

The Bulletin of Historical Research in Music Education

Its Authors, Reviewers, and Editorial Committee Members
for the First Twenty Years

JERE T. HUMPHREYS

Several scholars have examined various demographic aspects of the music education research enterprise. For example, Steven K. Hedden reported that the number of research papers presented at conventions of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) increased from a mean of almost sixty from 1980–84 to a mean of eighty-seven from 1986–90. He also reported that few papers presented at MENC national convention research sessions had two or more authors until 1990, when approximately thirty-four percent of the papers had more than one author. Similarly, co-authored articles in the *Journal of Research in Music Education (JRME)* increased from twenty-six percent of the total in the late 1970s to thirty-six percent by 1990. Finally, Hedden found that the majority of MENC research paper authors presented only one time at that venue between 1970–90, and only approximately twenty-four percent of *JRME* authors published more than once in twelve *JRME* volumes from the late 1970s through 1990. Brittin and Standley confirmed that finding when they noted that seventy-eight percent and eighty-one percent of authors whose articles appeared in the *JRME* and the *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education (CRME)* from 1983–92 made only single-article contributions, respectively.¹

¹Steven K. Hedden, "Research Sessions at MENC Conferences: 1970-1990," *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* 3 (Spring 1992): 80, 84; Steven K. Hedden, "Music Education Research: A Dozen Conventions and a Dozen *JRME* Volumes," *The Bulletin of Historical Research in Music Education* 15 (September 1993): 19, 27; and Ruth V. Brittin

Female authors of research papers presented at MENC national conventions hit a record high of almost fifty-two percent of total authors in 1980, the first year *The Bulletin of Historical Research in Music Education* came out. Since then, the MENC figure "has hovered around" forty percent, which is the same percentage as female *JRME* authors from the late 1970s through the 1980s. Similarly, females wrote thirty-six percent of doctoral dissertations on the history of music education produced in the United States during the 1980s. However, females constituted only twenty-eight percent of *JRME* editorial committee members from 1983-92.²

The authors of a study on the *JRME* editorial committee concluded that the journal had achieved adequate geographical representation during its first four decades. However, in the journal's fourth decade (1983-92), the Eastern and Western divisions were under-represented and the Southern and Southwestern divisions were over-represented on the *JRME* editorial committee when compared to those divisions' respective national population percentages.³

The purpose of this study was to examine selected characteristics of the authors, reviewers, and editorial committee members of *The Bulletin of Historical Research in Music Education* during its first twenty years (1980-99). Those characteristics were: (a) the number of articles and reviews; (b) the most prolific authors and reviewers and the longevity of committee members; (c) the percentage of multiple-author articles; (c) the sex of the

and Jayne M. Standley, "Researchers in Music Education/Therapy: Analysis of Publications, Citations, and Retrievability of Work," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 45 (Spring 1997): 150.

²Hedden, "Research Sessions," 82; Hedden, "Music Education Research," 22; Jere T. Humphreys, David M. Bess, and Martin J. Bergee, "Doctoral Dissertations on the History of Music Education and Music Therapy," *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* 7 (1996/97): 120; and Jere T. Humphreys and Sandra L. Stauffer, "An Analysis of the Editorial Committee of the *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 1953-1992," *Journal of Research in Music Education* (forthcoming). Female authors were involved in thirty percent of *JRME* articles from 1953-94; see John Grashel, "Women as Researchers: Publications in the *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 1953-94," *The Bulletin of Historical Research in Music Education* 20 (September 1998): 18.

³Humphreys and Stauffer.

authors, reviewers, and committee members; and (d) the geographical representation of the authors, reviewers, and committee members.

To facilitate analysis of changes over time, I divided the twenty-year period into four five-year periods: Period One (nine issues), Volumes 1–5 (July 1980–July 1984); Period Two (ten issues), Volumes 6–10 (January 1985–July 1989); Period Three (eleven issues), Volumes 11–15 (January 1990–May 1994); and Period Four (fifteen issues), Volumes 16–20 (September 1994–May 1999).

The Bulletin is published at The University of Kansas, and a number graduate students from that university have served as associate editors, editorial assistants, and the like. These individuals and their respective positions were not part of this study. Similarly, items that appeared in the journal other than articles and reviews—such as reprints from journals and books, news of events, and editorials—were not part of the study.

Thirteen articles appeared in *The Bulletin* during Period One (mean per issue = 1.44), twenty-three in Period Two (mean = 2.30), thirty-four in Period Three (mean = 3.09), and forty-six in Period Four (mean = 3.07). The total number of articles over the forty-five issues was 116, with a mean of 2.58 per issue. There were only five articles with two authors each and one article with three authors. Altogether, only approximately five percent ($N = 6$) of the 116 articles had multiple authors. Seventy-seven different individuals wrote or co-authored *Bulletin* articles for the first forty-five issues.

Michael L. Mark was the most prolific author with nine articles, followed by Samuel D. Miller with eight, Sondra Wieland Howe with five, and John W. Grashel, George N. Heller, and Jere T. Humphreys with four each. Four individuals wrote three articles each: Mark Fonder, Carolyn Livingston, Carol Pemberton, and Terese M. Volk. Nine individuals wrote two articles each (see Table 1). The remaining fifty-eight individuals wrote or co-authored one article each.

Fifteen book reviews appeared in *The Bulletin* during Period One (mean per issue = 1.67), fourteen in Period Two (mean per issue = 1.40), twenty-four in Period Three (mean per issue = 2.17), and thirty in Period Four (mean per issue = 2.00), for a total of eighty-three reviews, with a

Table 1

Authors, Reviewers, and Editorial Committee Members

<u>Article Authors*</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Book Reviewers†</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Editorial Committee Members</u>	<u>N‡</u>
Michael Mark	9	George Heller	16	Michael Mark	45
Samuel Miller	8	Jere Humphreys	8	James Scholten	45
John Grashel	4	Steven Kelley	4	Bruce Wilson	45
George Heller	4	J. D. Parr	3	Samuel Miller	42
Sondra Howe	4	Martin Bergee	2	John Grashel	35
Jere Humphreys	4	Lynn Brinckmeyer	2	Carol Pemberton	31
Mark Fonder	3	Alice-Ann Darrow	2	Jere Humphreys	30
Carolyn Livingston	3	Robert Fisher	2	Melvin Platt	24
Carol Pemberton	3	John Grashel	2	Sondra Howe	23
Terese Volk	3	Robin Liston	2	Carolyn Livingston	23
Allen Britton	2	William May	2	Marie McCarthy	20
Kevin Fenton	2	J. Kent McAnally	2	Reginald Buckner	18
Sharon Gray	2	Samuel Miller	2	Terese Volk	17
Marie McCarthy	2	William Richardson	2	Joan Lester	10
Melvin Platt	2	James Scholten	2		
Linda Pohly	2	Fumiko Shiraishi	2		
Roger Rideout	2	Patricia Sink	2		
Paul Sanders	2	Jack Smith	2		
Allen Spurgeon	2	Vivian Velásquez	2		

*Authors of two or more articles.

†Reviewers of two or more books.

‡Number of *Bulletin* issues.

mean of 1.84 reviews per issue. Altogether, forty different individuals wrote reviews for the first forty-five issues. *Bulletin* editor George N. Heller was the most prolific reviewer with sixteen, followed by Jere T. Humphreys with eight, Steven N. Kelley with four, and J. D. Parr with three. Fifteen individuals wrote two reviews each (see Table 1). The remaining twenty-one reviewers wrote one review each.

Of the 206 articles and reviews to date (jointly written works are counted multiple times for this portion of the analysis), Heller wrote twenty, followed by Humphreys with twelve, Samuel D. Miller with ten, Michael L. Mark with nine, John W. Grashel and Sondra Wieland Howe with six each, and Kelley with five. These seven individuals wrote almost one-third of all articles and reviews. The remaining two-thirds were by ninety-seven people, sixty-nine percent of whom ($N = 67$) contributed one work each.

Heller has served as editor of *The Bulletin* continuously since he founded it in 1980. Similarly, Mark, James W. Scholten, and Bruce D. Wilson have served on *The Bulletin's* editorial committee since the beginning, or forty-five issues. To date, they are followed in longevity by Miller with forty-two issues, Grashel with thirty-five, and Carol A. Pemberton with thirty-one. In addition to Heller, fourteen different individuals have served on the editorial committee for periods ranging from ten to forty-five issues (see Table 1).

Men wrote all thirteen articles in Period One, but women wrote or co-authored twenty-eight percent of Period Two articles and fifty-six percent of Period Three articles, before women's contributions fell to thirty-seven percent in Period Four. Altogether, women wrote or co-authored thirty-six percent of *Bulletin* articles. The percentage of female reviewers ranged from seventeen in Period Three to twenty-nine in Period Two, with twenty-seven percent overall. Female membership on the editorial committee ranged from nine percent in Period Two to forty-two percent in Period Four, or thirty percent overall (see Table 2).

The Bulletin's seventy-seven different article authors hailed from all six divisions of the MENC, plus seven foreign countries: Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Canada, Germany, Japan, and Mexico. The Eastern Division led all other divisions with thirty-four article authors (thirty percent

Table 2

Number and Percentage Sex Ratios (Male to Female) of Authors, Reviewers, and Editorial Committee Members by Five-Year Period

<u>Period</u>	<u>Issues</u>	<u>Article Authors</u>		<u>Reviewers</u>		<u>Committee Members*</u>	
		<u>N (m : f)</u>	<u>% (m : f)</u>	<u>N (m : f)</u>	<u>% (m : f)</u>	<u>N (m : f)</u>	<u>% (m : f)</u>
One	9	13:0	100:00	11:04	73:27	5:1	82:18
Two	10	18:7	72:28	10:04	71:29	6:1	92:08
Three	11	15:19	44:56	20:04	83:17	7:3	72:28
Four	15	32:18	64:36	22:07	76:25	7:4	64:36
Total	45	78:44	64:36	63:19	77:23	—	76:24

*Percentages based on number of issues served (rounded to the nearest integer).

of the total number of American authors), followed closely by the Southwest Division with thirty-two authors (twenty-eight percent), and the North Central Division with twenty-eight authors (twenty-five percent). The Northwest Division produced only one article author (and one article). When compared to 1990 United States regional population percentages, the Western Division was significantly under-represented in the production of articles, while the Southwestern Division was significantly over-represented. All other divisions produced articles proportionate to their population percentages within statistical limits. Foreign article authors contributed approximately seven percent of the total (see Table 3).

The Southwestern Division led strongly in the production of reviewers with sixty-four (seventy-seven percent of the total). Compared to population figures, the Southwestern Division was significantly over-represented, and the Western Division produced reviews proportionate to its population. The Eastern, North Central, and Southern divisions were significantly under-represented, but the Northwest division produced only one review. There were no foreign reviewers (see Table 3).

Editorial committee membership came from only four of the six MENC divisions. The North Central Division led all other divisions with thirty-seven percent of The *Bulletin's* "issue-terms" served (the sum of committee members times the number of issues each served), followed closely by the Eastern Division with thirty-four percent. Four of the six divisions produced editorial committee members proportionate to their population percentages within statistical limits, but the Northwest and Southern divisions provided no committee members. There were no foreign committee members (see Table 3).

Hedden identified a trend toward more and more research papers presented at national MENC conventions over time, a finding that corresponds with a significantly increasing number of *Bulletin* articles over the four time periods ($X^2 = 20.58$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$). Frequently, papers presented at national MENC conventions later appear in the *JRME*, as well as other journals.⁴

⁴Hedden, "Research Sessions," 80; and Hedden, "Music Education Research," 29.

Table 3

Article Authors, Review Authors, and Committee Members
in Number and Percentage by Geographical Region

<u>Division</u>	<u>Article Authors</u>		<u>Review Authors</u>		<u>Committee Members*</u>		<u>Population†</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%†</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%†</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%†</u>	<u>%</u>
Eastern	34	30	2	2 ^c	150	37	23
North Central	28	25	4	5 ^b	139	34	21
Northwest	1	1	1	1	0	0	4
Southern	14	12	4	5 ^b	0	0 ^c	23
Southwestern	32	28 ^a	64	77 ^c	89	22	14
Western	4	4 ^a	8	10	30	7	15
Foreign	9	—	0	—	0	—	—
Total‡	122	100	83	100	498	100	100

*Number of individuals per division times the number of journal issues published while on the editorial committee.

†Percentage of the national total based on 1990 census data. See Mark T. Mattson, *Atlas of the 1990 Census* (New York: Macmillan, 1990), 12-13.

^aSignificantly different from the respective division population percentage [$p < .05$ (df = 1)].

^bSignificantly different from the respective division population percentage [$p < .01$ (df = 1)].

^cSignificantly different from the respective division population percentage [$p < .001$ (df = 1)].

Similarly, the finding that seventy-five percent of *Bulletin* authors (fifty-eight of seventy-seven contributed only one article each compares with seventy-eight percent and eighty-one percent of authors who made single-article contributions to the *JRME* and *CRME*, respectively, between 1983–92.⁵

The finding that lone individuals wrote ninety-five percent of *Bulletin* articles compares with Hedden's finding of few co-authored research papers presented at the MENC national conventions until 1990, when approximately thirty-four percent of the papers had more than one author. Given that there were no co-authored *Bulletin* articles in Period one (1980–84), and that four of the six articles with multiple authors appeared in Period Four (1994–99), the trend toward multiple authors noted by Hedden in research papers may be at work in *The Bulletin* on a small scale.⁶

The first female author did not appear until the beginning of *The Bulletin's* second five-year period (tenth issue, Volume 6, Number 1), although women authored reviews and served on the editorial committee from the beginning. The thirty-seven percent figure for *Bulletin* articles with at least one female author is similar to the percentage of female authors of historical dissertations during the 1980s (thirty-six percent), and close to Hedden's figure on female authorship of MENC research papers at the 1990 MENC poster session (forty-three percent) and female authors of *JRME* articles from the late 1970s through the 1980s (forty percent). For unknown reasons, women authored a smaller percentage of *Bulletin* reviews (twenty-four percent) than articles.⁷

Altogether, women served thirty percent of *The Bulletin's* editorial terms during the first twenty years, which is much higher than the percentage of females on the *JRME* editorial committee during that journal's first forty years (fourteen percent). However, female membership on the

⁵Brittin and Standley, 150.

⁶Hedden, "Research Sessions," 80, 84.

⁷Humphreys, Bess, and Bergee, 120; Hedden, "Research Sessions," 82; and Hedden, "Music Education Research," 22.

JRME editorial committee increased to twenty-eight percent during its fourth decade (1983–92).⁸

Regional representation among *The Bulletin's* article authors was proportionate to each division's respective population percentage except for the Western Division, which failed to produce its share of articles, and the Southwestern Division which produced more than its share. Of the nine foreign authors who contributed to *The Bulletin*, the work of one appeared in Period Two, three appeared in Period Three and six appeared in Period Four. The strong regional disparities in the authorship of book reviews can be attributed to the fact that many review authors were University of Kansas graduate students. In addition, Heller himself penned far more reviews than anyone else. There were no foreign reviewers.

Editorial membership was distributed evenly among only four MENC divisions relative to the respective division populations (see Table 3). Reasons for this disparity are not apparent, although the indefinite terms for *Bulletin* editorial committee members, unlike those for the *JRME* editorial committee, may be part of the answer. Regardless, reasons for non-representation from the Southern and Northwest divisions should perhaps be explored further. In addition, there were no foreign committee members, probably because of *The Bulletin's* stated editorial policy of emphasizing research on American topics.⁹

Given the demographic trends over the first twenty years, future *Bulletin* readers can probably expect more contributions by women and foreigners, as well as more multiple-author articles.

—Arizona State University

⁸Humphreys and Stauffer.

⁹Ibid.