

climate of the times. This was frustrating for me. I wanted Mr. Jeffreys to tell us why he made the effort to play at a "White" school in the first place, and what the logistical challenges of such a trip were. How did the musicians and the audience react? This is information worth preserving and it seemed to me an opportunity was lost.

I contacted Dr. Ware and asked him if there were any questions or responses "left on the table" regarding the experiences and hardships these band directors had either in their preparation as teachers or acceptance as professionals dealing with, to put it euphemistically, minority affairs.³ Dr. Ware reminded me that the original purpose of the research was not to reveal the racial challenges but to help him do his job better at Jackson State. At that point it became clear to me and I'm trying to convince him that a sequel is needed!

The "separate but equal" policy of the Supreme Court's 1896 Plessy v. Ferguson decision and Jim Crow laws had a deep impact on American society. And, because this history has been and is being gathered, particularly through oral history projects, people in subsequent generations will know about segregated lunch counters, separate water fountains, and accommodations restricted by race. How many will know about the problems African American music teachers had to overcome dealing with stadiums and other public facilities, and the unique environment associated with historically Black colleges and universities? These are stories that need to be preserved and the time to collect them is now.

The *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* is ready to publish oral history scholarship or, for that matter, any historical scholarship that pertains to teaching and learning music. This issue clarifies a number of important topics. Kyung-Suk Moon and Jere T. Humphreys' scholarship on the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project and the fine work of Corin Overland and Alison Reynolds on the role of MENC: The National Association for Music in early childhood education negotiate the world of elementary music education. David Holdhusen's history of the Gustavus Adolphus College choral activities provides a focused look at a college-level music education. Last but not least, Mary Cohen provides a biographical sketch of the musicologist who turned music into a verb, Christopher Small.

As always, thank you for supporting the *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education*.

Mark Fonder
Ithaca College

3. David N. Ware, interview by author via telephone, 23 October 2009.

The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: 1966–1970

Kyung-Suk Moon

Gongju National University of Education, Republic of Korea

Jere T. Humphreys

Arizona State University

The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program (MMCP) was a major curriculum reform effort in the United States during the 1960s, a decade characterized by curricular innovation and experimentation. The direct impetus for this unique education reform movement was the 1957 launch of the world's first successful space satellite, Sputnik I, after which education came to be seen as vital to the nation's survival during the Cold War with the Soviet Union. In response to this perceived national crisis, for the first time in history the federal government began to support public school education, partially by funding large curriculum reform projects. During this period of unprecedented financial support, diverse groups formed alliances and made concerted efforts to improve the existing school curricula. MMCP was launched at a time when government involvement and support for arts education had just reached its highest point, in the wake of the Kennedy Administration's interest in and support for the arts and the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965).

MMCP received the largest federal grant, before or since, in the field of music curriculum development: a sum of \$221,000 from the Arts and Humanities Program (AHP) of the U.S. Office of Education. The founder and director of the project Ronald B. Thomas was a faculty member at Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart in Purchase, New York. The project brought together prominent musicians, educators, and institutions which put innovative educational ideas into practice.

Despite the fact that the MMCP is considered one of the major projects in contemporary American music education history, only one large-scale historical study on the project has been completed. An article on the beginnings of MMCP (1957–1966) based on that larger study has been published. The current paper, the second monograph drawn from the larger study, traces the development of the MMCP from 1966 to 1970.¹

1. Kyung-Suk Moon, "Historical Perspectives on the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: 1965–1972" (D.M.A. diss., Arizona State University, 2004). For the first article from the larger study, see Kyung-Suk Moon, "The Commencement of the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: 1957–1966," *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 27, 2 (April 2006): 71–84.

Chronological Description and Implementation: 1966–70

The primary goal of the MMCP was to develop an alternative music curriculum for grades K–12. The objectives of the project, listed in the contract with the U.S. Office of Education, included: (1) “to prepare a curriculum guide and related materials designed for the primary through the high school years, all using discovery approaches;” (2) “to develop a meaningful sequence of basic musical concepts in terms of the children’s understanding;” and (3) “to more closely unify philosophies and directions of all areas and levels of music learning through the development of a spiral-type curriculum.”²

Thomas invited twenty-two expert consultants, including musical performers (seven), music educators (seven), and general educators (eight). The practicing musicians were involved in cutting-edge fields ranging from electronic music to jazz. A significant feature of the program was the preponderance of composers, including Lionel Nowak, Henry Brant, Charles Wuorinen, and James Tenney.³

A prominent music educator, Robert A. Choate of Boston University, directed the program during the months of July and August 1966. Other major figures involved were Edwin E. Gordon and George H. Kyme, both in the area of program assessment, and several curriculum specialists from the field of education. The project also involved thirty-eight school teachers and administrators, called teacher-consultants, for a total of sixty professionals.⁴ The new music curriculum was developed in three phases: extensive experimentation through pilot testing, extended pilot testing, and final revisions.⁵

Phase One (1966–67): Extensive Experimentation

The first formal year of the program began with a five-week summer workshop at Manhattanville College in 1966. This workshop served as a planning and training session for nineteen teachers from the greater New York area. The workshop faculty was Choate, Thomas, Nowak, and Brant.⁶

The workshop had two major parts: a “Seminar on Materials of Music” and a “Curriculum Seminar.” The schedule was intense: participants met from

7:30 A.M. to 11:00 P.M. for five days each week and until 2:00 P.M. on Saturdays. In addition to the two intensive seminars, the workshop included five Saturday evening concerts and major lectures on such topics as the Madison Project Film on Mathematics, Renaissance music, techniques of contemporary music, electronic and computer music, the Orff method, stylistic analysis of the Brahms *Requiem*, and new liturgical music.⁷

Nowak and Brant led the materials of music seminar in which participants explored music through a series of compositional tasks that emphasized the use of twentieth-century composition techniques ranging from twelve-tone to unconventional sound sources. Every composition was notated, performed, and critiqued. Choate and Thomas led the curriculum seminar, which focused on designing a new music curriculum. Participants reexamined and redefined the concept of music education especially new aspects of educational psychology espoused by Jerome Bruner of Harvard University, and then applied the ideas to build a new music curriculum. One of Bruner’s core beliefs was that a curriculum should be built on a particular discipline’s structure, or its underlying principles. Consequently, participants formed committee groups to determine the basic structural concepts of music. They tentatively identified the basic concepts as sound, rhythm, pulse, meter, duration, pitch, timbre, volume, form, texture, expression, and style.⁸

As the major ideas for the new curriculum began to take shape, the focus of the workshop shifted to formulating plans for classroom experimentation during the ensuing school year (1966–67), when the classrooms of the nineteen teachers would function as laboratories to develop and test the new ideas and principles. Participants designed practical classroom strategies based on ideas discussed in the curriculum seminar.⁹

Approximately 2,100 students in eighty-one classes were involved in the experimental program in 1966–67. All grade levels were represented: grades 1–3 in two schools each; grades 4–6 in three schools each; grade 7 and high school in four schools each; and grade 9, college theory, and college music education methods in one school each. The amount of class time varied considerably, from one twenty-five-minute period per week to daily classes.¹⁰

2. Ronald B. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1970), xi.

3. *Ibid.* See appendix A for a list of MMCP program consultants.

4. *Ibid.*; and Manhattanville College, Purchase, N.Y., letter to Robert A. Choate, Newtonville, Mass., TLS, 4 February 1966, Special Collections, Manhattanville College Library, Purchase, N.Y.

5. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 1.

6. Robert A. Choate, “Final Report: Music Curriculum Workshop at Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Purchase, New York, July 18 to August 19, 1966,” TD, Special Collections, Manhattanville College Library, Purchase, N.Y., 5.

7. *Ibid.*, 3–4.

8. Renee B. Fisher, “Learning Music Unconventionally,” *Music Educators Journal* 54 (May 1968): 61. Jerome Bruner’s main ideas on curriculum were set forth in *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

9. Choate, “Final Report: Music Curriculum Workshop,” 5.

10. Ronald B. Thomas, “Interim Report: Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program,” submitted to U.S. Office of Education, TD, 16 February 1967, Special Collections, Manhattanville College Library, Purchase, N.Y., 2.

While the teachers carried out the experiments in their classrooms, they continued to interact with each other through conferences, visits to each other's schools, and observation reports written by project director Thomas based on his visits to their classrooms. At the end of the first experimental year, all nineteen teachers attended a two-week follow-up workshop. Important components of the new curriculum were discussed thoroughly in light of the teachers' classroom experiences, including the basic core of concepts and related skills development, classroom environment, time requirements for the various strategies, and mechanics of room management. They then prepared the first draft of the curriculum.¹¹

Phase Two (1967–68): Extended Pilot Testing

In summer 1967, a new group of nineteen music educators joined the project as MMCP teacher-consultants. This group differed from the first group in two respects. First, most members of the second group were music education directors or administrators, not teachers. Second, they represented a broad cross-section of the United States outside the greater New York area.¹²

Like the first group, these teachers attended an intensive five-week summer training workshop at Manhattanville College. The college provided the participants room, board, travel funding, and awarded six hours of graduate credit. The training program was similar to the one the previous summer: classes met six days per week beginning at 9:00 A.M. and continued into the afternoon. Evening activities included concerts, discussion groups, films, and lectures. Three members of the faculty remained same—Thomas, Choate, and Nowak—but another composer, Charles Wuorinen, replaced Henry Brant.¹³

As the project began to expand nationwide, pilot tests were carried out in two types of settings: experimental stations and field centers. Participating

11. Ibid.

12. "Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program—Summer Workshop 1967," list of participants, TD, 1967, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea. The second-year participants were from Seattle and Kent, Wash.; Lakewood, Colo.; Chicago, Ill.; Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.; Eugene and Marylhurst, Ore.; and San Angelo, Abilene, and Houston, Tex.

13. Manhattanville College, "Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: A National Research Project in the Field of Music Education, 1965–1969," recruitment brochure for prospective MMCP teacher-consultants, [1967], MENC Historical Center, University of Maryland, College Park; "Manhattanville College—1967 Music Curriculum Workshop," general information for participants, TD, May 1967, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea; and Ronald B. Thomas, Purchase, N.Y., memorandum to Mother E. McCormack, president, Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Purchase, N.Y., TD, 10 April 1967, Special Collections, Manhattanville College Library, Purchase, N.Y. The workshop ran from 16 June–28 July 1967.

high schools and colleges in the greater New York area, called experimental stations, were assigned to basic developmental roles. Results from the experimental station schools were discussed thoroughly in light of participants' classroom experiences. Participating schools in other regions of the county were called field centers.¹⁴

Experimenting, feedback, and refining also continued in the second year. At the end of that year, a fourth one-week long session was held for the teacher-consultants. Important components of the new curriculum continued to be revised, including the spiral curriculum, strategies, conditions of the educational environment, teacher roles, effective scheduling, preparation of materials, and rationale.¹⁵

Phase Three (1968–1970): Final Revisions

During the third year of the project, participants continued to refine and field-test the curriculum. They also started to: (1) investigate a separate curriculum for early childhood, (2) prepare and test plans for reeducating teachers about the new curriculum, and (3) develop an assessment instrument. Refining the curriculum was carried on in much the same sequence: experimentation, field testing, feedback, and revisions.¹⁶

By 1970, the fourth revision of the new music curriculum had been completed and published, titled *MMCP Synthesis: A Structure for Music Education*. During this fourth year, MMCP shifted to a new project, the College Curriculum Development Study.

A New Music Curriculum

The principal outcome of the MMCP was an innovative new music curriculum. Thomas described the most fundamental principle upon which the MMCP curriculum was based: "Essentially what MMCP did . . . was to get back to what music is and what musicians do. The idea is that in music one learns by doing, that what students should be doing at any level of growth should be consistent with what musicians do."¹⁷ Accordingly, the MMCP, as set forth

14. Ronald B. Thomas, "A Proposal Submitted by the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program," [1969], Special Collections, Manhattanville College Library, Purchase, N.Y. The purpose of this proposal was to seek funds from private sources for further extension of the project. See appendix B for a list of MMCP participating schools.

15. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 34.

16. Ronald B. Thomas, Purchase, N.Y., memorandum to program and teacher consultants, TD, 4 June 1969, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

17. Ronald B. Thomas, interview by Judith Murphy and Lonna Jones, 1976; quoted in Judith Murphy and Lonna Jones, *Research in Arts Education: A Federal Chapter* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), 59.

in the *Synthesis*, introduced an alternative music curriculum that differed radically from the traditional curricula used by many public school music programs.

MMCP identified five basic elements of music: dynamics, timbre, form, rhythm, and pitch. Teaching students to understand these concepts was the primary goal of the new curriculum. These elements were organized into sixteen cycles of concepts to enable students to repeatedly revisit them, each time at increasingly sophisticated levels, so they could "think, create and explore music in the manner of a musician."¹⁸ Indeed, one of the most innovative features of the project was the "spiral" curriculum, which was based on Bruner's theories.

The MMCP strategy was devised to help students understand these concepts. First, the teacher presents a problem as a creative musical assignment and students compose and rehearse. Next, students perform and record their compositions. Finally, the class, teacher, and students evaluate the compositions. The focus of evaluation was to be on three types of thinking: "analytical, 'What did you hear?';" "judicial, 'Was that factor used appropriately?';" and "creative, 'What other possibilities are available?'" The *Synthesis* specified that composing could be carried out singly or in groups of three, four, or five students. A compositional problem should be presented in a well-defined form, such as: "Create a three-minute composition built on a tone-row for two pitched instruments of contrasting timbre and two nonpitched percussion instruments. The piece should be dynamically and rhythmically consistent with the idiom of the row."¹⁹

The emphasis on contemporary art music was another innovative feature of the new curriculum. Many musical idioms commonly used in the twentieth century were incorporated, such as retrograde, serial form, broken chords, clusters, seven- and twelve-tone rows, and whole-tone groupings. The suggested discography consisted predominantly of works by twentieth-century composers, including Bela Bartók, John Cage, Igor Stravinsky, Virgil Thompson, Edward Varèse, and Anton Webern, among others. According to Thomas, "Music of our time is the most logical place to begin music study."²⁰ The discography also contained a broad repertoire ranging from Medieval and Renaissance to ethnic musics.²¹

Although Thomas advocated strongly for curriculum reform, his views on including popular music were conservative: "Public tastes are often and are generally shaped by commercial consideration. Popular music usually employs

18. Thomas, *MMCP Synthesis: A Structure for Music Education*, 17.

19. *Ibid.*, 33–35.

20. *Ibid.*, 20.

21. *Ibid.*, 133–67.

such simple musical factors that schooling is unnecessary."²² His stance on popular music was not in line with ideas expressed by the 1967 Tanglewood Symposium on the importance of teaching "popular teenage music."²³ Thomas maintained his orientation toward twentieth-century art music throughout the project.

In the MMCP approach, a musical work was a practical resource that the student could use to help complete a creative assignment. The project recommended using more than one musical example or reference, preferably three or more, with each example drawn from different musical periods to help open students' minds to (art) music of all periods. Similarly, MMCP described the teacher as a guide, a creator of problems for teaching, a resource person, and a stimulator for creative thinking.²⁴ Thomas cautioned that MMCP "is not another method. There is no recipe book of highly detailed activities to be copied into a plan book." Instead, the *Synthesis* was offered as a flexible guide for teachers.²⁵

Early Childhood Music Curriculum

MMCP participants also produced an early childhood music curriculum (K–2) because pilot testing revealed that the new spiral curriculum was ineffective for that age group. This curriculum was developed with the Central Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory's (CAREL) early childhood arts program. Beginning in August 1968, CAREL employed two MMCP teacher-consultants, Americole Biasini and Leonore Pogonowski, to manage its early childhood music curriculum efforts. CAREL followed the MMCP developmental model for its early childhood music curriculum. First, workshops served as training sessions and as a time for teachers to interact and develop curriculum. Next, participating teachers' classrooms were laboratories for testing new curricular ideas. Finally, project personnel visited classroom teachers.²⁶

22. *Ibid.*, 20.

23. Robert A. Choate, ed. *Documentary Report of the Tanglewood Symposium* (Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1968), 139. The Tanglewood Symposium's declaration that popular music should be included in the music curriculum was significant because it was the first time in American music education history that popular music was "formally" recognized "as worthy of being taught;" Jere T. Humphreys, "Popular Music in American Schools: What the Past Tells Us about the Present and Future," in *Bridging the Gap: Popular Music and Music Education*, ed. Carlos Rodriguez (Reston, VA: MENC: The National Association for Music Education, 2004), 92. It is interesting to note that Robert Choate was heavily involved in both MMCP and Tanglewood.

24. Thomas, *MMCP Synthesis: A Structure for Music Education*.

25. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 38.

26. Americole Biasini and Lenore Pogonowski, *Music: Development of a Music Curriculum for Young Children* (Washington, D.C.: CAREL Arts and Humanities Program and U.S. Office of Education, 1969), 5–6.

When CAREL ended in May 1969, MMCP assumed responsibility for developing the early childhood curriculum, with the two former MMCP teacher-consultants maintaining their role in the project. The two-week workshops for classroom teachers and classroom visits by MMCP personnel continued. In 1971, the early childhood music curriculum came out in a publication entitled *MMCP: Interaction*.²⁷

This curriculum contains some of the most innovative features of MMCP in the spirit of the *Synthesis*. Children are involved in music as creative musicians, and classroom experiences are structured around the "Developmental Phases of Musical Exploration:" free exploration, guided exploration, exploratory improvisation, planned improvisation, and refinement. The curriculum neither rigidly prescribes series of strategies nor the extent of the parameters, and it is highly flexible in terms of sequence. However, due to the developmental stage of the students, conceptual understanding is not emphasized. Users were cautioned, as in the *Synthesis*, that the early childhood curriculum was intended as flexible guide, not a methodology.²⁸

Dissemination In-Service Program

Another major goal for MMCP was to develop a teacher reeducation program. Toward that end, after the summer workshops the teacher-consultants returned to their respective school districts and organized in-service programs. During 1967–68, 179 teachers attended seventeen in-service programs. In 1968–69, twenty-six in-service programs served 229 teachers. The in-service programs varied in size from three to nineteen teachers and in length from ten half-hour sessions to twenty-two full-hour sessions. Many in-service programs met once per week in the afternoons and all were voluntary, although most carried local school salary credit.²⁹ Most were organized into three major parts: (1) musical inquiry through composition activities, (2) educational inquiry concerning educational philosophy, and (3) curriculum development.³⁰

Some teacher-consultants tried other approaches to teacher reeducation. Barbara Reeder Lundquist taught an eighth-grade general music class of thirty-two students every other day in Seattle. The regular music teacher at the school observed her teaching and taught a subsequent class using similar techniques and materials. John C. McManus from the University of Oregon

27. Americole Biasini, Ronald B. Thomas, and Lenore Pogonowski, *MMCP: Interaction* (Bardonia, N.Y.: Media Materials, Inc., 1971).

28. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 38–39.

29. *Ibid.*, 16.

30. Robert W. Thayer, interview by the first author, Bowling Green, Ohio, 18 January 2003, tape recording, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

held experimental sessions with high school bands and orchestras from the Eugene area to work out teaching strategies.³¹

College Summer Workshops

Major changes in teacher training began in summer 1969, when the project launched college summer workshops.³² The purposes of the workshops were to: (1) "prepare music educators to work efficiently and securely with the MMCP curriculum;" (2) "identify outstanding participants for further involvement with MMCP;" and (3) "serve as a means of dissemination of MMCP ideas, materials, and spirit."³³

In 1969, thirteen college music departments and schools sponsored MMCP summer workshops, followed by ten more in summer 1970. Each sponsoring school or college accepted full financial and administrative responsibility for its own workshop, while the project controlled the curriculum and established the environmental conditions and time schedule. Each participating college employed two MMCP teacher-consultants to teach the workshops.³⁴

The college summer workshops, which used a more formal format than the previous in-service programs, consisted of two major parts: laboratory experience and seminar participation. All workshops required sixty hours of class time and an estimated thirty hours of outside work. Participants were requested not to schedule other classes or activities during the concentrated two-week period devoted to teacher training.³⁵

Commercial Publication

MMCP also published curriculum materials. The spring 1970 issue of the "MMCP Newsletter" mentioned that the *Synthesis* was only available in a limited quantity, but offered hope for commercial publication in the near future:

31. Barbara Reeder Lundquist, Seattle, Wash., report on her in-service program submitted to the project, TD (mimeographed), [November] 1967, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea; and John C. McManus, Eugene, Ore., report on his in-service program submitted to the project, TD (mimeographed), 1 December 1967, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

32. "Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Consultant Meetings, April 10–12, 1969," session schedules, TD, 1969, 1–2, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

33. "MMCP Consultants' Meetings, April 12, 1969: Agenda for Workshop Sessions," TD, 1969, 1–5, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

34. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 18. This report includes a list of the host colleges as of 1970.

35. "MMCP Consultants' Meetings."

With the MMCP curriculum already in use in many thousands of classrooms, it is unfortunate that copies of the *Synthesis* are not totally available at this time. The reason is simple. Our budget does not allow for distribution of copies to other than participating schools. This situation will be remedied very soon. The possibilities of commercial publication are excellent, and we hope that the *Synthesis* will be in your hands in the next few months.³⁶

In an effort to get it published commercially, Manhattanville College solicited proposals for publishing and distributing the MMCP curriculum materials that had been developed over the previous four years. Detailed information about the apparent failure of the project to secure commercial publication could not be located. However, it appears that the *Synthesis* and *Interaction* could not be copyrighted because MMCP had been funded largely by the federal government. Furthermore, former MMCP teacher-consultant Carroll A. Rinehart believes that most publishers were not interested in the MMCP composition-based approach because it did not generate a demand for scores, the main commercial interest of publishers.³⁷

Whatever the case, Thomas and Rinehart formed their own company, Media Materials, Inc. of Bardonia, New York, to publish the *Synthesis* and *Interaction*. The price for *Synthesis* was \$3.75. Rinehart stated that they published the materials as "a service to music educators" and "had no income from it."³⁸

Relationship to MENC

One major dissemination venue the project sought was the Music Educators National Conference (MENC). Robert W. Thayer described the importance of MENC to the project:

To some degree, MENC represented "the establishment." We knew that in order for MMCP to have the credibility we felt it deserved that we needed the support of MENC. If more people were to understand and embrace MMCP principles we needed the "respectability" that MENC could provide.³⁹

36. Manhattanville College, "MMCP Newsletter," spring 1970, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

37. Manhattanville College, "Request for Proposals: Proposal Guidelines, Evaluation Criteria, and Evaluation Procedures for the Publication and Distribution of the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program (MMCP) Materials," 10 August 1970, Special Collections, Manhattanville College Library, Purchase, N.Y.; and Carroll A. Rinehart, interview by the first author, Phoenix, Ariz., 25 January 2002, tape recording, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

38. Media Materials, Inc., advertisement brochure for publication of *MMCP Synthesis: A Structure for Music Education*, [1971], owned by Robert W. Thayer, Bowling Green, Ohio; and Rinehart interview. Rinehart was unable to recall further information about the number of copies distributed or how long he and Thomas operated the publishing company.

39. Robert W. Thayer, Bowling Green, Ohio, e-mail message to the first author, 12 March 2003.

Nevertheless, surviving documents reveal that MMCP and MENC maintained a tense relationship throughout the project. In the final report, Thomas wrote that: "The largest national [music education] organization had assumed a parent status for another music project [Contemporary Music Project for Creativity in Music Education (CMP)] which prejudiced its attitude toward other educational ventures." The CMP was much larger than the MMCP, with fifteen seminars and workshops and six pilot projects that focused on teaching creativity in the public schools.⁴⁰

MENC's support for CMP instead of MMCP can be seen in published materials. From 1965-73, some twenty-one articles related to the CMP appeared in the MENC publication with the largest circulation, the *Music Educators Journal (MEJ)*. During the same period, only four articles on MMCP were published in the *MEJ* (see table 1). Furthermore, although the MMCP began in the summer of 1966, the first *MEJ* article on it did not appear until the May 1968 issue.⁴¹

There were only six advertisements about the MMCP in the *MEJ* during those same years, all on the college summer workshops for the summers of 1969 (three), 1970 (two), and 1971 (one) (see table 1). All of these advertisements are presented in the same format: a half-page advertisement in a "box" with a list of the sponsoring schools.⁴² In contrast, there were four advertisements for CMP publications and four for the CMP college summer workshops. Interestingly, there were no advertisements or news items in the *MEJ* about recruiting prospective MMCP teacher-consultants or for the *Synthesis*. Questions about whether the *MEJ* advertisements for MMCP or CMP were purchased or provided free of charge remain unanswered.

Another potential venue for MMCP to share information was at MENC conferences. The final report for the project provides little information on MMCP's "presence" at MENC conferences except a statement claiming that project participants made seven presentations at division and national conferences.

40. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 19. For a list of the CMP seminars, workshops, and pilot projects, see "Contemporary Music Project for Creativity in Music Education," *Music Educators Journal* 54 (March 1968): 59.

41. Renee B. Fisher, "Learning Music Unconventionally," *Music Educators Journal* 54 (May 1968): 61-64, 97. The other three MMCP articles published in the *Music Educators Journal* were: Ronald B. Thomas, "Innovative Music Education Programs," *Music Educators Journal* 53 (May 1967): 50-52; Ronald B. Thomas, "Rethinking the Curriculum," *Music Educators Journal* 56 (February 1970): 68-70; and Robert A. Gibbs, "The New Breed of Band Director . . . Thinks Realistically," *Music Educators Journal* 57 (November 1970): 34-37.

42. MMCP college summer workshop advertisements appear in: *Music Educators Journal* 55 (February 1969): 109; 55 (March 1969): 98; 55 (April 1969): 106; 56 (March 1970): 92; 56 (April 1970): 74; and 57 (March 1971): 96.

Table 1
Number of *MEJ* Articles and Advertisements
on MMCP and CMP (1965–73)

Year (volume)	Articles		Advertisements	
	MMCP	CMP	MMCP	CMP
1965–66 (v. 52)	0	1	0	1
1966–67 (v. 53)	1	2	0	0
1967–68 (v. 54)	1	5	0	0
1968–69 (v. 55)	0	5	3	0
1969–70 (v. 56)	1	4	2	1
1970–71 (v. 57)	1	2	1	1
1971–72 (v. 58)	0	1	0	2
1972–73 (v. 59)	0	1	0	3
Total	4	21	6	8

MEJ articles containing program listings for the 1970 (Chicago) and 1972 (Atlanta) MENC national biennial conferences show five CMP sessions but only one MMCP session in Chicago, and three CMP sessions versus only one for MMCP in Atlanta, a ratio of 8:2 for those two conferences.⁴³

Thomas acknowledged that the teacher-consultants were primarily responsible for disseminating information about the project. According to the final report, teacher-consultants made a total of 216 presentations at various venues: division and national conventions (seven), state conventions (thirty-one), meetings in colleges or with college representatives (sixty-seven), school district meetings (forty), parents' meetings (fifty-one), education conferences (fifteen), television (two), and others (three). In addition, consultants wrote articles for local school district newspapers and professional magazines.⁴⁴

Program Evaluation

MMCP used a variety of formal means to evaluate the project: classroom visits by the teacher consultants and Ronald Thomas, interviews with teachers, conferences among project consultants, and reports submitted by teachers.⁴⁵

43. "The 1970 MENC Convention," *Music Educators Journal* 56 (February 1970): 37–43, 101–03; and "MENC Atlanta," *Music Educators Journal* 58 (February 1972): 25–34, 98–101. The article featuring the 1968 MENC National Convention held in Seattle, Wash., 14–19 March 1968, does not contain a program listing; "The 1968 MENC National Convention," *Music Educators Journal* 54 (February 1968): 42–47.

44. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 20. Thomas did not provide information about the presentations beyond what is presented above. Furthermore, he did not provide citations for the consultants' articles.

45. Thomas, "Interim Report: Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program," 5.

However, formal research studies on the effectiveness of the new curriculum were not undertaken within the project, an omission some observers saw as a weakness. For example, Edwin E. Gordon recalled that he was invited to serve as the research director for MMCP, but he asked to be taken off the project after only one week due to what he saw as differences between himself and Thomas. According to Gordon, Thomas told him that "Music is an art. You can't be that precise," and that he did not want to do "experimental research."⁴⁶

MMCP leaders encountered two major obstacles to program evaluation. First, "there were not firm standards-based criteria against which to assess."⁴⁷ From the outset of the project, the MMCP leaders, Thomas in particular, preferred not to give measurable objectives. According to Thayer, leaders "feared that to codify it too soon might inhibit further experimentation."⁴⁸

Finding an appropriate instrument to assess the unique features of the project was another major obstacle. In the final report, Thomas argued that "available assessment materials" were inadequate in the area of "analytical, judicial, and creative thought in purely aural terms." He also contended that extant tests limited sound awareness to "elements of pitch, duration, etc. in isolation from one another," and to "the recognition of commonplace items," statements that appear to substantiate Gordon's memories about Thomas's viewpoints.⁴⁹

Dissatisfaction with available testing materials led MMCP leaders to shift the project's evaluation focus to developing a new assessment model. According to the final report, the project developed a preliminary assessment model during the third year (1968–69). Unfortunately, Thomas provided no specific information about this model in the final report.⁵⁰

An attitude test that appears to have been developed within the MMCP was located during the course of the present research. According to Edward Joseph Drew, who conducted an experimental study on the project, Thomas gave him a copy of this eight-item "Manhattanville Sentence Completion Test" in June 1969. The first five items asked students to complete the following sentences: "1. The best thing about music is _____"; "2. My interest in music is _____"; "3. Good musicians _____"; "4. Composing music of my own _____"; and "5. A music curriculum is _____." The remaining three

46. Edwin E. Gordon, interview by the first author, Tempe, Ariz., 12 October 2001, tape recording, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

47. Paul R. Lehman, e-mail message to the first author, 26 February 2003.

48. Thayer, e-mail.

49. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 5; and Gordon interview.

50. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*.

questions were aural test items that also asked students to complete a sentence after each of three short musical excerpts were heard: "This piece _____."⁵¹

It appears that George Kyme may have developed this preliminary MMCP assessment model, which might have included the sentence-completion test described above. He developed a two-section test entitled "Test of Aesthetic Judgments in Music." The first section of the test consisted of forty items of paired short piano pieces. The second section consisted of ten items, some of them songs chosen from various school music series and instrumental works. The test asked students to judge the musical style, tone quality, intonation, and ensemble. Kyme administered this test to 800 students in the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grades selected from MMCP participating schools in six states. He reported statistically significant gains from pretest to post-test at the eighth-grade level, but no significant pre-post differences for grades 4-7. However, no control groups were employed in the research design.⁵²

Thomas stated that the assessment model was not tested on a wider scale due to time constraints, and that the "observations and judgments" of project participants served as "sufficient grounds" for the credibility of the project.⁵³ Regardless of the reasons, it is clear that the project did not include developing standard program evaluation procedures or instruments.

Funding and Budget

The original MMCP grant proposal was not located during the course of this investigation, and the extant sources contain limited information regarding project funding and budgeting. According to a news release from Manhattanville College dated 2 November [1966], the total amount of grant funds received from the Arts and Humanities Division of the U.S. Office of Education was \$221,000 over a period of three years. The news release further indicated that "The remainder of the funds needed for completion of the \$300,000 project will be sought from private sources."⁵⁴ Indeed, the first five-week curriculum workshop at Manhattanville College in summer 1966 was supported by the

51. Edward Joseph Drew, "An Application of the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program to the Preparation in Music of Elementary School Classroom Teachers" (D.M.A. diss., Boston University, 1974), 172-74.

52. George H. Kyme, *The Value of Aesthetic Judgment in Music in Assessing Musicality for the Elementary School Children: Final Report* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education Printing, 1970). The schools in the study were located in Portland, Ore.; Denver, Colo.; San Angelo, Tex.; Larchmont and Yonkers, N.Y.; West Harford, Conn.; and Cresskill, N.J.

53. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 5.

54. Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, "News Release," TD, 2 November [1966]; attached to Vanett Lawler, memorandum to Joan Gaines, 4 November 1966, MENC Historical Center, University of Maryland, College Park.

Bureau of Teacher Education of the New York State Education Department (\$4,446) and the Magnavox Foundation (\$2,000).⁵⁵

A 1967 recruitment brochure for prospective teacher-consultants provides additional information on funding: "It [MMCP] is supported over a four-year-period (1965-1969) by grants of \$256,000 from the U.S. Office of Education and funds from private sources."⁵⁶ Thus, it appears that the project obtained an additional \$35,000 from private sources. In addition to private sources, it seems that participating school districts and some state agencies contributed the remaining funds (\$44,000) needed to reach the total (\$300,000):

With support in excess of three hundred thousand dollars from the Arts and Humanities Division of the U.S. Office of Education, a considerable commitment by participating school districts, and some state, foundation and industry assistance, the MMCP has been able to fulfill the immediate objectives established at its beginning.⁵⁷

In February 1969 Thomas submitted a proposal to the U.S. Office of Education which requested \$597,517 for a three-year extension of the project (1 October 1969-31 August 1972).⁵⁸ He sent another proposal to private sources requesting funding for an extension. This latter proposal addressed three objectives: "the development of viable curricula for college music students," "experimentation with new process to achieve skills," and "the extension, refinement and dissemination of learning programs developed by MMCP for students from the primary grades through high school." Thomas wrote in the latter proposal that the Office of Education had agreed to provide only partial funding for the project extension, approximately \$120,000 for 1969-70. He therefore emphasized how important it was to secure funding for the project from private rather than federal sources. He gave two reasons: "First, the Arts and Humanities Division of the U.S.O.E [U.S. Office of Education] is allotted a very

55. Choate, "Final Report: Music Curriculum Workshop," 6.

56. Manhattanville College, "Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: A National Research Project in the Field of Music Education, 1965-1969," recruitment brochure. There is a discrepancy about the funding period between the news release and the recruitment brochure. The news release indicates a grant period of three years (1966-69), while the recruitment brochure indicates a period of four years (1965-69). The three-year funding period is more likely because MMCP began officially on 1 October 1966; Thomas, "Interim Report: Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program," 1.

57. Thomas, "A Proposal Submitted by the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program," (n. p.).

58. Ronald B. Thomas, "Proposal for Research and/or Related Activities Submitted to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for Support through Authorization of the Bureau of Research," TD (mimeographed), 19 February 1969, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

limited budget;" and "Government support for projects is at best risky. . . . The type, level and extent of commitment of an undertaking of this scope demands a more stable base."⁵⁹

He estimated the budget as follows: "The yearly cost of operation is approximately two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) bringing the total cost of the next three years to approximately six hundred thousand dollars (\$600,000)."⁶⁰ Research shows that the requested funding for the three-year project extension was not obtained from governmental or private sources except for a grant of \$137,800 from the National Endowment for the Humanities for a two-year program in twelve colleges and universities.⁶¹

Influence

Regarding the influence of the MMCP on the field of music education, Ronald Thomas expressed faith in a promising future:

The real product of this project could not be bound in a report. It is people and ideas. By August 1970 over 1150 music educators will have become involved with project ideas through workshops and in-service programs. At least 1500 other teachers will have attended workshops, conducted by MMCP teachers, but not officially linked with the project. In addition, over 500 music educators at the college level will have in some way participated in fresh considerations of educational opportunities. These educators in turn will have influenced hundreds of others through demonstration programs, faculty meetings, and in private conversations. . . . It is people with ideas, people who have found new reasons and new freedom to question and explore.⁶²

At the time, MMCP drew the attention of music educators nationwide with its bold, daring approaches. Charles Leonhard and Richard J. Colwell later described MMCP influences as follows:

Among the USOE grants, the Manhattanville Project of Ronald B. Thomas attracted the most publicity and received the greatest attention due to its radical departure from traditional modes of school music instruction. Through numerous demonstrations at conventions and workshops, the Manhattanville scheme has had a genuine impact on the procedures and goals for music at every educational level, though its complete adoption has occurred in only a limited number of situations.⁶³

59. Thomas, "A Proposal Submitted by the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program."

60. Ibid.

61. Murphy and Jones, *Research in Arts Education: A Federal Chapter*, 59.

62. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 41.

63. Charles Leonhard and Richard J. Colwell, "Research in Music Education," *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* 49 (winter 1976): 1-30.

It does appear that MMCP was adopted by relatively few schools, both during and after the project. Virginia N. Densmore, president of the Florida Elementary Music Educators Association, surveyed the status of elementary music instruction in her state in the early 1970s. The findings indicate that the number of teachers who had adopted the MMCP was small relative to other approaches at the time:

The emphasis of most music programs around the state is on singing activities followed by listening, then playing instruments and creative activities, and finally, movement and music reading. Twelve counties report having a 'Comprehensive Musicianship' program; 11 use Kodály techniques, 8 Orff, 3 Manhattanville, 3 Dooling, 2 Pace, and 2 have music laboratories.⁶⁴

Several MMCP participants later recounted the difficulties they faced in their dissemination efforts. Ronald R. Davis, supervisor of secondary music in Broward County, Florida, attempted to adopt the MMCP curriculum in his school district, but had to withdraw the proposal due to substantial resistance from teachers and administrators. Reeder Lundquist recounted the difficulties Davis faced:

As an administrator he tried to implement the MMCP because he really became convinced of its value. But, at least initially, there were few teachers who either liked contemporary music or felt capable of doing compositional experiences with kids and technology.⁶⁵

In her report on in-service programs in 1967, Reeder Lundquist recorded responses from directors of performance ensembles:

Most of the instrumental teachers have problems in seeing how they could improve their offerings, other than to have more and better performance groups. Many choral teachers feel the same way. They see this as a loss of rehearsal time, and turn white at the mere thought.⁶⁶

McManus was disappointed that he failed to solve the same problem: "My greatest disappointment was my inability to influence most directors of large ensembles to touch base with creativity instruction. Tradition and status quo were clear winners in band and orchestra classes and were certainly easier for teachers."⁶⁷

Some former project participants provided insightful perspectives about why

64. Virginia N. Densmore, "FEMEA [Florida Elementary Music Educators Association], *Florida Music Director* 28 (February 1975): 14.

65. Barbara Reeder Lundquist, interview by the first author, Seattle, Wash., 19 March 2003, tape recording, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

66. Ibid.

67. John C. McManus, "'Rats in the Attic,' and Other Musical Explorations," *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* 1 (autumn 1990): 54.

it did not have wider success. Thomas, for example, believed that the MMCP was hampered by: (1) "the school structure itself which inhibited individual growth in music because schools were anti-noise;" (2) "many music teachers who lacked the fundamental music skills necessary to guide students' musical decisions;" and (3) "the lack of a taxonomy of music skills which impeded effective evaluation techniques of a student's growth."⁶⁸ Reeder Lundquist also identified several major barriers: (1) the culture of the "traditional" in music and music education, (2) traditional curriculum, (3) teaching materials and equipment, (4) instructional logistics, and (5) teachers' musical preferences.⁶⁹ Scott-Kassner stated that too few people bought into MMCP compared to other approaches available at the time, such as Orff and Kodály. She believes that teachers may have been frightened because they would have had to make radical changes in order to adopt the program.⁷⁰

MMCP since 1972 and Today

Thomas became head of the music department at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond after the MMCP college grant expired in 1972. He incorporated an MMCP music laboratory into his freshman class curriculum.⁷¹ Christina Thomas Fisk, Thomas's daughter, described his educational activities after MMCP:

When the MMCP project ended, my father went back to teaching. He was single-mindedly devoted to the cause of music education for his entire life. The last ten years of his life were specifically focused on developing a computer music education program based upon the MMCP work. Of course, over the years, he'd refined and expanded the MMCP principles, and all this advanced work was incorporated into his computer programs which are called *MusicLab Melody* and *MusicLab Harmony*. Copies of these programs are sold through a distributor in Seattle.⁷²

68. Ronald B. Thomas, interview; quoted in Daniel L. Steele, "An Investigation into the Background and Implications of the Yale Seminar on Music Education" (D.M.A. diss., University of Cincinnati, 1988), 118.

69. Reeder Lundquist interview.

70. Carol R. Scott-Kassner, Federal Way, Wash., telephone interview by the first author, 26 March 2003, tape recording, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea.

71. Ronald B. Thomas, Richmond, Va., letter to MMCP consultants, January 1973, in possession of Robert W. Thayer, Bowling Green, Ohio.

72. Christina Thomas Fisk, e-mail message to author, 9 June 2002. For information on these computer programs, see Ronald B. Thomas and Gary Barber, *Music Lab Harmony*, version 3.2, serial 150727 (Redmond, Wash.: Music Lab Systems, Inc., 1998); and Ronald B. Thomas and Gary Barber, *Music Lab Melody*, version 3.2, serial 251343 (Redmond, Wash.: Music Lab Systems, Inc., 1998). Student versions of *Music Lab Harmony* and *Music Lab Melody* can still be purchased for \$49.95 each; Joe Hebert, e-mail message to the first author, 12 June 2002.

Rinehart incorporated MMCP composition approaches in his *Spectrum of Music*, a K-8 music textbook series published by Macmillan in 1974. Revised versions were published through the 1980s. In an interview for this study, he expressed his strong belief that the best way to teach music is through creativity. He has implemented his belief through opera education for children since 1983. He initiated a program in Tucson, Arizona in which children created and produced their own operas to learn to appreciate and understand the art form. He has conducted numerous workshops on opera-making by children.⁷³

Similarly, at the time of her interview for this study (2003), Reeder Lundquist was still teaching African American music in the same way she did in the MMCP; Alex Campbell continued to conduct MMCP workshops after the project ended; and Lenore Pogonowski continues to administer the Creative Arts Laboratory at Teachers College, Columbia University, with focus on musical creativity, problem-solving, and comprehensive musicianship.⁷⁴ Scott-Kassner, who at the time of her interview for this study (2003) was working as consultant and textbook author, described MMCP's influence on her as follows:

I've done lots and lots of workshops around the country. . . . It was all based on MMCP and I wrote a chapter on music creativity in my college text, *Music in Childhood*. I put lots of composing into the series published by Silver Burdett that I've been a part of. . . . [MMCP] influenced me probably more than any other single thing that I had learned up to that point in my training of teaching music with kids.⁷⁵

Ronald Johnson continued to operate his MMCP music laboratory at Thomson Junior High School in Seattle until the summer of 1976; he used the MMCP laboratory procedures in various school music programs until 1988; and he presented a general music session on the technique at a professional conference in the late 1980s. He recently became a pilot teacher for the Yamaha Music In Education (YMIE) curriculum, which is now his primary focus. However, he emphasized that he still believes in the MMCP approach and uses it in his YMIE teaching.⁷⁶

73. Rinehart interview.

74. Reeder Lundquist interview; Alex B. Campbell, interview by the first author, Denver, Colo., 8 March 2003, tape recording, in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea; and Lenore M. Pogonowski, "Creative Arts Laboratory;" available from <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/centers/cal/faculty.html>; internet, accessed 18 November 2009.

75. Scott-Kassner interview. The textbook mentioned is Patricia Shehan Campbell and Carol Scott-Kassner, *Music in Childhood: From Preschool through the Elementary Grades* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1995).

76. Ronald G. Johnson, Seattle, Wash., memorandum to first author, [March 2003], in possession of the first author, Gongju-Si, Chungnam, Republic of Korea. Attached to this memorandum is a handout Johnson used for his conference session on MMCP.

The music education literature suggests that MMCP has continued to interest music educators. For example, there is an article by Thomas in a 1991 *MEJ* special focus issue on improvisation entitled "Musical Fluency: MMCP and Today's Curriculum." In 2001, the *MEJ* dedicated another issue to composition and improvisation in which Pogonowski contributed an article entitled "A Personal Retrospective on the MMCP." The 1987 conference of the MENC Southern Division included a session entitled "MMCP, CMP, HMP: Applications to K-12 Music Programs" in which Thomas participated as a panelist-presenter. In 1990, McManus wrote an article for a special issue of the *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* that provided a retrospective on music education in the 1960s and 1970s.⁷⁷

Conclusions

The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program was a bold attempt at curriculum reform that grew out of and became part of the curriculum reform movement in American education during the 1960s. The project was driven by the participants' genuine beliefs in certain pedagogical innovations and was directed by inspiring leaders, most notably Ronald Thomas, Lionel Nowak, and Robert Choate. Many of the living participants remain true to the premise of the project to this day. In a recent interview, Barbara Reeder Lundquist passionately described the crucial aspect of the project as "being authentic to the way teachers can be with music students: more interactive, less one-directional."⁷⁸ MMCP leaders who believed in the value of the new approach influenced the teachers and students they taught through workshops, convention presentations, and classes.

Although the project's ideas live on today in new contexts through the project's former participants, the MMCP had little direct influence on music education in American schools. The limited success of the MMCP reveals the complexities involved in bringing about lasting and widespread changes in the status quo. Most teachers and administrators refused to embrace the new approach. As several former project participants noted, teachers resisted the new approach because it was unfamiliar. They were uncomfortable with at least some of MMCP's innovative features that emphasized creativity,

77. Ronald B. Thomas, "Musical Fluency: MMCP and Today's Curriculum," *Music Educators Journal* 78 (December 1991): 26-29; Lenore M. Pogonowski, "A Personal Retrospective on the MMCP," *Music Educators Journal* 88 (July 2001): 24-27; Southern Division Music Educators National Conference, "America the Musical: Singing the Same Song," program for thirty-third biennial in-service conference, 29 April-2 May 1987, Orlando, Fla., in possession of the second author, Tempe, Ariz. (HMP was the Hawaii Music Project); and McManus, "Rats in the Attic," and Other Musical Explorations."

78. Reeder Lundquist interview.

twentieth-century musical idioms, and the teacher's role as a guide and resource person. Project members experienced great difficulties in influencing teachers, especially directors of large ensembles. Another obstacle was the absence of widespread program evaluation, a typical shortcoming in music curriculum reform efforts from that period.⁷⁹

According to Kirst and Meister's theory of reform longevity, one of the crucial elements for success is that powerful constituencies need to be willing and able to support new educational initiatives.⁸⁰ MMCP operated apart from the established organizations; indeed, MMCP leaders and teacher-consultants were the heart of the project, not one or more professional organizations. These individuals assumed voluntary responsibility for the project based on their genuine belief in the new approach. However, because they were engaged in other activities, it was not easy for them to monitor or help teachers who might have adopted the MMCP. Since project implementation relied on these individuals, typically when they left their schools or took on other commitments, the new program was discontinued.

Although MMCP received substantial funding from the federal government, the support was not stable. The lack of stable financial backing made it difficult to distribute materials about the program widely. Nevertheless, if MMCP had received strong support from the professional establishment, especially MENC, it could have offered in-service training programs, workshops, and materials to help teachers learn the MMCP approach even after the funded phases of the project ended.

MMCP reform efforts reveal two competing stories. First, the project was a curriculum reform attempt driven by project members' strong belief in certain pedagogical innovations, their enthusiasm for the project itself, and their commitment to make use of every opportunity to disseminate the new curricular ideas. The other story has to do with the obstacles participants encountered in the course of the project, obstacles that can be seen as vividly representing the complexities involved in effecting long-lasting and widespread changes in the status quo. The MMCP experiences present powerful lessons for future reformers who seek to change educational realities. Significant

79. For more information on this topic, see David M. Bess, "Comprehensive Musicianship in the Contemporary Music Project's Southern Region Institutes for Music in Contemporary Education," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 39 (summer 1991): 101-12; David Michael Bess, "A History of Comprehensive Musicianship in the Contemporary Music Project's Southern Division Institutes for Music in Contemporary Education" (Ph.D. diss., West Virginia University, 1988); and Richard J. Colwell, "Program Evaluation in Music Teacher Education," *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* 81 (winter 1985): 18-62.

80. Michael W. Kirst and Gall R. Meister, "Turbulence in American Secondary Schools: What Reforms Last," *Curriculum Inquiry* 15 (summer 1985): 169-86.

change is unlikely without solid bottom-up support, effective implementation strategies, and success in sustaining and institutionalizing new curricular initiatives.⁸¹

81. The MMCP College Program, which received additional funding from 1970-72, will be the subject of a third monograph based on the original large-scale study.

Appendix A MMCP Program Consultants⁸²

Music

Boepple, Paul: North Bennington, Vermont
 Brant, Henry: Bennington College, Bennington, Vermont
 Luening, Otto: Columbia University, New York, New York
 Lindsey, Merrill, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio
 Taylor, Billy: Channel 5 TV, New York, New York
 Tenney, James: Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, New York
 Wuorinen, Charles: New England Conservatory of Music, Boston, Massachusetts

Music Education

Alper, Herbert: New England Conservatory of Music, Boston, Massachusetts
 Choate, Robert: Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts
 D'Andrea, Frank: State University College, Fredonia, New York
 Gordon, Edwin: University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
 Kyme, George: University of California, Berkeley, California
 Morgan, Sister Josephine: Manhattanville College, Purchase, New York
 Nowak, Lionel: Bennington College, Bennington, Vermont⁸³

Contemporary Education and Curriculum

Abt, Harry: Nanuet Public Schools, Nanuet, New York
 Bregman, Judith: Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, New York
 Dirr, Peter: Channel 13 TV, New York, New York
 Dishart, Martin: Washington, D.C.
 Francis, Dolores: Washington Public Schools, Washington, D.C.
 Huebner, Dwayne: Columbia University, New York, New York
 Joyce, Bruce: Columbia University, New York, New York
 McCormack, Sister Elizabeth: Manhattanville College, Purchase, New York

82. Thomas, *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Final Report*, 31.

83. Nowak was primarily a composer, but Ronald Thomas listed him under "Music Education;" *ibid.*

Appendix B MMCP Participating Schools⁸⁴

MMCP Experimental Stations

Chicago Board of Education, Chicago, Illinois
 Cresskill High School, Cresskill, New Jersey
 Chatsworth Avenue School, Larchmont, New York
 Hunter College High School, New York, New York
 Lincoln High School, Yonkers, New York
 Maria Regina High School, Hartsdale, New York
 North Rockland Central School District, Stony Point, New York
 Parkway Oaks Junior High School, Farmingdale, Long Island, New York
 State University of New York, Potsdam, New York
 Wagner College, Staten Island, New York

MMCP Field Centers

Tucson Public Schools, Tucson, Arizona
 West Hartford Public Schools, West Hartford, Connecticut
 Jefferson County Public Schools, Lakewood, Colorado
 Broward County Public Schools, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
 Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa
 Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Oregon
 University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
 Portland Public Schools, Portland, Oregon
 Duchesne Academy, Houston, Texas
 San Angelo Independent School District, San Angelo, Texas
 Kent Public Schools, Kent, Washington
 Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, Washington
 Shoreline District No. 412 Schools, Seattle, Washington

84. Thomas, "A Proposal Submitted by the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program," [1969].

The Role of MENC: The National Association for Music Education in Early Childhood Music Education 1980–2007¹

Corin Overland and Alison Reynolds
Temple University

During the last one hundred years, MENC: The National Association for Music Education has provided immeasurable support for American music educators. Although a central tenet of MENC's philosophy has been to promote music education as key in the cognitive development of the very young, few researchers have documented its role in early childhood music education. Alvarez, in her doctoral dissertation, *Preschool Education and Research on the Musical Development of Preschool Children: 1900 to 1980*, provides comprehensive details of early childhood music education during that time period—including the role of MENC. Because the last twenty-five years remain largely unexamined, the purpose of this research was to examine the role MENC has taken in developing early childhood music education in the United States between 1980 and 2007.

Examining the last quarter century has shown that MENC has supported early childhood music learning and teaching in at least two ways: (1) advocating for music education in early childhood, and (2) providing structural support through facilitating research, publication, and practice. In this paper, we will provide a brief background of the socio-political circumstances that encouraged MENC to adopt specific positions regarding music education for the very young, and describe MENC's activity associated with both categories.

Music and Preschool Education Since World War II

During the 20th century, social and economic changes enacted by the federal government significantly affected the nature and quality of music education for preschoolers. As the latter part of the century saw increased enrollment in preschool programs, accompanied by decreased federal funding for these services, MENC began to adopt official positions regarding early childhood music education.

The increase in dual-worker families in the years following World War II meant that more childcare was needed. In order to assist children of these families, Congress proposed and enacted several financial initiatives between 1950 and 1980. One of the most significant, the Economic Opportunity Act

1. Major portions of this article were first given as a paper at the 2007 MENC Centennial History Symposium in Keokuk, Iowa.