Ms. Wendy described the atmosphere this type of pedagogical method requires, saying, “Well, in the classroom it’s so structured, you know we’re doing the stories on the board that [Landon has] learned in structure, the questions on the board that he’s learned in structure, even the stories that he’s generates has a formula” (Interview, 2.7.2012).

Music vs. classroom

“You have a little bit more flexibility.” During music class the students were given many choices regarding their engagement, sometimes with chaotic results. As Ms. Gail stated, “There’s a lot to be distracted by in music, besides the noise” (Interview, 2.24.2012). Often, the simple act of handing out instruments resulted in a cacophony of sound resulting from experimentation.
The classroom teachers who participated in this study pointed out the difference in structure several times. When considering Stephanie’s behavior in the music classroom, Ms. Aimee noticed that Stephanie did not interrupt as much. She stated,

I heard her maybe call out once, you know, which is, which typically she needs redirection for that, to wait her turn or raise her hand to say something, where this is not, is not the same sort of structure in the classroom where you have to do that… You have a little bit more flexibility, you know, with that. (Interview, 11.15.2011)

Ms. Meredith also observed a difference in Gregory’s behavior between music and her math class. She noted, “Well, he was smiling more, acting a little, um, mischievous maybe, I don’t see that too much in the classroom, I guess because it’s so structured. He had a little more freedom, it seems like.” She surmised that he has fun with it. He understands that that's different than his work, and, I mean, we try to have fun with work too, but it seems like he has a real good understanding of ‘ok, I can be a little more free with this,’ but not out of control (Interview, 11.17.2011).

By her description, Gregory “struggles with math. It’s not as funny in there” (Interview, 2.24.2012).

Ms. Gail also noted the difference between the routine directions that Lizzie heard every day in class versus more unfamiliar directions given in music class:

I mean, she usually does, she usually understands her verbal directions, but then again, most of what we do every day is so routine that it’s hard to know, because everything we do, I mean , ‘Go to the bathroom, wash your hands and get your snack.’ Well, she does that every day, so when I say that, I think she understands
that and does that; I think she does familiar things, but I don’t guess we give her a lot of different directions that are not what she’s used to each day (Interview, 1.31.2012).

Discrepancies in perception

“He was pointing out that he didn’t cheat.” Through examination of the data, I noticed some minor incongruities between student and teacher participants’ perception of musical engagement; however, given the sparsity of rich data collected from the students, some hermeneutic assertions were made with regards to the choices students made and their motivation for those choices.

Because Meredith only saw Gregory for math class, she had a limited viewpoint of his overall engagement as a student; however, I felt that her input was trustworthy due to the small size of the school and the number of years Gregory attended the school. Her insights seemed to align with my own and with Gregory’s, save for one incident. Gregory was working with a partner to create complementary rhythm patterns from index cards on which were written half notes, quarter notes, or eighth notes. He and the pair of boys next to him realized that they all made the same rhythm, and they discussed it excitedly until Gregory got my attention by raising his hand. “Me and Daniel just…we didn’t…we just made the same thing…We didn’t know” (Field journal, 3.1.2012). The boys seemed genuinely surprised about this coincidence, and I thought nothing more of it. When I showed the clip to Meredith, she had a different take: “He was pointing out that he didn’t cheat,” she said with a laugh. When I interviewed Gregory, I said, “So you did the same thing as…” he continued, “Daniel. We just, we did…it was weird” (Interview, 3.9.2012).

At first glance, the data I collected from interviews and observations of Lizzie seemed thin. Conversations with her were mostly one-sided; my questions began to lead
her to short, one-word or nonverbal answers. Rarely did she offer any information outside of my questioning. However, a closer look at her actions in the classroom and the information given to me by Ms. Gail revealed more layers of meaning to her seemingly superficial musical engagement.

Examination of the field journal I kept for Lizzie’s observations revealed that from my perspective, Lizzie was not a very enthusiastic or energetic participant in music class, nor was she disruptive. She rarely spoke during class, except for brief verbal exchanges with her teachers or other classmates, and I did not record a time when she contributed to our class discussions. When she needed anything, such as a chair or a bathroom break, she typically asked her teacher’s assistant. She frequently complained of being tired, punctuating her assertion by yawning, putting her head down, or sitting down when we were supposed to be standing. Observing these behaviors led me to believe that music class was not an exciting place for her. In one journal entry, I noted, “As the class period goes by, she slumps down farther in her chair. When we do speech patterns, I can see her mouth moving; other than that, she seems disengaged” (Field journal, 11.10.2011). Her teacher, on the other hand, saw Lizzie as “engaged. She seems happy and she’s watching. . . She seems like she enjoys it and even at the end it seems like she was anticipating the words and wanting to say it with you” (Interview, 11.15.2011).

In regards to rhythmic tasks, Gail noticed on many occasions that Lizzie was not playing accurately, but she observed that Lizzie was participating in the tasks. “She looks like she’s focused and trying but she’s kind of repeating you . . . and she’s not getting all the syllables, all the rhythms” (Interview, 1.31.2012). In reference to that same lesson, I noted, “As we review ‘ta’ and ‘ti ti,’ she sits in her chair, leaned back and not
participating . . . we move on to a body percussion and she is slumped back in her chair” (Field journal, 1.19.2012). From my point of view, Lizzie seemed tired and disengaged.

In contrast, Stephanie was an active and willing participant in music class. She put forth a good effort and was compliant with rules and expectations. Her teacher expressed, “I’m surprised I’m not seeing a lot more interruptions, because she is one that needs a lot of prompting: ‘Ok, wait your turn’, ‘Wait and listen,’ or ‘raise your hand,’ . . . so she seems to be doing well” (Interview, 11.15.2011).

“I’m afraid to tell you, Becky...” I surmised that Lizzie’s headaches, tired behavior, and overall languor during music class was her way of avoiding activities that she found too frustrating or confusing. Ms. Gail informed me that Lizzie did not claim to be tired during her class at the end of the day, which led me to believe that something about music was distasteful to her. Ms. Gail and I discussed several possible explanations for this during our third interview. She maintained that Lizzie enjoyed music, but that the additional cacophony that accompanied music class, especially at times when students are playing in unstructured ways, may have been quite distracting to her. She enforced her opinion that Lizzie was engaged by stating that “she cries when she thinks she can’t do something . . . she’s really not showing signs of frustration.” She went on to explain that when Lizzie was bored in the classroom, she asked for something to do; however, she noted that in music class, there really isn’t time to find something else, and “she knows that [Ms. Becky’s] in charge right now and she should be quiet; she should be listening” (Interview, 2.24.2012).

Another possible explanation for the lack of enthusiasm shown by Lizzie was also discussed. I offered the idea that she “doesn’t even realize that we’re actively trying to learn a concept.” Ms. Gail replies with a hearty laugh,
I’m afraid to tell you, Becky. I think they just think, ‘Hey this is fun, we get to go play instruments and sing songs with Becky, she’s our fun music teacher, and we get to get out of class for 30 minutes a week, and go do something fun where we don’t have to have pencil and paper.’ . . . That’s what most of them think, I think. (Interview, 2.24.2012)

Considering that statement as more than a possible mindset clarified my suspicion that the students weren’t talking about music on a deep emotional level because they didn’t necessarily think about music in that way.

Research Question Three

*What choices regarding engagement do music students with language disorders make in the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom?*

*Compliance with rules and procedures*

“Everything just so.” The DuBard School for Language Disorders operated as a very controlled environment, and expectations for student behavior were high. Because the children who attended the DuBard School have multiple diagnoses that included but were not limited to their language disorder, the potential for a myriad of behavioral issues was also present. The students were taught not only to use precise articulation and pronunciation, but they were also instructed in proper conversational manners, such as eye contact, using complete sentences, and using polite language. Teachers paid close attention to the choices students made, from what they ate at lunch time to where they sat and with whom they consorted. While this type of structured, controlled setting may seem extreme, it provided the students with a clear idea of what to expect and what was expected from them. For special learners such as these, the setting was appropriate and the students thrived.
The classroom teachers expressed the students’ need to execute tasks according to the rules and procedures that I, as their music teacher, set forth. Ms. Aimee noted that she was “a little surprised that [Stephanie] didn’t interrupt as much, but she may be just trying to follow, trying to listen for her turn, trying to you know, make sure she’s doing it correctly” (Interview, 11.15.2011). In addition to identifying Stephanie’s self-awareness in music class, Ms. Aimee pointed out that Stephanie also became concerned and frustrated when others make mistakes. She stated that when “someone else messes up something in the group . . . she’ll . . . hit her leg and . . . she doesn’t fuss at them, it’s just . . . to herself” (Interview, 2.7.2012). Ms. Aimee also pointed out that Stephanie has certain mannerisms that indicate heightened anxiety. She stated,

I don’t know if she gets nervous . . . she likes things just so . . . If something’s not exactly where it’s supposed to go, she’ll start with all these movements of her hands and I say, ‘That’s bothering you, huh?’ and she says, ‘Yes, it’s bothering me.’” (Interview, 2.7.2012)

According to Ms. Gail, Lizzie showed frustration in the classroom by crying. Although I did not see her react in this way, Ms. Gail mentioned it several times in our interviews. She stated, “If she thinks she’s in trouble or she’s done anything wrong, she gets upset really easily and it’s hard to bring her around.” Later, she elaborated, “Even though she may get upset and feel like she didn’t perform as well as she’d like to on a new task or something, she usually is willing to try again the next day” (Interview, 11.15.2011). Lizzie’s concern with compliance may stem from a desire for acceptance. Ms. Gail explained in a later interview that Lizzie “doesn’t want to stand out, she wants to be a good student, she wants to try and do her best . . . [she is] trying to fit in.” In social situations, she “sits back and kind of lets the others decide what the activity’s
going to be and then she’ll fall in.” She can be seen directing the actions of her classmates because “she wants everyone to comply and do things the right way” (Interview, 1.31.2012).

Meredith pointed out that Gregory was self-motivated and eager to learn and achieve success. “He really does work well with praise . . . Tell him he’s got the right answer, he’ll speak out a little more” (Interview, 11.17.2011). Because she saw him during math class, a subject in which “he has a hard time,” she experienced how he coped with frustration. “He just re-does it. I’ve never seen him get upset; he’ll just try again” (Interview, 11.17.2011). She later stated, “He likes to get things right. He doesn’t freak out if it’s wrong, but he likes to get things right” (Interview, 2.9.2012).

Gregory’s own words supported Meredith’s assertion:

Gregory: [while watching the video segment] Those last two tries I got it right.

ARBH: So when you were practicing through it, were you thinking about . . . ’cause it looked like when you didn’t feel like you had it . . .

Gregory: Yeah, and then the last 2 tries I think I had it.

ARBH: Mm hm. I could tell by looking when you weren’t satisfied with it. What was going through your mind at those times?

Gregory: Mm,

ARBH: Like, if you played it wrong, what do you think . . . ?

Gregory: I guess just look back at the board and try it again (Interview, 3.9.2012).

As I have stated, Gregory was a well-liked, sociable boy, and in music class I saw him redirect his classmates to help them stay on task. I relayed one incident to Ms. Meredith: “I asked them to watch me . . . and he was sitting next to someone and said [not unkindly], ‘She said watch.’”
I then asked Ms. Meredith if she had seen him become “concerned about someone else following the rules?” to which she replied, “I have seen him re-tell directions to someone with an appropriate tone . . . to keep the peace, you know” (Interview, 2.9.2012).

Again, Gregory explains his actions in a similar situation:

ARBH: Like, if that were happening now, would you think, “Oh, I don’t want Walt to get in trouble for not doing this”, or . . .

Gregory: Yeah, I guess

ARBH: Would you think, “Oh, this just needs to get done so we can keep moving in music class”

Gregory: I like, so he won’t get in trouble (Interview, 3.9.2012)

Gregory also seems to feel a sense of responsibility in music class to abide by my direction. For example, when another classmate was complaining of a sore throat, Gregory stepped in to sing his part, even though he claims that he doesn’t like to sing much.

ARBH: Yesterday when we did it, you did come and sing. What was the difference?

Gregory: Well, David didn’t, David ‘cause of his sore throat, so I said I would do it.

When he and a partner were tasked with creating complementary rhythm patterns, he noticed that his partner was not playing at the right time. He gave him subtle nonverbal cues to help his partner, and when I asked him about it he said he helped because ‘it didn’t really sound right’ (Interview, 3.9.2012).
Landon’s awareness of his classmates did not seem to extend beyond taking social and directive cues from his peers. Ms. Wendy noted, “He does like to see what other children are doing and then kind of you know follow along with that” (Interview, 2.7.2012), and in my own field journal entries I observed similar attention to the actions of others. With the exception of his interactions with Stephanie during the unstructured instrumental focus group, I saw little evidence that he was concerned with the engagement of the others in his class.

During that focus group session, Stephanie followed Landon almost the entire time, exchanging instruments with him and chatting alongside him. Landon did not ignore her, but he was not seeking interaction with her. Ms. Wendy stated that if Landon is playing with his classmates on the playground, “He’s included but he’s not really playing with them” (Interview, 2.7.2012). I found this statement comparable to his interaction with Stephanie in this setting, with the exception of a short conversation he had with her early in the session. I noted in my observation:

He follows Stephanie down the row and tells her to pick any [instrument]. She picks up a cabasa and he says, ‘Do you like that one?’ . . . Stephanie comes and gets [the vibraslap] from him and he says, ‘Do you want to trade?’ (Focus group, 1.27.2012).

Because the Orff Schulwerk music classroom can be a chaotic place, the students were not always be fully aware of the extent to which they are allowed to contribute. The highly improvisatory nature of the Schulwerk allowed students many opportunities to choose their level of engagement, and some chose to contribute very little while others performed excessively. One student’s perception of proper engagement may be different from another’s, potentially causing distress and tension. In my data sources, these
behaviors are mostly observed by myself and the teachers, but could be inferred through analysis of the students’ interviews, in some cases.

All four participants were conscientious of classroom rules and procedures, and all were compliant when given directions. For example, when given an instrument to use in class, Landon responded in the following way:

When instruments were passed out, he perked up and pointed to the ones he wanted: ‘I want that one;’ however, he took the one I gave him without complaint. He did not play when I gave it to him, and put his mallet down when I directed them to sit quietly. After my explanation of when to play, he asked for clarification of when to play (Field journal, 10.25.2011).

In the music classroom, there were a few procedures that, through reinforcement, became automatic with the students. For example, when they used a pitched percussion instrument, they were to hold their mallets on their shoulders when not playing. Likewise, when they were playing a handheld instrument, they were to rest it on the ground or hold it quietly when it was not time for them to play. They were also instructed to sit tall when singing, and to keep their feet on the floor when sitting in the chairs (there was a metal bar across the bottom of the chairs on which some of them commonly propped their feet). In general, the four students in this study had no trouble behaving according to these rules, and they did so without much prompting.

With the exception of Landon, the participants also encouraged their classmates to follow these directives as well. During class they could be seen gesturing for people to engage as I have asked, helping others to play their part at the correct time or assisting their classmates with arranging the music space for our activities (moving chairs so we
can use the space for movement, replacing or removing bars, putting instruments away, etc.).

Stephanie was especially assertive when she perceived that a classmate was inhibiting her contributions to music class. She did not hesitate to tell someone to move out of her way, to tell me when she did not had a turn, or direct others in proper participation. In one instance, she was working with a partner during an activity that had a set sequence. We sang a song while moving around the circle of carpet squares. When pairs of students reached the next carpet square, they stopped to do a patticake pattern before sitting down to play the instrument found in that spot. Stephanie’s partner was a little confused about the sequence, but Stephanie took the lead and directed their involvement. “Her partner is laying out the rhythm and she seems unsure. Some discussion ensues, then they pick up the drums and play . . . [Stephanie] says, ‘OK, that’s better.’” (Field journal, 2.14.2012)

“I’ll come to music.” Landon was aware of the rules and procedures that he was expected to follow during the day. The DuBard School operated on a full-day school schedule that varied only when there was a special event planned; for example, when one of the USM sports teams came to visit the students. Other than that, Landon’s day was fairly routine and he knew what to expect. When we finished our first interview, he asked me, “Hey, when we go into the hall, are we going to be [whispers] quiet?” (Interview, 11.17.2011) Ms. Wendy may have verbally prepared them for going out into the hallway in this way.

Whereas Stephanie, Lizzie, and Gregory concerned themselves with the actions of their classmates, Landon showed little interest in whether the other students were behaving as expected. He took notice of them and interacted with them, but he did not
correct them or assist them. During one of our interviews, we watched a video excerpt from a class in which the students were participating boisterously; Landon remarked, “I was loud . . . we were loud” (Interview, 3.9.2012). At no other point in our interviews did he remark on the behavior of any of his classmates, or about his class in general; however, he mentioned his classmates frequently during video stimulated recall sessions, pointing them out by name and identification of their shirt color. He also associated himself with others; for example, saying, “You see me and Jackson? I sat with Jackson. You see me and Jackson? You see me and Jackson.” Later, he said, “There’s me, I’m with Jackson!” (2.10.2012). He requested certain video segments by referring to times when he worked with other students stating, “I want to see me and Gregory” (2.24.2012) or remembering, “Me and Jackson and Carlton are daisies. You want to see me and Carlton?” (3.9.2012)

Early in the study, I observed that Landon’s engagement in music class came and went. At times he participated enthusiastically, and at times he physically turned and walked away from the group, gazing out the window or studying a map on the back wall. In the same class period, I observed that his classmates became “carried away” with their movements, but Landon did not; “he stayed seated on the carpet square” (Field journal, 11.1.2011). Upon viewing the video recording of this behavior, Ms. Wendy remarked, “That is typical Landon behavior . . . just wandering . . . and the not looking, you know, just kind of looking down and not the eye contact is typical autistic behavior that he has” (Interview, 11.18.2011).

Knowing Landon’s pharmaceutical interventions may illuminate his behavior during the study. Prior to 1.27.2012, Landon was taking 1 patch of Daytrona (10 mg.) to control his ADHD symptoms; Ms. Wendy explained that she did not think it was
“appropriate for him” because “sometimes we can’t even tell if it’s on, and if [Landon’s] mom forgot it, the we can’t even tell that she forgot it” (Interview, 11.18.2011).

At the end of January, Landon’s medication was changed to 5 mg of Ritalin per day. His behavior in music class changed slightly. I observed him three times before his medication changed again, and all three times he seemed less engaged in class. He paid less attention to those around him and seldom responded to general instructions. If I directly addressed him, he attended to the task (Field journal, 1.31.2012). During this time he was also more fidgety, tossing his mallets around in the air and tapping them on the floor “absentmindedly.” In the second of the three classes that took place during this time, students were given index cards with quarter notes or eighth notes written on them. They were to create their own rhythm patterns with the cards. Regarding Landon, I noted, “He is not responding to verbal direction so I move to him and help him directly . . . when I go back to my instrument, he continues to sit facing me, perfectly still, not touching his cards” (Field journal, 2.7.2012).

Valentine’s Day marked the final time that I observed Landon while he was taking Ritalin. By this time he had only been taking it for three weeks, but his behavior was markedly off-task. Not only was he physically more active, but I noticed that his rhythmic execution was not as accurate as it had been. We were singing a Valentine’s Song (“Love Somebody”) and playing instruments, echoing each other’s rhythm patterns. I noted, “He plays at the proper times but he is not attentive to the pattern” that was being played by the originating group. At one point, he stopped participating altogether (Field journal, 2.14.2012). When Ms. Wendy saw footage from this class session, she too commented on his lack of focus, stating that his attention was, “Poor, very poor. I don’t think he was paying attention.”
His medication changed soon after that. He was placed back on the Daytrona patch at a higher dose (1 ½ patches; 15 mg), and remained on that dose for the rest of the study. His behavior, focus, and rhythmic accuracy improved a great deal, and he seemed to enjoy music class much more. I observed him six days after his medication changed and found him to be much more attentive.

Two incidents that I found remarkable occurred after the medication change. Both involved the same boy, Zachary, and both times he was Zachary’s partner. The first incident happened the first time he was in my class after his medication change. The class was in transition between activities and my attention was on taking up scarves that we had been using for a movement activity. When I turned around, Landon and Zachary were “grabbing each other’s arms and putting their heads together.” I told them to keep their hands to themselves, and Landon turned to Zachary and said, “Stop!”, then, “Are you mad at me? I’m not acting” (Field journal, 2.28.2012). When I showed the video clip to Ms. Wendy, she exclaimed, “Oh my goodness! . . . I’ve never heard him say that before in the classroom” (Field journal, 3.6.2012).

The second incident happened in the last observed class of the study, and Ms. Wendy did not have an opportunity to comment about it. In this case, Zachary and Landon were again partners, and we were using flower names to create rhythm patterns. On this day, each pair was assigned a flower. Landon and Zachary were assigned “cornflower,” and every time they saw that flower name, one was to do a movement with the blue scarf and the other was to play the rhythm on the guiro. They were to trade during the activity, so each could have a turn with the scarf or the instrument. I do not believe Zachary understood the directions. He had a hearing impairment and may not have heard me, or perhaps he simply was not paying attention. At any rate, he did not
trade with Landon at the specified time, even though Landon held the scarf out to him. The next time we traded, Landon thrust the scarf at Zachary and said, “Trade!” Zachary came to me and told me what Landon said, and I explained that they were supposed to trade. Nothing else was said and no one seemed upset. (Field journal, 2.28.2012)

In our next interview, I showed him a segment of this music class, not specifically to point out the above exchange, but to talk about the process of using the scarf and the instrument. His reaction surprised me.

ARBH: Why does [Zachary] have the scarf now?
Landon: ‘Cause we’re the yellow ones - daisies [they were actually blue cornflowers].
ARBH: Why does he have a scarf and you have an instrument?
Landon: [makes a pouty face] ‘Cause he wanted my scarf.
ARBH: Oh, ok. What’s he going to do with it?
Landon: He was taking my scarf; he’s got my scarf.
ARBH: Ok, were you upset about the scarf? Did you look mad or sad?
Landon: No, I was *mad*!
ARBH: You were mad? That he had your scarf?
Landon: But he won’t give me my scarf.
ARBH: OK, let’s see what happens . . . [we watch part of the video; he says something inaudible . . . We reach a point in the video when he has his scarf again]
Landon: [smiles] I got my scarf!
ARBH: How did you get your scarf back?
Landon: ‘Cause he got it to me!
ARBH: So are you still mad at him?

Landon: [his demeanor changes - his smile fades] So he won’t give me my scarf.

ARBH: But he just did.

Landon: He got my scarf, so he wants my instrument.

ARBH: Did you want the scarf or the instrument?

Landon: I just want the scarf (Interview, 3.9.2012).

The scarf was associated with the movement activity; through the course of the study I noticed that Landon often chooses movement over playing an instrument. I found this event especially interesting because Landon first had the scarf and tried to trade with Zachary at the appropriate time in the activity. Perhaps he did not want to trade and his anger at Zachary was misdirected. According to Ms. Wendy, Landon does not typically exhibit negative emotions. “He is not a very emotional child” (Interview, 2.21.2012).

Kinesthetic engagement

“I did my trick.” Custodero asserts, “Musical experiences are corporeal; they are located in the body. This means that we experience the movement and associative aspects of music in correspondence with our physical being” (Custodero, 2010, p. 62). Movement is an integral component of the Orff Schulwerk method. Steen (1992) asserts that within this approach, “Students are not passively involved in their education. Rather, the room is full of their purposeful activity” (Steen, 1992, p. 6). In this context, the students at the DuBard School have ample opportunities to add expressive, purposeful movement to their musical product.

In observing Lizzie, Stephanie, Gregory, and Landon, I began to classify their movement into different categories: spontaneous, extraneous, prescribed, and
improvisatory. With the exception of Lizzie, the participants were seen engaging in these types of movements frequently if not most of the time they were in music class.

Spontaneous movement applied to participants’ purposeful but not planned responses to stimuli, musical or non-musical. For example, Gregory often moved his body when playing musical instruments; he bounced his knees, moved his shoulders, or nodded his head with the beat. When I asked him why he moves in this way, he replied, “So I won’t get off rhythm” (Interview, 3.9.2012). Stephanie and Landon displayed this type of spontaneous action when they were playing buffalo drums and marching around the room during our unstructured instrumental focus group session.

Extraneous movement referred to non-purposeful movement such as jiggling legs, bouncing, feeling the texture of an instrument, etc. Landon often displayed such actions, perhaps due to his diagnoses of autism and ADHD. Especially after his first medication change, these types of actions could be seen. In one field journal entry, I noted that “he opened his arms wide and began slowly spinning . . . he spins for 17 seconds, his gaze moving to the ceiling” (Field journal, 11.1.2011). During this time, the class was meant to be engaged in improvisatory movement, but he was not involved in our activity.

Prescribed movement included any choreographed movement task: a folk dance, a play party, or otherwise directed movement activity. For example, Stephanie’s class performed a play party game with the song “London Bridge.” In another lower level lesson, we created a rainbow using scarves that we raised up while singing a song. The students were to raise their scarf at the directed time, it was to be slow and stop just above their head. When the students were given their scarves, they immediately began waving theirs around, putting it over their heads, or tying it around their neck. Landon was no exception; while he was waiting for the other students to receive their scarves, he
waved his around in the air (Field journal, 1.17.2012). When Stephanie’s class did the same activity, she took her scarf from me and wrapped it around her arm. When it came time to perform the prescribed movement, Landon “kept waving his around,” rather than holding it still above his head. Stephanie followed directions and held hers still, showing an increased level of self-control (Field journal, 1.17.2012).

Improvisatory movement is purposeful, unplanned movement that falls into preset parameters. For instance, the classes were asked to act as though they were the characters in our Halloween song: witches, goblins, ghosts, and skeletons. Although the upper and lower level classes had different songs, both had the same characters. The students were told their character, and it was up to them to create a movement. In the spring semester, Stephanie’s class was asked to improvise movements for their flower names. Her flower was “rose,” and when she said the word, she flipped her scarf over her head. As we progressed through class, her movement became more and more complex, until by the end she was twirling around and jumping in the air.

ARBH: Did you like doing the movement?

Stephanie: I like do the movement, and I like instr . . . I can’t remember what movement I do.

ARBH: Let’s see if we can see (shows video)

Stephanie: No, I did the jumping part . . . it be my turn and I did my trick (Interview, 3.9.2012).

Instrumental engagement

“They sound like music.” Instrument preference was voiced by the participants and observed by the classroom teacher and myself. The students seemed to base their choices on different factors, such as timbre, loudness, or tactile stimulation.
Of the four participants, Gregory seemed to get the most musical satisfaction from playing the instruments. As mentioned before, the rhythm and beat of the music visibly resonated through his body, manifesting as knee and head bouncing, shoulder movements, toe tapping, and the like. When asked about his preferences, he often responded that he liked “the way it sounds” (Interview, 11.17.2011). When I asked him about his choice to play the contra bass bar during our instrumental focus group, he replied, “I just like the sound and how it goes with the beat of the song” (Interview, 2.10.2012). During that focus group, he spent a good deal of time playing on the pitched percussion instruments, improvising with rhythm and melodic patterns. “I wanted to see what they sounded like with the same sound, like what I’m doing that will sound the best.” I also asked him about playing the vibraslap, and he gave a similar reply: “I like the rattling of the noise, and the shaking.” He described his partiality to the xylophone over the metallophone in much the same way, “It’s not so loud, it’s not like really soft, but it’s kind of in the middle . . .” I then spoke to him about improvising, saying, “You also played some different things . . .” to which he replied, “Yeah, I wanted to kind of switch it around see if I, if it sounds better than the other one” (Interview, 2.10.2012). He also demonstrated sensitivity to musical expression. In response to my question, “Is there anything you have to think about when you’re actually moving to play the instrument . . . like how high your hand needs to be [when using a mallet]?, he responded, “Well, like soft, be soft.”

ARBH: What happens if you play too loud?

Gregory: Like, it vibrates and you can’t hear it over the other people (Interview, 3.9.2012).
The latter part of Gregory’s earlier statement about the vibraslap, “the shaking,” was another example of his attention to the tactile, kinesthetic aspect of instrument playing. During the above discussion of the xylophone, he continued, saying, “I like that it doesn’t vibrate as much, like the metal ones.”

Lizzie responded enthusiastically to instrument playing as well. When I asked, “What are your favorite things to do in music class?” she replied that she liked the “triangle and the ratchet . . . and drums” (Interview, 2.10.2012). Lizzie’s choices and her verbal replies to my questions indicated a preference for instruments that are loud and have a lower timbre, with the exception of the triangle. I surmised that another part of their appeal involved the tactile sensation provided by the vibrations of the instrument - she mentioned the hand held buffalo drums, the contra bass bar, the ratchet, and the triangle, all of which produced vibrations that were easily felt.

Although Lizzie was not very forthcoming in our interviews, she frequently expressed an interest in playing instruments, and affirmed that she liked to play the drums, the ratchet, and the triangle. During our unstructured instrumental focus group, she returned to the ratchet several times and stood playing it while looking around the room. She did not seem interested in its shape or the way it worked; she simply cranked the handle and observed the happenings in the rest of the room. When I questioned her about it, she stated that she would rather play the ratchet than the drum. When I asked her why, she simply said, “Because I wanted to.” She also expressed that she liked “the way it plays” (Interview 2.10.2012).

Also in the instrumental focus group, she returned several times to play the contra bass bar. I asked her about this choice:
ARBH: How do you like to play [the contra bass bar]? Do you like to play it soft or loud or fast or slow?

Lizzie: I always like to do it...do it harder.

ARBH: Harder? What does it sound like to you? Is it like a big boom, or ... 

Lizzie: A big boom.

Whereas Landon mostly showed a preference for movement activities over playing instruments, he clearly found instrumental activities enjoyable. During our interviews, he rarely referred to an instrument by name; rather, he mimicked the movement and sound that it made. In reference to a vibraslap, he stated, “You see? [points] I’m doing this pshhhh [mimes] I can do that. My ball goes mmm [mimes]. What’s it do? Makes a noise pshhhh? It goes like this [mimes] pshhhh” (Interview, 11.17.2012). As a matter of fact, Landon did not refer to instruments very many times in our conversations. He was more likely to discuss the speech-based rhythm pattern or the movement that was associated with our instrument playing.

ARBH: What instrument are you playing there?

Landon: [pointing] - That one.

ARBH: What is that one? Do you know?


ARBH: How do you like doing rhythms? What do you think about playing instruments?

Landon: It goes like this: “Taa.ti ti.ti ti” - [shakes arms out to the sides]

(Interview, 2.24.2012)
Stephanie’s predilection for certain instruments seemed to be related to dynamic quality. During music class, I offered her a kokoriko, a wooden instrument that made a clapping sound. Her refusal of the instrument because it was “too loud” was a bit perplexing, as her preference was the vibraslap, which was comparable in dynamics if not louder. During our instrumental focus group she also chose to play the ratchet, one of the loudest instruments available during that session.

During one of our interviews, Stephanie watched a video excerpt in which she played several instruments. I asked her which one she liked the best. She pointed to the screen, saying, “I really like those,” indicating the tambourines. “I like them best, ‘cause they’re easy.” I then asked her what they sound like, and she answered, “They sound like music.”

Summary and Implications

When walking past the DuBard School for Language Disorders on the campus of The University of Southern Mississippi at midday, one notices the clamor of excited children, their energy filling the playground with sound and movement. The calm interior of the building belies the action outside, its muted colors and carpeted walls providing a peaceful atmosphere with few sensory distractions. In this environment, verbal and written language is unlocked for these children through a time-tested, intensive program of intervention.

In the previous pages, I explored the experiences of four of these children in their Orff Schulwerk music classroom through examination of their words and those of their classroom teachers. Comparing those data sources with my own observations as their music teacher through the lens of a researcher, I found many similarities between each case, as well as discrepancies in perception between the students, their teachers, and
myself. To summarize, I revisit the framework of the individual cases found in Chapter IV in order to provide a general overview of the cross-case analysis, followed by a closing discussion of emergent themes.

**Student Attributes**

The four participants in this study were conscientious, attentive students who rarely displayed inappropriate or disruptive behavior. Each student was described favorably by his or her teacher and seemed well-liked by his or her peers. In addition, the four students seemed to feel a sense of responsibility to comply and promote compliance with classroom rules and procedures.

**General Perception of Music**

When questioned about musical activities, the overarching response referenced instruments or singing. Stephanie also mentioned playing games; because she is in lower level this comes as no surprise, as the music lessons for the younger students often involve play party games and dances.

**Social Engagement**

Each of the participants expresses some level of awareness with regards to their classmates. In Gregory’s case, this manifests as peer interaction and a positive rapport with others. Stephanie and Lizzie also engage with their classmates socially in a friendly manner, but there is also a sense that they feel some responsibility for the actions of others. This is indicated by their attention to the behaviors of others, which sometimes leads to a verbal response, either to the misguided student or to a nearby adult.

Landon, on the other hand, rarely engages directly with those around him. When he interacts with his peers, he is usually reacting rather than initiating. However, during the unstructured focus group session, he directly addressed Stephanie and Gregory at
separate times. He and Stephanie followed each other around the room, sometimes trading instruments.

All four participants watched their classmates for musical or social cues during class, Gregory the least of all. I observed Stephanie, Landon, and Lizzie on several occasions looking to the larger group when they were unsure of the task or how to respond to directions; however, Gregory seemed the most at ease with musical concepts, and was therefore more confident with his efforts. Many times, students in his class looked to him for cues.

_Societal Engagement_

The highly structured nature of the DuBard School allowed the participants the security of knowing what to expect in their day to day routine. They were well aware of school policies, rules, and procedures, and were respectful, obedient and conscientious students. As stated previously, they encouraged their classmates to do the same.

_Musical Engagement_

Gregory, Stephanie, and Landon left me little doubt that they enjoyed music class a great deal. Their enthusiastic, eager participation was evident through observations, their teachers remarked on their high level of engagement, and the students themselves used positive “feeling words” to express their satisfaction with our musical activities. Lizzie also expressed those positive feelings; however, her actions did not reflect her words. Many times in class she seemed languid and bored, even though Ms. Gail posited that she was simply tired or distracted from the noise and disarray that was common during music class time.

Students played musical instruments during almost every music class session. Whether the activity was prescribed or improvisatory, the students responded positively
to playing and enjoyed experimenting with the sounds the instruments could make. They verbally affirmed their pleasure in performing on the instruments, and specifically mentioned the ones they liked best.

While Gregory, Stephanie, and Landon executed rhythmic tasks appropriately and accurately on the instruments, Lizzie was imprecise and her effort seemed lacking. However, she showed few signs of frustration; only once did she seem upset, shaking her mallets and frowning. Her teacher’s assistant came to her and assessed that Lizzie had a headache, perhaps revealing the reason for her irritability.

All four students participated in singing, but Gregory stated in an interview that he does not like the way his voice sounded “because when you’re a kid you still have that high pitch voice” (Interview, 2.24.2012). Stephanie and Lizzie both expressed that they enjoy activities in which they sing; Stephanie even sang along with one of the videos we watched. Landon voiced no opinion, but almost always participates in vocal activities. All of the participants demonstrate a good memory for the lyrics, perhaps because of the repetitive nature of most of the songs used in class.

Movement activities were met with great enthusiasm from all four participants. Landon and Stephanie, being in lower level classes, participated in singing games such as “London Bridge,” “All around the Buttercup,” and exploratory activities designed to help them build a movement repertoire. I accomplished this by using pictures of dancers whose body positions were interesting, then asking students to mimic their pose. I also showed them pictures of tools such as hammers, saws, and screwdrivers, and asked them to act as if they were using the tool. We then discussed the vocabulary used to describe the movement: push, pull, twist, pound, turn, etc. Landon especially shows enthusiasm for
such activities, smiling and laughing out loud. “Once he gets excited, it is over the top excitement” (Ms. Wendy, Interview, 3.6.2012).

Gregory and Lizzie’s upper level classes also took part in improvisatory activities, but rather than allowing the children to experiment with body movement, they were meant to dramatize songs or poems we were using as musical materials. While Gregory strayed from his group’s idea of playing football in favor of acting like a cheerleader, Lizzie participated with her group in an imaginary game of tag. Both responded positively with smiles and laughter.

*Intrapersonal Engagement*

Based on prior scholarship in the area of infant musical development, Lehmann, Sloboda, and Woody (2007) conclude that “musical capacity is a universal inherent human capacity: It is part of what it means to be human” (Lehmann, Sloboda, & Woody, 2007, p. 30). Although the participants in this study had no prior formal musical training, they all demonstrated the ability to self-correct, anticipate, and evaluate their performance on some level. Stephanie’s pride in remembering the rhythm pattern she created is evidence of her self-assessment skills. She was also observed making anticipatory movements as she prepared for a musical or movement response. In addition, Stephanie described her musical engagement with positive feeling words such as happy and excited.

Not only did Gregory point out when his class “did a really good job stopping” in reference to a song on their fall semester culminating performance, but he also frequently commented on his own musical performance, stating when he got something right or when he “kinda messed up.” In regards to the latter statement, he went on to say, “I accidentally hit it twice, and then I had to start over” (Interview, 11.18.2011), showing
personal evaluation skills. He visibly reacted to mistakes or successes by raising his mallets in the air triumphantly or looking down and shaking his head.

Landon and Lizzie seemed the least aware of their musical contributions to class. Landon was typically accurate with his rhythmic execution and played at the correct moments, but did not express satisfaction or discontent in his conversations with me. From the eye of the observer, Landon could be seen reacting to successful musical endeavors by smiling and laughing, but he did not become visibly frustrated when he made mistakes.

Lizzie, on the other hand, was not adept at rhythmic tasks. While many times she started and stopped at the correct moments, her execution was random at best. She showed frustration with her performance only once; she complained to her teacher’s assistant that she had a headache. I observed her in singing tasks as she mouthed words to herself during idle time, preparing to sing the song again. I also noted that she visibly prepared for musical cues by sitting taller or raising her instrument in readiness to play.

Implications

Campbell (2010) asserted that music “exists in children’s lives because of their biological abilities to discern it, feel it, and express it” (p. 217). I was privileged to be the observer of my own classroom for six months in order to watch how specific students engaged with my pedagogical efforts. This study allowed me to then question them and compare their responses to another set of outside observers, their classroom teachers, who provided a depth of insight that exceeded my expectations.

On first glance at the data sources, I saw a superficial description of music and musical engagement through interviews with the participants. Their answers lacked the depth of description that I sought, and I began to think that perhaps I did not glean
enough information to truly explore their musical engagement. To some extent, that was true. Ms. Gail illuminated this when she said:

I’m afraid to tell you, Becky. I think they just think, ‘Hey this is fun, we get to go play instruments and sing songs with Becky, she’s our fun music teacher, and we get to get out of class for 30 minutes a week, and go do something fun where we don’t have to have pencil and paper.’ (Interview, 2.24.2012)

The extent of our musical experiences at the DuBard School was limited, mostly by time. In the thirty minutes I had with the students, I strove to include instruments, vocalization, and movement. Through those media, I attempted to not only teach musical concepts, but also musicianship. We discussed the musical product and what could be done aesthetically and technically to improve it as we rehearsed. The students were allowed to give input, up to a point. But, we rarely went very deep into the psychology of music, the internalization of beat, rhythm, and melody and the outward expression those elements afforded the performer.

It was perhaps for this reason that the participants did not discuss their emotional reaction to music beyond basic terms such as “happy,” “excited,” or “fun.” Another strong possibility is that the students lacked the vocabulary and insight to express these abstract emotional concepts verbally. It was evident from our interviews that they lacked the terminology to name certain instruments, and they reverted to mimicking the motion associated with playing the instrument and approximating its sound. In this way, they bypassed the need for musical lexis.

I saw the participants making sometimes tenuous connections between music and other areas of their experience. This served as a marker of their application of ideas from music class, no matter their correlation to musical concepts, to other areas of their lives.
(for example, Stephanie’s conversation about the azaleas in her yard relates to the subject matter of our song, “All around the Buttercup,” and the accompanying activities).

When considering their descriptions of activities and concepts introduced and explored during music class, I surmised that their words and actions were the most accurate descriptors of their lived experiences in that setting. Much of the time, when the participants were questioned about musical activities, they responded by repeating words of songs or pointing to corporeal engagement such as playing instruments or singing. On a few occasions, Stephanie or Gregory mentioned the musical concept that was referenced in video clips, but for the most part, their descriptions involved the tangible activities that we undertook in class.

I suggest that the participants’ replies to interviews and observed actions in music class reflect an overall positive experience. When describing their emotional responses, they used sanguine expressions such as “happy” and “fun.” However, I feel that their words do not reflect the emotional and aesthetic depth to which music touches most people. That being said, I posit that these four students lack sufficient vocabulary to describe that aspect of self-awareness; neither have they established the level of trust necessary to share those feelings with me. To that end, I find myself in agreement with Campbell (2010): “It is one of the tasks of teachers to listen for the music children manifest and to gauge their musical interests and needs accordingly” (p. 216).

Future Directions

For the past six months, I watched videos of my four participants in which I was the teacher. At no point in my 15 year career as an elementary general music educator have I had the privilege to closely watch a student respond not only to my pedagogical methods, but to the overall experience of making and experiencing music individually
and in tandem with his or her peers. Not only that, but by proxy I saw my own teaching methods - some worked, some failed, and many only worked because of student input and response.

It is my opinion that at some point, educators should find time to observe their students in some way, even if it is simply to take lunch on the playground and watch them interact with each other. Many elementary school music teachers, me included, feel a sense of isolation as the sole representative of our subject area. In addition, many of us teach hundreds of students per week; I sometimes have trouble remembering the names of my students. For these reasons, I believe that this study may inform best practices in music education through teacher participation in action research, “in which the teacher gains a greater self-understanding of practice, conceptual change, and an appreciation of the social forces that shape the school” (Hagevik, Aydeniz, & Rowell, 2012, p. 676). By undertaking a project in which the teacher, as researcher, reviews the actions and hears the words of his or her students, a greater understanding and insight into student engagement may be attained.

Mooney (2007) describes his experience as a special education student in an inclusive environment:

I was the bad kid, the stupid one with terrible handwriting, spelling, and reading. Everyone knew that I was in the slow reading group. The black birds, the blue birds, and the sparrows; why do we bother? My reading group might as well have been named after a bird that did not fly: an ostrich trying hard just to keep up. (Mooney, 2007, p. 22)

I conjecture that in an inclusive setting, special learners may find some sense of safety in the music classroom, where most students are learning new skills and being
asked to participate in new and unfamiliar ways such as singing and musical movement. Eliciting responses related to self-awareness in special learners who participate in an inclusive music education setting may reveal different responses to those given in this study. The DuBard School for Language Disorders is structured as an individualistic approach in which all the students are experiencing the same type of instruction but are not necessarily aware of how they compare intellectually with the other students.

Mooney later explains, “There [are] no outsiders in the special ed room and on the short bus because we are all considered to be freaks. But in this community being a freak [is] normal” (Mooney, 2007, p. 7). Some of the students at the DuBard School have been enrolled since they were four or five years old, now adolescents. These students may not know the discrimination that occurs against children with similar impairments in typical school settings. This is not to say that they are protected from the general public’s intruding gaze when outside the walls of the school, but at least in their classrooms at DuBard they are on a level playing field, so to speak.

I believe that including the input of others who are stakeholders in the education of the special learner may provide additional depth to the data. Parents, clinical workers, and medical professionals have a far different perception of the child’s responses than the classroom and music teachers, and may provide valuable insight into the words and actions gleaned during interviews and observations.

Conclusion

It is my hope that this study will reveal the voices of students who struggle with language. Through careful examination of their words and actions, compared with observations provided by their teachers and my own field journals, I wish to accurately portray their lived experience in the Orff Schulwerk music classroom, a place where
students are encouraged to make choices regarding their musical interests while being introduced to new ways to experience music through singing, moving, and playing instruments.

In addition, this study may serve as a catalyst for future endeavors in phenomenological research with special learners in order that their lived experiences may inform best practices in educational settings. As diagnoses of developmental disabilities (DD) such as autism spectrum disorders (ASD) and attention deficit hyperactive disorder (ADHD) are rising in numbers, it is important for teachers to be prepared for the challenges that may arise when educating students with such learning disabilities in the music classroom. A 2008 study showed a 17.1% increase in diagnoses of any DD in 2006-2008 from the previous decade. Within that group, the prevalence of autism increased 289.5% and ADHD increased 33.0%. The percentage of people with hearing loss decreased by 30.9% during this time (National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities, 2012).

It is not uncommon for elementary music teachers to be unaware of such diagnoses, given the number of students that pass through the music room on a weekly basis - typically the entire population of the school. Having this vital information better prepares the teacher to plan lessons that provide successful experiences for students with exceptionalities. The Orff Schulwerk approach applies a variety of avenues in which a child with special needs may participate: “Singing and (to a lesser extent) playing instruments are mainstays of all music education methods; Orff Schulwerk practice . . . has elevated movement and text to the essential components category, creating central roles for them in a comprehensive pedagogical approach” (Frazee, 2006, p. 24).
Hearing the voices of these children and truly listening can provide the utmost insight into how best to serve special learners in the music classroom. Giving students opportunities to sing, dance, and play in a way that provides them with successful experiences despite their special needs. “The key to participation by a student with special needs is that it must be meaningful. Each student should make a contribution to the ensemble” (Hammel & Hourigan, 2011, p. 161).
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“LIVING PROOF”: REFLECTIONS OF A PRE-SERVICE MUSIC TEACHER

Truth

This qualitative inquiry into identity construction of pre-service music teachers makes several initial assumptions. First, that music majors identify themselves as musicians, and that their background includes musical instruction, perhaps for many years. We also surmise that such instruction was conducted by significant, inspiring mentors. Additionally, we know that universities have certain academic requirements for admission; therefore, we can assume that our participants have above average intellectual ability.

The Researcher Instrument

As the researcher, it was my task to identify statements from my participant, who shall be called Marie, which were relevant to the overall picture of her identity construction. Her detailed descriptions of past experiences with band directors, teachers, friends, and family provided snapshots into her life which helped me to identify emergent themes. Communicating this through my own perspective, I hoped to show how each of these separate areas of her life - social, familial, musical, and academic – together contribute to her overall identity, specifically as a music student and future music educator. “Readers sometimes see more depth in our reports when we portray more than a single reality” (Stake, 2010, p. 66).

During the process of data collection, I began to hear Marie’s voice through her writings and our interviews. Although I only observed her music education class one time, I had an idea based on comments from fellow researchers as well as the professor and graduate assistant about the general structure of the class, including assignments,
observation of teachers, and general rapport between students. It was my understanding that although Marie was not necessarily outgoing in class, she was attentive and somewhat participatory. Through analysis of classroom observations, narrative responses to course readings on current trends in education and clinical observations, as well as personal interviews, I acquired a better understanding of her viewpoint regarding topics covered in class, such as classroom structure, curriculum design, and teaching methods. The reflective assignments required students to comment on various teacher observations completed during the semester. Students were also asked to consider issues in education such as ability grouping and administrative efforts. “Insights about teaching and classrooms can be secured by talking to students about their work and asking their views about what is transpiring” (Eisner E., 1998, p. 81). Marie’s answers were always honest and heartfelt, and I quickly began to see her passion for becoming an inspirational mentor for her future students. As I acquired more data, her belief systems became increasingly clear to me, giving me an appreciation for her overall self-concept.

My own background shares several commonalities with Marie. In the past, I too played a band instrument and participated in a high school and collegiate marching band. Likewise, I was a college-bound high school student whose parents impressed upon me the importance of higher education. We also share the experience of being undergraduate music majors (albeit for me it has been over 20 years). It has been easy to relate to descriptions of her musical experiences; however, in specific terms our lives are quite divergent, making the familiar strange for me. For instance, Marie’s home town is small; her high school had around 60 in its graduating class, whereas my hometown is much larger; I graduated with over 300 people. Many of my high school friends attended four-year universities; however, Marie states that about half the people from her high school
went to junior colleges. Additionally, my high school band marched approximately 80 people, whereas Marie’s was much smaller.

Perhaps my most prominent level of subjectivity involves my 14 year career as a music educator. Although my experience has been limited to elementary and some high school, I can relate to her comments regarding school structure, treatment of students and classroom management. Having formed my own philosophical beliefs about the role of music education within the school curricular structure, I find it interesting to hear her thoughts on the subject. However, I fear that I am not attuned to the weight of my own subjectivity. While inescapable, I do not want to run the risk of moving “away from the cooler edges of the world I investigate to its emotional core, where hazards of overidentification or going native lie.” Furthermore, “untamed subjectivity mutes the emic voice” (Peshkin, 1988, p. 20).

Eisner asserts, “True connoisseurship includes the ability not only to experience qualities, but to experience qualities as a case or a symptom of factors . . .” (Eisner E., 1998, p. 65). I was fortunate to work with Marie on this inquiry because of her ability to express herself honestly and clearly – not only in our interviews but in her narratives as well. Her consistency allowed me to see her viewpoint in her language and because of my own lived experiences as a musician and educator, I developed an informed perception of who she is as a musician and a pre-service music teacher.

Connoisseurship draws not only from unique aspects of her personality, belief system, and background, but also my background, experience, and beliefs. Because, as Eisner states, “Connoisseurship depends upon the ability to experience those qualities as a sample of a larger set of qualities” (Eisner, 1998, p. 64). I am a connoisseur when I get a full, triangulated vision of Marie: a rich, thick description of her in many different
contexts, including home, school, social life, and extracurricular musical activities.
Additionally, I will gain understanding of her beliefs regarding school structure, music education, and structure of a music program through analysis of data, triangulation with participant feedback, observation, and comments from her instructors.

Research Design, Methods and Trustworthy Criteria

Sampling

Participants were chosen from an MUS 199 course led by the Primary Investigator of the overall study. Of the group that volunteered, five were chosen based on their diversity of race, ethnicity, and gender which we considered to be representative of the student population. Each participant was paired with a researcher, who collected data from written narratives, interviews, and observations, described in more detail below. In doing so, my fellow researchers and I attempted to “understand a distinct social group,” pre-service music teachers, “from the participants’ perspective” (Ho & O'Farrell, 2006, p. 208). Although we have yet to perform an extensive cross-analysis of our findings, through superficial comparison we have begun to identify common themes.

As we expected, each of our participants voiced a unique perspective about their beliefs, goals, and observations based on their personal background as a musician. Participants included Marie, the focus of my study, who is a Cuban-American student from a small town about 90 miles from the University. She is a trombone player who aspires to complete graduate school and become a trombone professor. Her past mentors had a profound influence on her, and she is driven to inspire her future students in the same way. “Now that I am in college, I have an extreme craving to put all the tips my mentors have given me to good use” (Narrative, 8.19.2010).
“Jack is a non-traditional student from a coastal community sixty miles away from the University. He is a cellist who hopes to complete a PhD and become a cello professor. His appearance and diction conflict with his struggle to succeed in school. ‘I can fix cars and I’m not gonna have to worry about starving if I don’t make it as a professor. And I don’t want a better backup plan than that . . . . it’s kinda like, do this or bust’” (Interview, 10.21.2010).

Marcus is an African American student from a small “one gas station town” a few hours north of the University. Although his main teaching aspirations are to become a college professor, his true passion lies in performing on his clarinet. Past instructors in Marcus’ life have had a profound and positive impact on him, and he feels that teaching, like performing, is something that can be fueled with effort and drive. He says that a good teacher is “gonna give you what you need, then you gotta use it” (Interview, 10.21.10).

While Marie and Marcus aim to teach higher education as private studio instructors, another participant in the study is Nathan, who is a white trumpet player with aspirations of becoming a band director. While he, too, describes significant mentors, he is also concerned with others’ perceptions of him. These are themes shared by all our participants in some form or another.

Our small sample size renders it impossible to project broad generalizations about identity construction in pre-service music teachers. Each individual student enrolled in the program has a unique perspective. Some are native to this state; some come from other countries. Their backgrounds vary between instrumental (band, orchestra, piano) and choral, and their future goals might be anything from church music to private instruction, directing a band or choir, or teaching elementary general music. Our participants have aspirations of being professors or band directors, but our study does not
include the perspectives of other students who wish to pursue a career in other areas of music education. Also absent were the voices of non-music majors in the field of education, and professors who are preparing these students.

**Naturalistic data collection**

The majority of data collected in this study was conducted by way of self-report in the form of written narratives and personal, open-ended interviews in response to clinical observations, the profession of education, and identity construction. Class narratives were submitted to the professor then forwarded to me, and my one observation of the class was conducted before Marie and I met. Therefore, the least natural setting was in the interviews which took place outside her normal routine.

**Interviews**

These interviews are a rich source of data. Marie is an easygoing person who shares her thoughts and ideas without hesitation. She chooses her words carefully and her answers are heartfelt. Keeping in mind that “a critical drawback of interviews . . . is the tendency in which individuals may respond in a manner they perceive as most socially acceptable or desirable rather than endorsing what they truly think or feel” (Ho & O’Farrell, 2006, p. 210), a comparison of her narratives and interviews, received at separate times, strengthens Marie’s credibility. Statements she makes in our one-on-one conversations directly correlate to her class narrative assignments. For instance, in a class assignment from the beginning of the semester, she states, “I am living proof of how teachers can inspire so much passion in a young person; now, I would really like to reverse the roles and be the person inspiring others” (Narrative, 8.30.10). Later, in our first interview, she reiterates, “I love how like, wow, this single person just changed my
life completely, and helped me achieve my goal. I want to go out and do that myself.” (Interview, 10.19.2010).

Marie and I met twice over the course of the study. Our first meeting was the lengthier of the two, as we were establishing connection at the same time as exchanging information. I made the decision to begin our interview without giving her any personal information; I simply greeted her warmly, introduced myself by name and we got started. I refrained from telling her about my background because I wanted the focus to be on her responses; I also wanted to circumvent “any a priori categorization that may limit the field of inquiry” (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p. 708). This interview began with a Grand tour question: “Tell me about being a musician” (Brenner, 2006). During this initial meeting, my focus was on our mutual comfort level and beginning to identify emergent themes. Neither was difficult to achieve; our conversation was relaxed and she was willing to share.

In our second interview, Marie was short on time, as she had a scheduled marching band rehearsal to attend. I had a list of questions prepared, based on our previous interview and her narratives from class. We met for about 35 minutes, and because my questions were more pointed, she was able to answer more easily. Both interviews yielded rich data from Marie’s articulate responses.

As I gain experience in this method of data collection, I will hopefully gain the sense of what to ask and when. In Marie’s first interview, I had certain items that I wished to explore based on her class work, but I wanted to leave most of the talking to her. In the second interview, I had more focused questions for her, based on analysis of the data I had so far. I’m not sure how much interjecting is appropriate in order to keep the conversation going. Having been on the other side of the table, I know that answering
personal questions in that setting can be awkward, so having a pleasant, friendly demeanor was important to me. “The aim is for the interviewer to put the person at ease, to have some sense of what he or she wants to know” (Eisner, 1998, p. 183).

**Contexts**

I have been a student or a teacher for most of my life; therefore, I relate strongly to educational settings, philosophies, and structures. For this reason, looking at Marie through the eye of a researcher rather than a fellow musician and student was strange. Our age difference helped; I would have a completely different perspective if studying someone my own age. What I found surprising was her readiness to opine about the classrooms she observed, her philosophies of education, administrative influence on school structure, and current issues which affect educators. Her statements on these topics are insightful and refined, considering her age. Below is an example of her assertive opinion regarding the current structure of American public schools:

> Since ideals constantly evolve (after all, that’s just human nature), I believe we should try to make education work for the issues and people there are today, rather than try to adjust it to ideals that existed centuries ago. Sometimes out-with-the-old-in-with-the-new is necessary, and that is especially the case here in the United States today because of the vast diversity of people living today.

(Narrative, 10.6.10)

Most of the themes which emerged during our interviews could be grouped by her experience in high school band and her current situation as a college freshman. We talked at length about her participation in her struggling high school band program, and how she found ways to grow under each new director. Even the director who bears the unfortunate nickname of “Hitler” had a positive impact on her growth as a musician:
We’re all like, ‘Oh, this is useless, this is a waste of time, it’s so exhausting,’ but when time passes, when you see how much you’ve improved because you kept pushing and pushing and pushing, you’re like, ‘Wow this guy was right.’ And that was the realization we had with the Hitler director. We didn’t realize what we had until he was gone (Interview, 10.18.2010).

If given more time, I believe that a visit to her hometown to meet her band director and see the places she has described would be highly enlightening. I would also like to interview her former private instructor, a female trombone player. “Dr. Williams is my hero, mentor, and she’s just a normal person. . . .Who said women can’t play the big boy instruments?” (narrative, 8.19.2010).

To gain more insight in the context of her early collegiate experience, I would like interview college professors and private instructors. I would also like to meet some of her non-music major friends to gain additional insight.

Marie had little to say regarding the data I collected and how I interpreted it. After reading the first paper I wrote, her response was positive but brief: “I love it! I feel like you really captured the essence of our interview! I have no complaints at all” (email, 10.24.2010). Following the reading of the final paper, she made a couple of factual corrections but was otherwise pleased:

I really enjoy reading your paper! It’s definitely an interesting topic, and it’s a tad weird knowing that it involves me! Here’s what I’ve got to point out:

Page 7: I did not take private lessons in middle school band. The private instruction began my first year of high school band.

Page 8: The first high school director started the job at the beginning of the year in September.
Again, I loved your paper! I’m really glad I was able to help you out so well! If you have any more questions, please send me an email and maybe I could try to clear things up for you (Email, 12.6.2010).

Themes

Pre-determined

Because the study aims to show identity construction in pre-service music teachers, we knew that image would be a primary theme, as well as the idea of how the participant sees herself in relation to others. In Marie’s case, the theme of self-image was more pronounced.

Unique sense of self. From her personal narrative, written at the beginning of the semester, I knew that Marie had a strong sense of self and that she openly expressed her opinions. The opening statement of her narrative, “Standards. Aren’t they annoying? I’ve been living up to so many standards for so long” (Narrative, 8.19.2010). In these few sentences, I could see that she had a strong personality. As I read on, this impression was substantiated by her descriptions of her high school experiences and her perceptions of these events.

Right away she states that she wanted to join the band because it was “cool and new. . . . Boy, I sure was excited! . . . Because of its uniqueness, (and let’s be honest: its awesomeness) I chose the trombone” (Narrative, 8.19.2010). This impressed on me her desire to distinguish herself from her peers.

Emergent themes

Influence of mentors. Since beginning band, she has seen four different high school band directors and two private instructors (one of whom was also her band director). Out of these, she sees three as “mentors,” but she insightfully recognizes that each experience
directly affected her growth as a musician. Even in reference to the band director who was so unproductive during her sophomore year, she realizes, “I wasn’t happy that year because I wasn’t improving at all” (Narrative, 8.19.2010).

When Marie describes the instructors who have had the most impact on her, it becomes obvious that she thrives under those who push her; the more challenging, the more satisfaction she feels from her success. She describes her private trombone lessons as “tough . . . it seemed as though I wasn’t playing anything correctly at all,” yet she states, “Dr. W. helped me grow so much and everyone could really see how much I had improved” (Narrative, 8.19.2010).

Although Marie is proud of her musical abilities, these teachers were hard on her at times. Even still, she maintains a positive outlook with grit and determination. “I was put down for not having perfect trombone skills, but I believe we all have perfect skills for our instrument within us. I proved the ‘if you suck’ standard completely wrong by improving greatly.”

In describing the director she not-so-affectionately calls “Hitler”: “Again, I felt like that dead fly on the ground, but he molded each and everyone one of us into top-dogs.” Although his disciplinary style involved fear tactics such as yelling at the band and requiring push-ups as punishment, Marie saw value in his overall vision.

Believe it or not, he’s one of my heroes now. Sure, all the work we did was so difficult, but he introduced the whole band to the real world of musicianship…the only reason my musical forte is musicianship is thanks to [him]… He taught me that music is all about emotions and feeling the emotions of a piece of music is the most important aspect of playing an instrument. (Narrative, 8.2010)
Overall, Marie seems to have developed a sense of purpose beyond her years. She sees adversity as an opportunity for improvement, and she meets challenges head-on. Although she attributes this to her mentors, humility prevents her from taking any credit. She is truly a remarkable young woman who is driven to succeed.

I am living proof of how teachers can inspire so much passion in a young person; now, I would really like to reverse the roles and be the person inspiring others. And with all the information I have gained through the years from my mentors, I feel almost obligated to do as my mentors did and keep the cycle rolling. Also, not only will I help others improve, but I will improve as well. Knowledge is a great gift, and the best part is that it keeps on giving. (Narrative, 8.30.10)

Formation of beliefs.

Even at such a young age, Marie clearly expresses a thirst for knowledge and a desire to freely express her opinions, whether observing a working classroom or pondering a philosophical question. The wording she chooses, such as “I have a real problem with…”; “I am firmly against…” and “I feel strongly that…” shows that she has formed firm beliefs regarding the subjects in question.

The maturity with which she approaches educational issues is remarkable. Not only can she clearly opine about issues regarding music education, she has logical reasons for her arguments. Many times, these are based on her own past experiences. For instance, Marie states that her elementary school music class “sucked due to the administration not showing much concern at all for it” (Narrative, 10.18.2010). In her words, “They take you out and they put you in a room and play you a c.d. and you sing along with it and that’s about it.” (Interview, 10.19.2010) Similarly, she felt that her
middle school band program was unchallenging. “I guess compared to others it’s really, it was really mediocre, um, wasn’t really much of a big deal, just read out of method books for three years, that’s about it...” (Interview, 11.18.2010)

Motivation to inspire.

Throughout her writings and interviews, Marie strongly states her intention not only to make music education her career, but to be an inspiration and mentor to her future students. The model she intends to use is based on those significant music educators from her past. From her comments, it can be seen that her vision of the ideal music teacher includes descriptors such as professionalism, caring, inspiration, and integrity.

When asked what she means by the term “professional,” Marie explains that this characteristic is displayed when someone is “staying focused on the task and going about it the proper way...because when you are formal and professional you gain respect” (Interview 11.18.2010). In her description of her most significant high school mentors, she states, “There’s always that professional, you know, air about them...” (Interview, 10.19.2010). Likewise, she sees this trait in one of the educators observed in her music education class. “He stays so focused, but he keeps his professional-teacher face on” (Interview, 10.19.2010). On the other hand, she appreciates those educators who can break their more formal classroom demeanor and show some flexibility. Her current trombone instructor is seen to be a good example: “I’ve seen him in a relaxed setting, but when he’s doing business, he’s so into it...” (Interview, 10.19.2010).

Quality teachers not only exhibit professionalism, but they also genuinely care about their students. Marie is emphatic on this point; this is perhaps the most important aspect of being an effective educator. She states that “caring is important for every
student, from elementary to collegiate level. There's research that shows that if a teacher cares, then the students care” (Narrative, 11.17.10).

Educators who genuinely love their profession, see the value of their subject matter, and care for their students transcend the moniker of good teacher. Marie would call such a teacher an “inspiration,” and in her eyes, this seems to be the pinnacle of measuring a teacher’s success. In fact, her portrayal of those who she considers her “mentors” includes this terminology. “I am living proof of how teachers can inspire so much passion in a young person; now, I would really like to reverse the roles and be the person inspiring others” (narrative 8.30.2010).

**Emic themes**

As stated before, Marie has a strong sense of who she is and why she makes certain choices. An example would be her choice to pursue higher education. Although many of her classmates attend community college, she frankly states, “I didn’t want to waste my time, my youth, on two years of general classes and then being thrown into two years of university freaking out because I didn’t learn this when I was younger” (Interview, 10.18.2010).

Similarly, Marie has concrete reasons for wanting to become a college professor: “I want to teach in a university because…you deal directly with the students, it’s just…teachers – students. There’s no administration in the way, like in the high school setting…you don’t have to worry about parents...You deal directly with the kid, and from my experience, that makes the most difference” (Interview, 10.19.2010).

As the inquirer, I was fortunate to be paired a willing, forthcoming participant. Analysis of data merely entailed compiling congruous statements in order to follow her thought processes. The themes I identified were simply the organization of her ideas and
beliefs. Interpreting the data was not difficult, given her articulate, thorough explanations and insightful statements.

*Etic themes*

Through reading her narratives and transcribing the interviews, I was impressed by the reflective nature of her answers. For her young age, she has a very mature outlook regarding her inner motivation. As an example, she is frustrated with her current trombone instructor but has strategies for maximizing her time in her private lesson: “He’s definitely not the best person I’ve ever had lessons with, but I try to make it efficient and worthwhile, and so my lessons with that person’s really, I still learn, I’m still improving because I know where my problem is. It’s not just walk in there and him trying to figure out ok what are we randomly going to try to work on and randomly gonna work on and try to figure out where you have a problem. I’ll be like, ‘I have this problem, now help me.’ And he really does try to go about you know, trying to help me out in multiple ways, but he’s sometimes kind of more of a ‘do it’ kind of person, not OK, you can’t do it this way, let’s try to think of it another way” (Interview, 11.18.2010).

From an etic perspective, I see this as an overall theme of introspection. Marie is a determined young lady who is goal-oriented, musically gifted, and proactive, “I don’t wanna waste my time, cause it’s what I’m choosing to do with my life. So, I wanna make it worthwhile, otherwise I’m wasting everyone’s time” (Interview, 11.18.2010).

*Researcher context*

Marie and I share many commonalities in our musical backgrounds; however, the contexts of our experiences are quite different. We were both active in high school band programs, and we both had opportunities to participate in special audition-based clinics.
Our private instructors challenged us in similar ways, and we both chose to make music education our career choice. However, for the large part the similarities end here.

Our hometown demographics were quite different. The small town from which Marie hailed is approximately 90 miles north of campus, and was “known for having the highest teen STD and teen pregnancy rates in the whole state” (Narrative, 8.19.2010). There were approximately 60 people in her graduating class, and around 40 in the band when she attended school.

Although I am a music major at the same university as Marie, my situation removes me from the undergraduate experience. Because I am not a GA in a collegiate classroom and many of my classes are small seminars, I have very limited interaction with other music majors, especially undergraduates, and I am not knowledgeable about the other degree programs. Additionally, I have not had the opportunity to meet many of the studio professors or ensemble directors, so those references are also lost on me.

Methodology

Koro-Ljungberg et al. (2009) assert:

(E)pistemological awareness and instantiation of methods present one way of assisting qualitative researchers in constructing research studies that appear better justified and informed and that provide instances of “evidence” to support their particular claims and theories (p. 696).

Conducting a study such as this one with multiple researchers who wish to eventually cross-analyze results necessitates a focused approach with a clear methodology. In this case, we approached our case studies from a constructivist approach, in which we “describe individuals’ perspectives, experiences, and meaning-making processes...values and beliefs” (Koro-Ljungberg, et al., 2009).
The research team approached data collection and analysis from a grounded theory perspective, in which “the subjective world of informants is analyzed to produce conceptual understanding specific to the data collected” (Brenner, 2006, p. 360). Our inductive methods informed our results by describing the “categories that emerge from the data during the analytical process” (Brenner, 2006, p. 360).

Because the participants’ MUS 199 instructor was the Primary Investigator of this study, we were privy to the class assignments beforehand. Therefore, we had an idea of possible overarching themes which led us to the topic of identity construction; however, from there we allowed the data to inform our emergent themes.

Reflections

Challenges. Learning the language of qualitative research has not come easily to me; I feel more fluent when reading than when writing, but as I gain experience my learning curve will even out. I have enjoyed the challenge; although reading articles about qualitative research can be cumbersome and overwhelming, reading and writing actual research studies is fascinating.

Rewards. Participating as a researcher in this pilot study was a fascinating exercise. It was as though we had a blank piece of paper with only an idea for a picture. Collecting the material we needed to create our study was extremely enjoyable; my participant was very interesting and I am quite certain that she will realize her goal of being an inspiration to others, whether she ends up leading a trombone studio or directing a high school band.

Frustration. Although data collection and analysis was very satisfying due to my participant’s articulate and clear descriptions of her experiences, beliefs, and goals, frustration set in when organizing my findings into a cohesive, formal paper. Referring
back to the above section regarding challenges, I found myself trying to express myself in a language I didn’t (and don’t) fully understand. However, I learned greatly from struggling through the task and keeping an open mind for feedback.

Implications

My research interests lie in my work at the Maxwell Laboratory School (pseudonym) as a GA. Students there have been diagnosed with severe language disorders, and my position is that of their music teacher. As the first GA in this position, and the first music teacher at the school, I feel a sense of responsibility to lay the groundwork for future research within this specific context, while exploring a research question which will contribute to the field as a whole. I find the prospect of discovering this elusive topic to be both exciting and daunting. I feel that there must certainly be an element of qualitative research to be conducted in this setting; however, I am concerned about the process of traditional data collection as it seems heavily dependent on the participant’s expressive and receptive language skills, something that is clearly lacking in students with compromised proficiency in this area.

Perhaps it would help to consider the audience I wish to inform, specifically, music educators and speech-language-hearing specialists. Because my musical background is Orff intensive, I would aim to conduct a presentation regarding my work at the Maxwell Lab School at the AOSA conference; at the same time, the Speech Language Hearing community is becoming aware of the positive effects of musical training on people with these types of impairments; this may be another avenue for presentation or publication.

It is my goal to pursue a research interest about which I am passionate. I am already involved in work that I find more rewarding than anything I’ve done in the past,
and I am eager to share my experience in a setting beyond this university. The students at the Maxwell Lab School come to music eager to express themselves, and with each passing week they become more comfortable participating in movement and vocal activities which stretch the boundaries of their comfort level (they were never inhibited about playing the instruments). I consider myself truly blessed to share this experience with them, and I hope to leave a small footprint behind in the form of my completed research.
APPENDIX C

“PLEASE SHUT THE DOOR”: IMPRESSIONS AND ACTIONS OF A NINE-YEAR-OLD AUTISTIC BOY IN THE MUSIC

Introduction

Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) are defined as “a group of developmental disabilities that can cause significant social, communication and behavioral challenges” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011). In an educational setting, a student diagnosed with a form of autism faces many challenges, not the least of which is his struggle with expressive and/or receptive language (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011). Hammel and Hourigan (2011) assert, “Music teachers may find that if a student has a delay in receptive and expressive language skills, she may have similar challenges in her ability to receive, understand, and express herself musically” (p. 15). This disjunction of communication may be somewhat bridged if time is taken to investigate the individual child’s needs based on input from those who know him best: his parents, his teachers, and himself. The importance of understanding, preparation, and appropriate intervention by the teacher is crucial to the success of the student’s academic and social development. As Nieto (2010) asserts, “teaching our children well also means affirming and honoring who they are, and believing they are capable of doing great things” (p. 33).

This study seeks to inform our understanding of how an autistic student constructs his identity within the music classroom, from the child’s point of view. This will be accomplished through the lens of the participant, using data collected from interviews, observations, and student generated artwork.
Review of Literature

As increasing numbers of children are being diagnosed with autism (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011), educational scholars hope to uncover generalized attributes of these children which will lead educators toward effective interventions, which may better accommodate the special needs of students on the autism spectrum. For the purposes of this review of literature, I seek current research regarding 1) identity construction in autistic children and 2) music with autistic children.

Searches performed through Academic Search Premier and JSTOR using the terms “autism” and “identity construction” revealed no articles using that specific terminology. Substituting the term “lived experience” for “identity construction” yielded only two results, both concerning the experience of the mother (Gill & Liamputtong, 2009) or the parents of autistic children (Farrugia, 2009). Likewise, substituting “autism” with “learning disabilities” returned no studies investigating children’s lived experiences. However, using the terms “children” and “lived experience” returned 189 results. Within this group were several studies of the lived experiences of parents with children who have chronic illnesses or learning disabilities, e.g. (Björk, Nordström, & Hallström, 2011; Gill & Liamputtong, 2009; Wennick & Hallström, 2007). Other studies were aimed at children with chronic illnesses, such as epilepsy (Chen, et al., 2010) and end-stage renal disease (Nicholas, et al., 2011).

**Autism and Identity**

A search of ProQuest using the terms “autism” and “identity” was more fruitful, as several dissertations seek to describe social relationships of autistic children in the general education classroom (Lee, 2008), on the playground and in play groups (Wolfberg, 1994) (Frankel, Gorospe, Chang, & Sugar, 2011), the “social response to
autism” (Rocque, 2007), political issues which impact the “construction of autism as a disability within the public schools” (Ritchie, 2006), emotional experiences of high-functioning autistic children (Losh, 2004), and issues facing autistic adults (Bagatell, 2003; Duncan, 1994). In addition, some scholarship exists that explores autism within the framework of Theory of Mind (ToM) (Starr, 1992), which is defined as the ability to “infer the full range of mental states (beliefs, desires, intentions, imagination, emotions, etc.) that cause action. In brief, having a theory of mind is to be able to reflect on the contents of one’s own and other’s minds” (Baron-Cohen, 2001).

**Autism and Music**

Recent scholarship investigates the use of music as a didactic device with autistic children and adolescents (Simpson & Keen, 2010), as a neurological trigger for social skills and communication (Finnigan & Starr, 2010; Wan, et al., 2010), and neurological sensitivities to musical attributes (Heaton, 2003; Heaton, 2005; Heaton, Williams, Cummins, & Happé, 2007).

In addition, the music therapy research community has studied various interventions for those within the autism spectrum (Wigram & Gold, 2006). Several of these studies pertain to social aspects of the child’s environment (Finnigan & Starr, 2010; Kern, 2007). Another body of research addresses improvisational music therapy (Jinah, Wigram, & Gold, 2009), which has “long been noted for its efficacy in engaging autistic children at their level and interest, and helping them to develop spontaneous self-expression, emotional communication and social interaction” (Kim, et al., 2008).

While a great deal of research has explored the complexities of autism spectrum disorders, few studies attempt to describe lived experiences of autistic children in their
own words, and no studies were found that explore the autistic child’s experience in the context of an elementary Orff Schulwerk music classroom.

Methodology

This qualitative case study was designed “to help us understand phenomena or relationships within” the case (Stake, 1995, p. 77). Through observation of the participant in his music classroom, open-ended and semi-structured interviews, and participant drawings (Freeman & Mathison, 2009), I, as a participant/observer, identified emergent themes regarding musical identity construction in a music classroom serving students with language disorders. Using video and digital audio recordings, I documented the participant’s actions in his Orff Schulwerk music class. Data collection comprised of the participant’s responses to interviews and excerpts of video recordings made during his music class, student generated drawings, and observation of the student’s behaviors from video recordings.

The participant was nine-year-old David (pseudonym), who was chosen based on his enrollment in a school for children with language disorders and his participation in weekly 30 minute music classes offered at his specialized school for children with language disorders. He is autistic and struggles with articulation as well as expressive and receptive language disorders. David’s music class contains 20 students of approximate ages 9-14. His regular classroom contains 10 students, and is combined with another class of 10 for music instruction.

David’s music class was videotaped for four weeks using a Kodak EasyShare camera, which was set up to film David’s area of the room. No one manned the camera; therefore, David is not always onscreen. “For research purposes it is best to use raw video footage prepared with a minimum of camera editing, that is, shot continuously . . .”
I reviewed and transcribed the video in a narrative format. Excerpts of what were perceived to be key moments were shown to the participant during semi-structured interviews. During this time, the class rehearsed a song intended for a culminating concert in mid-May.

For this performance, David will be playing the alto metallophone; he and another boy will perform the steady beat underlying the melodic section of the song “This Old Man”. A chanted section has been added to the song, during which David and his partner do not play.

Open-ended interviews were conducted to allow the researcher’s understanding of the participant “on [his] own terms and how [he] make[s] meaning of [his] own [life]…” (Brenner, 2006, p. 257). To facilitate the examination of musical identity construction (the central phenomenon being studied), David’s first interview began with a solicitation to generate drawings using “specific directions, most often in the form of a prompt or question . . . Drawing as a mode of sense making and representation offers different possibilities than talk alone does” (Freeman & Mathison, 2009). He was given heavy white paper and Rose Art colored markers, and was asked draw a “map of music class,” after which he was given a grand tour question (Brenner, 2006): “What does this (drawing) say to you about music class?” This grand tour question may expose the participant’s language as well as identify themes that might lead to deeper knowledge regarding his socially constructed identity as a learner and musician. At the close of this interview, David was asked to draw instruments related to music class.

The second interview took place three weeks later. In this meeting, David was shown three videos taken from the last three music classes. The videos were played on an ACER Aspire 7741Z-4839 laptop. The excerpts he was shown were edited using
Windows Live Movie Maker software, and were chosen by the researcher based upon salient themes emerging in the data. The first video clip showed David sitting on the floor with the other instrument players waiting for further instructions from me. One of the other students pointed to something on the floor, and David started trying to hit it with his mallet. The next segment from the same class period involved the teacher’s assistant in David’s classroom, Ms. Tammy (pseudonym). She played the instrument part for the boy who doubled David’s part, who was absent that day.

In the second set of excerpts, taken from the following week, David was shown three different moments when he reacted strongly to the sound of the boomwhackers, by covering his ears and turning around. Finally, he was shown segments from the third week of recording when he was either waiting his turn or actively participating in class. In addition to eliciting his reactions to the video recordings, David was asked several follow-up questions unrelated to the videos.

To facilitate data triangulation, the researcher maintained a reflective journal separate from the field notes in order to make visible bias and subjectivity during the project. Digital audio recordings of all interviews were made on a Sony ICD-PX820 digital voice recorder and personally transcribed using the Sony Digital Voice Editor 3 software so as to maintain confidentiality.

Delimitations

This study took place over four weeks, including a total of two hours of video recording and 35 minutes of interview time, during which the participant completed his artwork and reflected on video excerpts from music classes. Clearly, this is a mere snapshot of David’s impressions of and actions during music class.
Additionally, the activities in music class were not as varied as they would be at other times of the year. Our focus during these class times was on our upcoming culminating performance, and we have been repetitively rehearsing our entrance, improving our instrumental performance, and working on proper vocal technique. These classes are structured differently than the ones at the beginning of the semester, which are structured toward specific musical concepts using an Orff Schulwerk pedagogical approach. A wider temporal span would give a better idea of how the student responds to more variety in musical activities.

This study did not include the reflections of teachers, perusal of specific records regarding his diagnoses or academics, or parental input, all of which would provide a richer description of the student and possibly uncover some fascinating information.

School Environment

The School. The Maxwell Laboratory School was founded in 1962. Currently, it serves as a campus laboratory school for a mid-sized research university in the Deep South. Students at the school have been diagnosed with some type of severe language disorder and are receiving intensive instruction utilizing the DuBard Association Method®. Students are identified for the program based on formal assessments such as the Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language, the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals, and informal observations (DuBard & Martin, 2000; DuBard School for Language Disorders, 2008). The school’s curriculum strictly adheres to The DuBard Association Method®, which uses a very precise sequence of learning that progresses at an individual student’s readiness level. Instruction is prescribed by decades of experience developing this method.
In the fall of 2009, the Maxwell School and the music department of its university affiliate partnered to create a graduate assistantship for a music educator trained in Orff Schulwerk pedagogical practices. The administrators in both departments who created this GA were of the opinion that a music program would serve to enhance the overall scope of the school’s structure. “It is the experiences that we provide to our students in the form of education and cultural access that enhance that potentiality. “It is the pedagogical environments that we create that influence achievement” (Selden, 1999, p. 142). As the first music teacher to assume this position, I had the privilege of introducing many of these students to musical concepts including singing, moving, and playing instruments. From the beginning, I found David to be an enthusiastic participant.

Because the Maxwell School is comprised of students that require intensive speech and language intervention, there seems to be a comradery between classmates. The typical bickering and social groupings exist, of course, but the fact that they are similar in their special needs minimizes the amount of labeling between students. In my brief encounters with the participant, David, I have not observed other students being unkind to or impatient with him. Perhaps in a regular public school setting, David’s behavior would be noticeably dissimilar than the other students, but here his differences go unnoticed with his peers.

As Jonathan Mooney explains, “There [are] no outsiders in the special ed room and on the short bus because we are all considered to be freaks. But in this community being a freak [is] normal” (Mooney, 2007, p. 7). Some of the students at the Maxwell School have been enrolled since they were four or five years old, now adolescents. These students may not know the discrimination that occurs against children with similar impairments in typical school settings. This is not to say that they are protected from the
general public’s intruding gaze when outside the walls of the school, but at least in their classrooms at Maxwell they are on a level playing field, so to speak.

The Maxwell Laboratory School is a beautiful facility that is approximately six years old. Its curved overhang provides shelter to parents dropping off or picking up their students while contributing to the impressive exterior of the main entrance. Upon entry, visitors face a mural of a tree with gold, silver, and bronze leaves on the facing wall. Each leaf represents an individual or group that has donated money to the school. Just to the right is a waiting room with several chairs that are available to the many visitors that frequent the school; not only parents, but university students who are there to observe or complete practical experience, politicians, potential or existing donors, and students who receive clinical services but are not enrolled as full-time students. Prior to the construction of this space, the school’s enrollment was less than 40. The school can now house 80 students.

Two long parallel hallways stretch almost the entire length of the building. The eight classrooms are found on the north hallway, each housing a teacher, assistant, and up to ten children. The waiting list for this school is very long, so the classes are almost always at capacity. Pale green carpeting on the floors and walls mask footsteps and absorb sound, maintaining an environment with minimal aural distractions. Student work hangs on the walls outside the classroom in neat rows, but does not pervade the space. Visual distractions are also kept to a minimum throughout the school in an effort to keep the children focused during the day.

Stepping into a classroom, one is likely to see several of the reinforcement activities prescribed by the DuBard Association Method® happening at once. Some students may be sitting at desks working individually on writing activities, while some
are at the chalkboard involved in small group work. Others might be working one-on-one with a peer, teacher, or volunteer. Teachers and assistants quietly facilitate these activities, and although many different things are happening, the room seems orderly and controlled.

Each child at the Maxwell School marks their progress through the DuBard Association Method® in an individualized book:

It expands systematically as the child progresses through each level of instruction. It serves as a record book for material which has been taught at the same time that it provides a way for the child to become aware of his or her own progress. It is also crucial for use in home reinforcement activities (DuBard & Martin, 2000, p. 58).

This book becomes a representation for the child’s successes as he or she completes each stage of the method, from the phoneme to syllables, whole words to sentences, and finally to stories; all of this is meticulously recorded in the child’s book. (DuBard & Martin, 2000) However, failures are not recorded. It becomes his or her success story.

The south hallway leads past the teachers’ work room, large conference room, small conference room, and offices for the speech-language pathologists. At the end of the hall is the cafeteria, which is a brightly lit room with high ceilings, flanked on all sides by large windows with mini blinds. The tiled floor is white, and the walls are carpeted. There are rules posted next to the exit that are written in cursive, a familiar sight throughout the school. Small numbers, either one or two, are written above certain letters. To one who is unfamiliar with the DuBard Association Method®, these numbers may
seem curious, but to the students and teachers at the school, they serve as a key to the sound of that particular phoneme.

*Music instruction.* I usually arrive in the cafeteria during lunch time for the upper level classes. These are the students who have progressed to a later stage of the DuBard Association Method®, who range in age from approximately nine years old to early teens. Some are seated on one half of the cafeteria at large folding tables with round stools attached. The other half of the room contains square tables with four chairs each, where the rest of the students sit. In the rear of the room is a teachers’ table, made up of two square tables pushed together and eight chairs, three on each side and one on each end. This table is usually full by the time all of the teachers, including myself, fix lunch in the large industrial kitchen attached to the cafeteria. All of the students bring lunch from home, and the teachers actively instruct the students to eat a proper lunch each day.

Immediately following lunch, the cafeteria is transformed into the space used for music classes. Because of their proximity to the white marker boards, the smaller tables are pushed aside and chairs arranged in a half-circle, 20 in all, for the upper level classes. Four upper level students stay behind to help me configure the room. Barred instruments common to the Orff Schulwerk method (Frazee & Kreuter, 1987) such as xylophones, metallophones, and glockenspiels are lifted off the tops of cabinets and set out for use by the first class, the one lower level class of the day. After that class, the room is further transformed to accommodate the activities of the upper level classes.

The Orff Schulwerk approach to music education is the prescribed pedagogical methodology used with the classes at Maxwell School. The originators of the program felt that Carl Orff’s concept of “elemental music” would be well-suited to the needs of the students:
What, then, is elemental music? Never music alone, but music connected with movement, dance, and speech, not to be listened to, meaningful only in active participation. Elemental music is pre-intellectual, it lacks great form, it contents itself with simple sequential structures, ostinatos, and miniature rondos. It is earthy, natural, almost a physical activity. It can be learned and enjoyed by anyone. It is fitting for children (Orff, 1977).

Closer examination of this definition reveals a multi-sensory experience. Orff participants use body percussion (tactile), handheld instruments and mallet instruments (kinesthetic), rote learning (aural), and movement (kinesthetic, tactile). A visual element is added by virtue of seeing the mallets or hands move with the beat or rhythm. Students also learn to read rhythms and visual aids which lead them to formal musical notation. There is also a vocal/speech element which is central to the methodology, in that much of the Schulwerk is driven by rhythmic chant and song. Students must also employ listening skills: as individuals critiquing their own performance, as participants in an ensemble who must listen in order to stay together, and as critical listeners to the performances of others (Frazee, 2006).

The activities used by teachers of the DuBard Association Method® are carefully structured so that the multisensory components happen simultaneously, according to the guidelines of the International Multisensory Structured Language Education Council (DuBard Association Method® training manual, p. 2-8). The common component of multisensory teaching techniques is but one of several complementary components to the DuBard Association Method® and the Orff Schulwerk Method.

Combining these two methodologies provides the DuBard Association Method® student with an outlet for creativity within a structured environment. The pedagogical
process behind Orff Schulwerk involves a certain sequence of skill development, beginning with very simple, repetitive rhythmic and melodic components which engage the student through movement, singing, and playing instruments. The teacher is merely a guide through this process, giving the students a great deal of input into the creation of their musical ideas. The structure of the Schulwerk is an underlying framework which the teacher carefully builds, with careful attention to the needs and abilities of her students (Frazee & Kreuter, 1987; Steen, 1992). Many times (in my experience), the final product is nowhere near what had been envisioned during lesson planning. When spontaneous actions breed creative ideas, the result can be very exciting.

The Participant

The first time I met David was in his classroom at the Maxwell Laboratory School (pseudonym). He is a slightly heavyset boy with a handsome face who moves awkwardly but exudes an air of confidence. At the time, I was visiting the school to observe classes and become acquainted with teachers and students. His teachers told me from the start that he loved music and was a very good singer. He had been singing a Michael Jackson song earlier that day, and they asked him to sing it for me. He hesitantly obliged, and I found their musical assessment of him to be true.

David has autism, which means that his developmental delays and behavior place him within a rather ambiguous spectrum under the umbrella of Pervasive Developmental Disorders, which include Asperger syndrome, various forms of autism, and PDD-NOS (Not Otherwise Specified), which is a catch-all for children who do not fit neatly into other PDD categories. “With Not Otherwise Specified . . . we have a category for every shade of human experience out there” (Mooney, 2007, p. 242). I do not know the specifics of David’s impairments, but his enrollment in the school clearly indicates a
language disorder as well. “Communication impairment is the second of three deficient behavioral domains defining the Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASDs)-Pervasive Developmental Disorders (PDD) in the current Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders and International Classification of Diseases (ICD 10)” (Rapin, Dunn, Allen, Stevens, & Fein, 2009).

David has been in upper level for at least two school years. When I enter the cafeteria, which doubles as the space for my music classes, David greets me enthusiastically by calling my name and giving me a hug. An hour later, when his class arrives for music, David typically greets me again in the same way. During music class he participates in our activities by contributing ideas for songs and instruments. When the class uses the Orff instruments, David almost always chooses a glockenspiel, then takes one mallet and lightly rubs it across the C.D.E combination of bars, creating a glissando effect. This seems to be a compulsive act which I usually ignore. However, when directed to play the instrument, he does so with accurate rhythm, steady beat, and mallet technique. David contributes a good deal to our music classes, and his joy for music is evident in his delightful demeanor.

Salient Themes

Impressions and Actions

Analysis of data using NVivo 9 software revealed several salient themes which can be grouped under two broad headings: “Impressions” (Figure 3) and “Actions” (Figure 4). David describes events from long-term memory which left an impression upon him, positive, negative, or neutral. In the data collected, these might be musical or non-musical events. The term “impression” used in this context is defined as “a telling image impressed on the senses or the mind” (Merriam-Webster, 2011). My use of this
term is intended to relay the effect of David’s responses, which are often indirect. Themes emerged from topics that he mentioned more frequently in relation to experiences we had during music activities.

**Musical Impressions**

Impressions were coded positive, negative, or neutral based on his elaborative descriptions. Those events which elicited a response such as “I’m not quite sure” (in response to “what else do you remember about that [the December] performance?), or one-word responses in which he does not elaborate on his answers, such as this conversation:

ARBH: Well, let me ask you one more question, David, and then we'll you can go back to your class.

D: All right

ARBH: All right, so tell me when you are not at school, do you listen to music or do you sing, or...

D: All of them

ARBH: Yeah? What do you listen to?

D: Everything.

ARBH: Do you listen to cd's or radio?

D: Everything

ARBH: Everything, well what's your favorite?

D: Everything.

ARBH: Wow, I feel the same way about music. I love it all. What song is in your mind right now? Do you have a song in your mind right now?

D: None in my brain.
ARBH: Nothing right now?

D: No. (Interview, April 8).

Events that seemed to leave a positive musical impression on him were associated with performing, such as his granddad’s attendance of our music performance last December: “I was waving at him. I thought I could see him on the stage” (Interview, April 28). He also enjoyed playing instruments such as the drum and xylophone because they are “just loud, so I can hear them” (Interview, April 8).

David is assigned to play the steady beat for the song “This Old Man” on the alto metallophone for our May performance. The beat is interrupted by short rhythmic chanted sections, one of which follows “This old man, he played four, he played nick-nack on my door.” The spoken response by a small group is “Please shut the door” with a pantomimed action of slamming the door. Although this is not David’s given part, he mentions it in our interview, and on the videos he can be seen performing the pantomime with the group each time it happens in class. In our first interview, I asked him about singing and he responded by speaking the lyrics of “This Old Man,” interrupting himself after the fourth verse to say:

D: And after that you say ‘please shut the door,’ I go like this: (pantomimes slamming a door, makes vocal sound effect)

ARBH: [laughs] Is that your part? Please shut the door?

D: Yes (Interview, April 8).

During our interviews, I was surprised by the musical concepts from the past year and a half that made an impression on David. The first request I made in our first interview, as an ice-breaker, was for him to draw a “map of music class” (Figure 1). Instead of my preconceived idea of a map of the physical space, his reaction was “Music?
With notes?” His drawing, then, was of notes, which he was able to describe as ta, ti ti, ta-a or tiri tiri. He also wanted to include a quarter rest: “D: What about pause? ARBH: Uh, that looks kind of like a squiggle line. D: Can you help me draw it? ARBH: Sure” (Interview, April 8).

Student generated artwork, April 8.

David also enjoys musical instruments of all kinds. In the same interview, he asked me: “Well, did you know there’s a new instrument? It’s called a clarinet” (Interview, April 8). This was followed by a discussion of other instruments in music class. When I said I wanted him to draw another picture for me, he said, “More instruments?” I replied “Yeah!” and said he could draw “anything he could think of” (see figure 2).

Student generated artwork, April 8.
Attention to detail can be seen in his drawing of the xylophone. The dot on the third bar represents a sticker which covers the letter “h” on the bar. In our interview, we discuss the sticker:

ARBH: You just put a sticker on that, didn't you?
D: Yes . . . because you just put the sticker on the xylophones about h or b.
ARBH: Do you know why I did that? It was . . .
D: no
ARBH: It was confusing to some students. I would say play “b”, and there was a bar that had an “h” and a “b” on it. So, since I never say that bar’s name is “h”, I covered up the “h.”
D: That’s right. (Interview, April 8)

On the other hand, David’s negative impressions are inferred not only through verbal responses but also through video evidence in his physical reactions, such as facial expressions and movement (e.g. putting his hands over his ears). He reacts this way to loud sounds, notably the sound of the boomwhackers, which are long plastic tubes of different lengths, each of which produces a pitched percussive sound when struck against another object. After viewing a video of his reactions, he explains: “I didn’t want to hear that . . . because it was too loud” (Interview, April 28).

In contrast to David’s excitement about the “please shut the door” section of our piece, he had a negative experience with part of our December performance of “There Was an Old Woman”. He was asked to be one of the skeletons “a-layin’ around” onstage during the song. At the end, they were to sit up quickly and yell “Boo!” Although I do not recall any issues with this part, David apparently had a different view. Below, I include
the entire transcript to emphasize the amount of time spent on this topic within the interview, three separate references for a total of 9.07% of the interview.

ARBH: Do you remember at Christmas time when we went to the stage and performed?

D: Yes

ARBH: What did you think about that?

D: Well, now when you said, ‘Boo,’ and then at school, probably on Thursday, everybody was saying ‘boo’ to me . . .

ARBH: Ok, so they were saying ‘boo’ to you?

D: Yes, because I didn’t want it to be funny.

ARBH: Oh, ok, you just wanted to say it?

D: To scare everybody away.

. . .

D: Well, everybody said boo, and then we screamed and then they laughed. Thought I was going to play dead, but I didn’t.

ARBH: Oh, you didn’t get to do it?

D: (sigh) Well, someone, well, someone said (inaudible), then they said boo.

ARBH: They said boo?

D: Well, we had practice without everybody looking at us [dress rehearsal], and then they said ‘Boo!’ Waaaa! And that’s when I screamed.

. . .

ARBH: Mm, ok, well tell me: What did you think about standing onstage and seeing people out in the audience, was that a cool thing? Did you like that?

D: I think so.
ARBH: How did it make you feel?
D: Made me feel about what?
ARBH: Well, did it make you feel happy?
D: Which thing?
ARBH: To stand on stage and do musical activities?
D: Well, not for saying boo.
ARBH: Not for saying boo, you didn't like that part? [D. shakes his head “no”]
oh, ok (Interview, April 8).

Nonmusical Impressions
Nonmusical impressions involve events that David recalls, usually outside of the context of our current conversation. For instance, when being questioned about a song his class composed for the December concert, he recalls watching “Frosty the Snowman” with his class. From my point of view, this does not answer the question I asked, and he does not directly relate it to the song. However, something about the question triggered that memory, and it made enough of an impression on him to mention it in some detail:

ARBH: What about singing? Do you remember the song that you wrote, about..what was that song about that your class wrote? Santa, and ... you don’t remember? Reindeer? Was that your class that did the mistletoe?
D: Well, before Christmas we just watched a DVD. It’s called Frosty the Snowman.
ARBH: Oh, you did?
D: He was talking.
ARBH: Oh, ok
D: Trying, the children was (sic) trying to get Frosty to the North Pole, but not the
South Pole.

ARBH: No, why not?

D: Because we didn’t, we didn’t know that Frosty was going to melt.

ARBH: Oh, ok

D: I mean, the snow melts when the sun is shining.

ARBH: That’s true. If it’s warm enough it will.

D: Oh, the North Pole is so cold

ARBH: Yeah

D: So is autumn

ARBH: Right

D: Well, it does get cool, except cold <inaudible> but it didn’t snow. Of course (Interview, April 8).

David also seems to have a positive impression of learning, based on his reaction to new ideas and his curiosity about the world around him. I call this an impression because of his enthusiasm, from which I infer positive reinforcement toward learning in his past. “As I am setting up, Matthew says ‘We’re learning a new story? A new song?’ I confirm. He responds ‘All right!’” (Video journal, April 21). His previously mentioned statement about the “new” instrument called the clarinet indicated to me that he wanted to convey his new knowledge of this item. He also questioned me about the markers I brought, asking where I got them, how much they cost, and what colors were available (Interview, April 8). He was also quite interested in my laptop, when during our second interview I used it to show him video excerpts. He wanted to manipulate the mouse, click the pause and play icons, and shut it down at the end. Also in that interview, he
mentioned that he enjoyed volleyball, and took a few moments to demonstrate how it is played (Interview, April 28).

On the other hand, David is concerned with following directions properly. He does not hesitate to ask for verification of directions, as is evidenced on video when asking how many mallets are needed and what bar he is supposed to play (Video, April 7). However, he becomes noticeably upset when, in an interview, I ask him to describe his actions on the video. He seems to think his actions were inappropriate:

ARBH: and I want you to tell me...ok...so tell me what - sometimes you were waiting and sometimes you were playing. What did you do when you were waiting?

D: Playing.

ARBH: What do you mean, playing?

D: I'm not quite sure.

ARBH: You weren’t playing your instrument.

D: No

ARBH: What were you playing?

D: By myself.

ARBH: Oh, ok, so what does that mean?

D: It means that I’m playing crazy. It’s because my brain is making me doing that.

ARBH: Oh, really? I didn’t think you looked crazy.

D: Don't worry [he’s starting to get a little upset]

ARBH: What do you think you should’ve been doing?

D: Oh, I don’t know.
ARBH: Well, I don’t think you looked crazy. As a matter of fact, David, when I was watching this video, I watched a lot...I watched three videos of music class, and you had to wait a lot and I was really impressed because you are very patient. I was very proud of that (Interview, April 28).

He also possibly shows some awareness of his autism when he says “It’s because my brain is making me doing that.” This reinforces my belief that his reaction is based on previous events which impressed upon him the importance of proper behavior, and that at some point it was brought to his attention that his brain may be the cause of how he behaves.

David’s reaction to being a skeleton in the December performance of “There Was an Old Woman” also indicates a negative impression of the event. Looking back at that interview, I see that some of his statements indicate that other students were ridiculing him about his performance. “Well, now when you said, Boo, and then at school, probably on thursday, everybody was saying boo to me . . . Well, everybody said boo, and then we screamed and then they laughed. Thought I was going to play dead, but I didn't . . .” (Interview, April 8).

**Actions**

“Action” is meant to describe on- or off-task behaviors in interviews and in class. When he is on-task, he is following the directions given at the time, such as waiting quietly or playing appropriately. On the other hand, off-task behaviors display a loss of focus in which I might observe behaviors such as a change of subject, or improper use of the instrument David is playing. These groupings of behaviors are not meant to imply proper or misbehavior; simply whether he is attending to the given task.
Of the two interviews, approximately 50.25% included behaviors or conversations that were coded “unrelated to music.” This percentage was calculated in NVivo software, and it does include my own words in the interview. Some of these were mentioned earlier in this paper - the “Frosty the Snowman” conversation, and his desire to control the mouse on my laptop – and others included a lengthy discussion of the markers I brought for his drawing (Interview, April 8), a shirt he was wearing, a shirt I was wearing, and his enjoyment of video games and volleyball (Interview, April 28).

As I observed the videos, I noticed that although David was not disruptive in class, his actions were often off-task. He has a tendency to fidget by biting his nails, playing with nearby items (such as scooting carpet squares with his feet or lightly playing the bars of his instrument), or making silly or exaggerated movements. Without empirical evidence, I cannot say definitively that David’s off-task behavior is more or less troublesome than students at a regular public or private school, but my estimation from experience in such settings is that he is actually more attentive and responsive than the average student.

From time to time, David interjects comments during music class. For instance, one day in class an idea popped into my mind:

As we perform, I get excited about an idea I had: ‘Ooh! You know what would be cool?’ Matthew: ‘What? [shaking his mallet] Say it!’ I explain, then again say ‘Wouldn’t that be cool?’ Matthew: ‘Yes! I love it!’ [Jumps up and down with a big smile] (Field notes from video, April 7).

At other times during class, he may respond with phrases such as “Let’s do that again,” “OK,” or “All right!,” as he did in the following excerpt from my field notes: “As
I am setting up, Matthew says ‘We’re learning a new story? A new song.’ I confirm. He responds ‘All right!’” (Field notes from video, April 7). David is the only member of the class who responds in this way. Others who talk spontaneously (meaning, without raising their hand or otherwise being directed to talk) during class are usually not interacting with me directly.

When playing his instrument, he begins to lose focus toward the end of music class, swinging his mallet with more flourish and not playing as accurately. For the most part he follows directions and plays appropriately. In addition, his musical actions are usually 0accurate. As he plays the steady beat for our song, he rarely speeds up; however, he usually plays a little too loud, a common issue for children playing percussive instruments. His teacher, Tammy, usually redirects him when this happens.

Overall, David is an active and willing participant in music class, even though he does not always seem to be fully engaged. Observing him during times when I am giving directions or commenting on the lesson, I notice that he usually sits with his right foot resting on his left knee, hunched over and biting his fingernails. He rarely watches me, nor does he engage with other students. At a glance, one may think he is not listening, and maybe he isn’t. However, when reviewing the video, I noted the following: “He is always ready to play when we start, not disruptive, and his exclamations in class are enthusiastic. He seems to take great pride in knowing what to do, and displays great patience as I organize the activities of the rest of the class” (Field notes from video, April 7).

Summary

Having both receptive and expressive language disorders makes meaningful communication more difficult. Many of David’s answers to my interview questions were
unrelated to what I asked, and he was easily distracted from our conversations. When he elaborated on a certain subject, or revisited it later (such as “please shut the door”), I surmised that the event or activity had a lasting impression on him. It is perhaps these types of impactful experiences that remain in long-term memory that play a large role in construction of identity.

As Hoffman (2008) asserts, “Identity, then, is both the outward projection of who we desire to be, as well as the internalization of such desired behaviors and characterization” (p. 10). Considering the first part of Hoffman’s definition of identity, “the…outward projection of who we desire to be” (p. 10), I see David attempting to follow verbal directions and unspoken rules. His frequent verification of directives, questioning of his environment, and appropriate behavior in class speak to his desire not only to please, but to satisfy his curiosity about his environment; for example, his concern about the markers we used for his artwork – where I got them, what colors were available, and how much they cost (Interview, April 8).

David’s “internalization of such desired behaviors and characterizations” (Hoffman, 2008, p. 10) forms from past experiences which made impressions on him. In looking at the events he seems to hold important, I can see that although he shies away from loud sounds, he does enjoy performing on instruments, specifically triangle, drum and xylophone, and is not intimidated by the positive attention of others. He directly mentioned that his granddad attended our December performance, and positively responded to my question, “Did he like it?” (Interview, April 8). He also recounts songs and activities involving movement, such as the pantomime of “Please shut the door,” the song “Little Tommy Tucker’s Dog,” which we performed one year prior, and his affinity for volleyball (Interviews, April 8 and 29). On the other hand, he related the experience
of the Halloween song with a negative emotional response. The reactions of his classmates made him uncomfortable and he intimated that he did not want to participate in an activity like that again (Interview, April 8).

People with disabilities such as David’s faced a myriad of issues, not only in their daily lives, but also within the context of education. During his 35,000 mile trip throughout the United States, Jonathan Mooney, a dyslexic man with Attention Deficit Disorder, sought out people who, like him, struggled with disabilities in a typical American public school setting:

. . . kids who still locked themselves in bathrooms and threw up during reading class; . . . those who hid under their beds and had ulcers; . . . others who pulled out their hair and scratched their faces until they bled; . . . who grew up in segregated schools – in institutions for the disabled; . . . who were sterilized” (Mooney, 2007, p. 5)

What would happen to David in a typical school setting? Would he hug his teachers? Would he feel free to administer his blunt brand of honesty (for example: he was asked how much he loved Ms. P (his teacher) and he responded by throwing his arms wide, then how much he loved Ms. M (his teacher’s assistant) and he put his hands about two inches apart)? Many thousands of students like David do not have the opportunity to learn in an alternative environment (Mooney, 2007) such as this, where the students are not only receiving intensive interventions for their speech, language, hearing impairments, but are also privy to special attention from community outreach groups, media attention, and visits from well-known individuals and groups such as university athletic teams, state legislators, and donors with deep pockets. Rather, these students become minorities in
settings where the pressure to succeed and be accepted trumps the need for adequate intervention, which all too often is, in itself, lacking (Mooney, 2007).

David was crying when he came to music class several weeks ago. Something had upset him earlier in the day, but his teacher told me that he didn’t want to miss music because he loves music class. It shows in the way that he attends to the lesson, contributes to musical decisions we make as a class, and enthusiastically performs his given task. I never know what to expect from David. He is not disruptive or disrespectful, but he is unpredictable. By the end of the days’ lesson, David’s tears were gone and he was engrossed in his musical world once again.

Implications

By looking at the structure and activities presented in our classrooms through the lens of a student, we can see that our choices can make a lasting impression on our students, either positively or negatively. We do not usually know what experiences are in our students’ past and we cannot know how those experiences impact their reactions, but an in-depth examination of their point of view could be very revealing. This study hopes to inform educators of ways to approach such an analysis of students, through examinations of their actions and analysis of their words to gain understanding of past experiences that made an impression upon them and helped to form their identity. Students with language disorders may have difficulty with expressive language (Shore, 2003); however, by triangulating data, we get a better idea of how certain activities make a lasting impression and affect their actions in our classroom. For instance, in David’s case, the “please shut the door” section of our song is meaningful to him, enough that he makes mention of it in our interviews, in addition to performing the action and spoken phrase each time it happens during rehearsals even though it is not his assigned part.
Further triangulation may offer additional insights into the special learner’s construction of identity in relation to the musical self. Soliciting the involvement of teachers and parents who have a much deeper understanding of the student can provide meaningful information about the student. In addition, a lengthier data collection period may well uncover other salient themes, as the student participates in a wider variety of experiences in and out of class.
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1. Project Goals

The purpose of this multiple case study will be to explore the lived experiences of 4 students with language disorders within the context of their Orff Schulwerk music class at the DuBard School for Language Disorders. In addition, the observational insights of their teachers and the practitioner researcher will be compared with the responses of the students in order to determine any discrepancies between the children’s awareness of their musical engagement and those of the outside observers. This study hopes to inform those who interact with children with language disorders as to their perceptions, their lived experiences, and their ability or inability to communicate their thought processes in regards to educational, specifically musical, school settings.

2. Protocol

During the 2011-2012 academic year, Anna Halliday serves as the music teacher for the DuBard School for Language Disorders, which enrolls students who have severe language disorders of various kinds. Students receive weekly 30 minute music classes that are taught using the Orff Schulwerk pedagogical method, which includes vocalization through singing and chanting, instrument playing, and music-based movement.
Participant Selection

Based on The University of Southern Mississippi IRB approval, selected students will be provided with a description of the study (Appendix A), authorization to participate in research project form (Appendix B), student assent form (Appendix D) and parent consent form (Appendix E). Participating adults will be provided with a description of the study (Appendix A) and the authorization to participate in research project form (Appendix C). Purposeful sampling of maximum variation (Creswell, 2007) from students enrolled as full-time students at the DuBard School for Language Disorders during the 2011-2012 school year will allow an exploration of the “widest possible range of the characteristics of interest for the study” (Merriam, 2009, p. 79), namely, the various major diagnoses represented within the school. Four students with diagnoses including autism, dyslexia, hearing impairment, and apraxia, who can clearly articulate and who consent to participate will be selected. These students may range in age from 4 to 14 years of age. An additional parameter will be the willingness of their classroom teachers to collaborate with the researcher as secondary participants (van Manan, 1990).

Procedures

This phenomenological multiple case study is designed “to help us understand phenomena or relationships within” the case (Stake, 1995, p. 77). The multiple case study method aims to “allow for greater opportunity to generalize across several representations of the phenomenon” (Borman, Clarke, Cotner, & Lee, 2006, p. 123). Using this methodology, this study seeks understanding that will “lead to a better understanding, and perhaps better theorizing, about a still larger collection of cases” (Stake, 2005, p. 447).

Through observation of the student in the music classroom and in their regular classroom, semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and participant drawings (Freeman
& Mathison, 2009) to be collected from October 1, 2011 until March 11, 2012, the practitioner researcher hopes to represent the lived experiences of 4 students in the Orff Schulwerk music classroom at the DuBard School for Language Disorders. Using mini-dv video and digital audio recordings, the researcher will document the participant’s observed responses to singing, instrument playing, and music-based movement. Data collection will comprise of the participant’s video and audio recorded responses to interviews and focus groups, student generated drawings, and observation of the student’s behaviors from video and audio recordings of their involvement in music classes. The digital files from the voice recorder will be stored on the researcher’s laptop computer, which will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at her home. The mini-dv tapes will be kept in the same location. Additional data will be drawn from the children’s classroom teachers in the form of responses to video recorded examples of the students’ participation in music class.

Semi-structured interviews allow the researchers to understand participants “on their own terms and how they make meaning of their own lives, experiences, and cognitive processes” (Brenner, 2006, p. 257). To facilitate the examination of lived experiences in music class (the central phenomenon being studied), the participant’s interviews will begin with a grand tour question (Brenner, 2006), such as “tell me about music class.” This grand tour question may expose the participant’s language as well as identify themes that might lead to deeper knowledge regarding his or her lived experiences as a learner and musician (Appendix F contains possible interview questions). The themes identified by the participant will comprise follow-up questions. Each participant will be interviewed four times: the first will take place in late October, the second will be in mid-December, the third will be in late January, the fourth will be in
early March. The participant will be interviewed for no more than 80 minutes (over the course of the study) in a classroom of the school at the participant’s convenience. During one interview, the participant will be asked to generate drawings using “specific directions, most often in the form of a prompt or question . . . Drawing as a mode of sense making and representation offers different possibilities than talk alone does” (Freeman & Mathison, 2009, p. 72). Appendix G provides sample guided statements for student generated drawings. Disruption of classroom instructional time will be minimal.

“Interviewing children in groups may also reduce the researcher’s power within the research context, because the presence of peers will typically take precedence over the presence of the researcher” (Freeman & Mathison, 2009, p. 88). Participants will meet as a group two times during data collection: Once prior to the end of the first semester, to have an informal, open-ended conversation about music class, once following the winter culminating concert to view a video of the performance and discuss/react, and a third time during the study to have unstructured use of instruments and other implements of music class, such as scarves and manipulatives, during which students will be videotaped and observed in their interactions with each other and their actions within the setting. Directions will be given regarding personal safety and proper treatment of the musical instruments. Each session will last no longer than 20 minutes.

In addition, the classroom teacher of each participant will be asked to respond to excerpts of video recordings of the child in the music classroom. These responses will not only increase the trustworthiness of the data through triangulation, but may also reveal discrepancies between the child’s response and that of his or her teacher. These responses will be collected four times, following the schedule of interviews with the students. Student and teacher will be shown the same excerpts.
To further facilitate data triangulation, the researcher will maintain a reflective journal separate from the field notes in order to make visible bias and subjectivity during the project. Digital audio and video recordings of all interviews will be made and personally transcribed so as to maintain confidentiality.

Data Analysis

The researcher will begin data analysis following the first interview in order to identify and refine themes that will inform later interviews and writing/drawing prompts. Once the interviews are transcribed, broad themes will be coded and organized along a chronological trajectory, which will show any change in response over time. As data is classified by conceptual labels or themes, the process of interpretation will begin. Web-based data analysis software known as Dedoose (www.dedoose.com) will be used to sort emergent themes from participant interviews, researcher field journal entries, and field observations which will be collected via video recordings.

3. Benefits

The student participants may benefit from participating in the research study because they will have additional opportunities (through the interviews and member-checking process) to reflect on their musical learning. These participants may also gain a sense of ownership in the music learning process by having their voices heard by a music educator. Additionally, their participation may contribute to the improvement of music pedagogy for students with language disorders.

Teacher participants may find benefit by observing their students in a context separate from their regular classroom. Additionally, the teachers will observe their students’ responses to a different adult authority figure (the music teacher). Finally,
teachers may find that their own perceptions differ from those of the children, perhaps providing insight into the motivation behind student engagement.

4. Risks

There are no foreseeable risks to the participants as they will express their thoughts willingly. The participants will be asked to express only what they choose. Students in music class do not earn a grade; therefore, there is no academic risk to the student participants.

There exists a limited potential conflict of interest in this study as the investigator serves as the music instructor in which the student participates. The study is intended to be non-invasive and requires a minimum of disruption to instructional time while complying with the expectations of the research.

The participants’ names will be changed in the report to ensure anonymity. The researcher will keep all data collected in digital form on password protected personal work computers. All interviews will be transcribed by and restricted to only the researcher. Transcriptions will contain only pseudonyms of participants in order to maintain confidentiality. Interviews will be immediately deleted from the digital files following transcription. The data will be kept only until the final research report is completed and then all digital files will be deleted. Student drawings and other non-digital files will be destroyed upon completion of the study. Hardware containing digital materials associated with the study, such as the laptop computer, mini-dv tapes, external hard drives, and flash drives will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the home of the researcher when not in use. The researcher alone will keep the key to the filing cabinet. Materials such as video recordings, drawings, or pictures may be used in future
presentations at conferences, and confidentiality of participants’ identification will be maintained.

5. Informed Consent

The students and their parents/guardians will receive a complete description of the study and its purpose. They will be fully aware of the intentions of the investigator. Informed consent will be obtained through a signed statement from each participant and ongoing conversations about the research process. The DuBard School for Language Disorders will likewise give Institutional consent (Appendix I). In addition, the dissertation prospectus defense committee for Anna Halliday has approved this study (Appendix J).
APPENDIX E

ORAL PRESENTATION

1. **Purpose:** This purpose of this research is to explore the lived experiences of 4 music students at the DuBard School for Language Disorders. In addition, their classroom teachers will be asked to respond to video recordings of student engagement in the Orff-Schulwerk music classroom at the DuBard School. This research may help to improve music pedagogy for students with language disorders. The findings of this study will be presented at education conferences and published in education journals.

2. **Description of Study:** Through observation of the students in their music classroom, individual interviews, and participant drawings collected during the Spring 2011 semester, the researcher as a participantobserver hopes to identify emergent themes regarding her perception of the students’ musical responses. Using video and digital audio recordings, the researcher will document the participants’ observed responses to singing, instrument playing, and music-based movement. Data collection will comprise of participant interviews, drawings, and observation of the students’ behaviors from video recordings in order to gain insights regarding attitudes toward the culminating performance experience.

To facilitate data triangulation, the researcher will maintain reflective journals separate from the field notes in order to make visible bias and subjectivity during the project. Digital audio recordings of all interviews and focus groups will be made and personally transcribed so as to maintain confidentiality. Video recordings of rehearsals and performance will allow the researcher, who is also the instructor, to more thoroughly examine participant behavior during music class.
Four participants were chosen based on enrollment in the Dubard School for Language Disorders music program and their consent to participate. If at any point during the study the participant chooses not to participate, he or she may withdraw.

3. **Benefits:** The participants may benefit from participating in the research study because they will have additional opportunities (through the interviews and member-checking process) to reflect on their musical learning. The participants may also gain a sense of ownership in the music learning process by having their voices heard by a music educator. Additionally, their participation may contribute to the improvement of music pedagogy for students with language disorders.

4. **Risks:** There are no foreseeable risks to the participants as they will express their thoughts willingly. The participant will be asked to express only what they choose. Students in music class do not earn a grade; therefore, there is no academic risk to the participants.

There exists a limited potential conflict of interest in this study as the researcher is the music instructor for the class in which the students participate. The study is intended to be non-invasive and does not require any significant loss of instructional time while complying with the expectations of the research.

5. **Confidentiality:** The participants’ names, as well as the name and location of the institution, will be changed in the report to ensure anonymity. The researcher will keep all data collected in digital form on password protected personal work computers and will personally transcribe all interviews with the participants using pseudonyms to maintain confidentiality. Interviews will be immediately deleted from the digital files following transcription. The data will be kept only until the final research report is complete and then all digital files will be deleted. Student drawings and other non-digital files will be
destroyed upon completion of the study. Hardware containing digital materials associated with the study, such as the laptop computer, mini-dv tapes, external hard drives, and flash drives will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the home of the researcher when not in use. The researcher alone will keep the key to the filing cabinet. Materials such as video recordings, drawings, or pictures may be used in future presentations at conferences, and confidentiality of participants’ identification will be maintained.

6. **Alternative Procedures:** N.A.

7. **Participant’s Assurance:**

   This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board at 601-266-6820. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. Any questions about the research should be directed to Anna Halliday at anna.halliday@eagles.usm.edu.

Signature of Person Given Oral Presentation          Date

________________________________________          __________________________

8. **NOTE:** This is a complete statement of what is to be said to research participants.
APPENDIX F

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

(Short Form - to be used with oral presentation)

Student Participant

Participant's Name ____________________________

Consent is hereby given to participate in the research project entitled “A Single Case Study of Musical Identity Construction of a Student with a Language Disorder”

This project does not involve any experimental procedures. All procedures (analysis of student generated drawings, observation of participation in music class, four interviews not to exceed 80 minutes outside of class throughout the course of the study, and two focus group sessions not to exceed 40 minutes outside of class through the course of the study) to be followed and their purpose were explained by Anna Halliday. Information was given about all benefits, risks, inconveniences, or discomforts that might be expected. The opportunity to ask questions regarding the research and procedures was given.

Participation in the project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw at any time without penalty or prejudice. All personal information is strictly confidential, and no names will be disclosed. Any new information that develops during the project will be provided if that information may affect the willingness to continue participation in the project. Digital audio recordings of interviews and focus groups will be stored on the researcher’s laptop computer and will be deleted upon completion of transcription. Mini-dv video tapes of interviews and focus groups will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the researcher’s home. The material on these tapes will be deleted upon completion of the
study.

Questions concerning the research, at any time during or after the project, should be directed to Anna Halliday (anna.halliday@eagles.usm.edu). This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

A copy of this form will be given to the participant.

__________________________________________________________________________  _________________
Signature of participant  Date

__________________________________________________________________________  _________________
Signature of person explaining the study  Date
APPENDIX G

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

(Short Form - to be used with oral presentation)

Adult Participant

Participant’s Name _____________________________

Consent is hereby given to participate in the research project entitled “A Single Case Study of Musical Identity Construction of a Student with a Language Disorder”

This project does not involve any experimental procedures. All procedures (analysis of student generated drawings, observation of participation in music class, four interviews not to exceed 80 minutes outside of class throughout the course of the study, and two focus group sessions not to exceed 40 minutes outside of class through the course of the study) to be followed and their purpose were explained by Anna Halliday. Information was given about all benefits, risks, inconveniences, or discomforts that might be expected. The opportunity to ask questions regarding the research and procedures was given.

Participation in the project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw at any time without penalty or prejudice. All personal information is strictly confidential, and no names will be disclosed. Any new information that develops during the project will be provided if that information may affect the willingness to continue participation in the project. Digital audio recordings of interviews and focus groups will be stored on the researcher’s laptop computer and will be deleted upon completion of transcription. Mini-
dv video tapes of interviews and focus groups will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the researcher’s home. The material on these tapes will be deleted upon completion of the study.

Questions concerning the research, at any time during or after the project, should be directed to Anna Halliday (anna.halliday@eagles.usm.edu). This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

A copy of this form will be given to the participant.

___________________________________________  ____________________
Signature of participant                         Date

___________________________________________  ____________________
Signature of person explaining the study         Date

This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, Box 5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406, (601) 266-6820.
APPENDIX H

STUDENT ASSENT FORM

Interpretations of student engagement in the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom at the DuBard School for Language Disorders

Name: ____________________________

As your music teacher at the DuBard School for Language Disorders and as a doctoral student at The University of Southern Mississippi, I want to know more about how you view yourself as a musician. I will be observing, interviewing, and looking at drawings you create about being a musician.

There are two important things to remember. First, you are a volunteer. That means you are helping us, but you do not have to unless you want to. Second, the information about you will be kept private. You do not have to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable, and we can stop at any time. You will not be in trouble if you do not want to participate. I will be using a video camera and a voice recorder for our interviews and focus group sessions. I will turn off the camera or voice recorder if it makes you feel uncomfortable. The tapes and files will be kept in a safe, secure location at my home.

All of the information that we get will be used in research, but your name and other information that would let people know it is about you will not be used. None of the information will be placed in your records here. The information gathered will be kept on a computer that is password protected and only I will be able to see it. However, if any information I get leads me to be concerned about the safety of you or others or about how you are feeling, I will talk to you about it and to the staff here so that you can get the right kind of help.
By participating, you will help me find out about how you see yourself performing music. I can use that information to help me understand how other students might feel about performing. If you agree to participate, please sign your name below. Thank you for helping!

______ I agree to participate in this study. ______ I choose not to participate in this study.

______ I agree to be audio and video recorded

Student signature_________________________ Date______________

Parent signature ________________________ Date______________

This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, Box 5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406, (601) 266-6820.
APPENDIX I

PARENT CONSENT FORM

Interpretations of student engagement in the context of the Orff Schulwerk music classroom at the DuBard School for Language Disorders

Name:_________________________________

As your child’s music teacher at the DuBard School for Language Disorders and as a doctoral candidate at The University of Southern Mississippi, I want to know more about how he or she views him- or herself as a musician. I will be observing, interviewing, and looking at drawings he or she creates about being a musician. If you have any questions, please let me know.

I will be getting some information from his or her file about academic achievement and specific diagnoses. However, this information will be kept private, and only I will know the answers and information about your child.

There are two important things to remember. First, your child is a volunteer and may withdraw from the study at any time. Second, the information about him or her will be kept private. All of the information obtained will be used in research, but his or her name and other identifying information will not be used. None of the information will be placed in his or her records here. The information gathered will be kept on a computer that is password protected and only I will be able to see it. The data will be kept only until the final research report is complete and then all digital files will be deleted. Student drawings and other non-digital files will be destroyed upon completion of the study.
Hardware containing digital materials associated with the study, such as the laptop computer, mini-dv tapes, external hard drives, and flash drives will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the home of the researcher when not in use. The researcher alone will keep the key to the filing cabinet. Materials such as video recordings, drawings, or pictures may be used in future presentations at conferences, and confidentiality of participants’ identification will be maintained.

If any information I get leads me to be concerned about your child’s safety or that of others or about how he or she is feeling, I will talk to you, your child, and to the staff here so that you can get the right kind of help.

By participating, he or she will help me to better understand his or her perceptions about participating in the various types of activities done in music class. I can use that information to help me understand how other students might feel about these types of activities. If you agree to allow your child to participate, please sign your name below. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thank you for helping!

Becky Halliday

Music Teacher

_____ I agree for my child to participate in this study.

_____ I agree for my child to be audio and video recorded.

_____ I choose for my child not to participate in this study.

Parent signature ___________________________ Date__________
This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, Box 5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406, (601) 266-6820.
APPENDIX J

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The investigator will employ unstructured interviews in order to uncover the participant’s language in his or her own terms, reducing the possibility of imposing preconceived constructions of meaning on the participant. Therefore, the open-ended questions may lead to unanticipated follow-up questions. The following is a list of possible questions to be asked during the individual interviews:

- Tell me about music class.
- Tell me about times you have performed on stage.
- Tell me about any of your other music teachers.
- What is your favorite activity in music class?
- What kinds of music do you like?
- Tell me about musical concerts you have seen.
APPENDIX K

SOLICITATION OF DRAWINGS

The investigator will employ unstructured interviews in order to uncover the participants’ language in his or her terms, reducing the possibility of imposing preconceived constructions of meaning on the participant. Therefore, the specific questions for the drawing tasks may lead to unanticipated follow-up questions. The following is a list of possible prompts:

- “Draw a picture of yourself in music class.”
- “Draw a picture of yourself performing on stage.”
- “How do you feel when you are singing?”
- “How do you feel when you are playing an instrument?”
- “How do you feel when you are moving to music?”
APPENDIX L

ALL AROUND THE BUTTERCUP: ACTIVITIES

All around the Buttercup

Traditional
arr. Becky Halliday

Improvise on unpitched percussion instruments using flower names

5
Materials:

- An assortment of cards with flower names written in Northampton symbols and pictures of the flowers sized to correspond with their musical rhythm.

- soprano, alto, and bass xylophones; Alto metallophones

- various unpitched percussion instruments, such as rhythm sticks, tambourines, hand drums, triangles, guiros, etc.

Game:

Children sit in a circle. A leader walks around the outside of the circle; on the words *come with me*, he or she stops and chooses the nearest student, who then follows the leader around the circle, choosing a new person at the end of each iteration.

Improvisation:

Between iterations, students improvise using combinations of flower rhythm cards, arranged either by the teacher or by students in small groups, using pitched or unpitched percussion instruments.

Final form:

Some students play the game, some are accompanying on pitched percussion instruments, and some perform the improvisatory measures on unpitched percussion instruments.
APPENDIX M

HALLOWEEN: SCORE

Halloween

Traditional
arr. Becky Haliday

Crazies creep- ing through the night
watch- ing wix- ches in their flight,
Ghosts and gobs- ins

all a-round
list- en to their spoo- ky sound
co- co they're
call- ing you
co- co BOO!
APPENDIX N

HALLOWEEN NIGHT: SCORE

Halloween Night

Traditional

arr. Bobby Halliday

Better watch out, it's Halloween night. Look at all the spooky sights.

Shutters, let's have some fun When I count to eight you must be done.

Who are you? What can you do? When I count to eight you must be through.

Goblins and ghosts, how can you fly? When I count to eight come down from the sky.

Ones, twos, threes, fours, fives, sixes, sevens, eights
APPENDIX O

A SAILOR WENT TO SEA: ACTIVITIES

A Sailor Went to Sea

Traditional
arr. Betty Halliday

Materials:

- drums
- guiros
- claves
- maracas

Procedure: movement, then instruments are added to each repetitive word

- *sea sea sea* and *see see see*: hand above eyes as though shading eyes from the sun (drums)
- *knee knee knee*: pat knees (guiros)
- *chop chop chop*: chopping motion with right hand on crook of left arm (claves)
- *shoobop shoobop*: shake hips to the right, then to the left (maracas)

Final form: all students sing, some students perform movement, some students play instruments.
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