Taylor, F. J. (1981). *The development and evaluation of a Black music course of study designed for junior high students.* Doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Thomas, R., Jr. (1980). *A survey of jazz education courses in colleges and universities in the state of Mississippi for the preparation of music educators.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi.

Thomas, S. L. (1989). *An instructional sequence in music education using vocal and instrumental music of five world cultures.* Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University.

Trinka, J. L. (1987). *The performance style of American folksongs on school music series and non-school music series recordings: A comparative analysis of selected factors.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

Volk, T. M. (1993a) . The history and development of multicultural music education, as evidenced in the *Music Educators Journal*, 1967–1992. *Journal of Research in Music Education 41* (2), 137–155.

Volk, T. M. (1993b). *A history of multicultural music education in the public schools of the United States, 1900–1990.* Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University.

Whitworth, L. E. (1977). *Determination of attitude change toward high school general music resulting from instruction in curricular units incorporating cultural and historical contributions of Blacks.* Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University.

Winn, J. D. (1990). *The use of African-American music as the core of general music instruction for fifth grade African-American students living in the inner city of Grand Rapids, Michigan.* Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan.

Woodard, A. (1978). *The effect of Afro-American music upon the performance and attitudes of Black educationally disadvantaged high school students.* Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Yudkin, J. J. (1990). *An investigation and analysis of world music education in California's public schools, K–6.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Milagros Agostini Quesada is an assistant professor of music at Kent State University, Tuscarawas Campus. Her areas of special interest include elementary music, world musics, and secondary general music.

Terese M. Volk is an instrumental music educator in the Buffalo Public Schools. Her areas of special interest include historical-biographical studies, instrumental music, world musics, and string education.

Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, No. 131 pp. 67–86

Sex and Geographic Representation in Two Music Education History Books

Jere T. Humphreys
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine sex and geographic representation in two well known books on the history of American music education—*History of Public School Music in the United States* by Edward Bailey Birge (1937/1966) and *A History of American Music Education* by Michael L. Mark and Charles L. Gary (1992). The number of different individuals mentioned, total number of mentions, and number of lines devoted to each individual were categorized by sex and geographical region. Photographic evidence was examined in a like manner. The authors of both books, published 55 years apart, provided statistically significant inequitable representation with regard to sex and region of the country. On the other hand, the two books are remarkably similar with regard to the variables examined. The researcher posits the "top-down" approach to historiography as the main reason for the inequitable representations.

The Study

Music education history books, especially those that consist of surveys of music education history, serve as texts and reference sources in many graduate music education programs throughout the country. Undergraduates, practicing music teachers, professors, organizational leaders, and others also utilize these books. Arguably, music education history books are the most important readily accessible source of historical information for the music education profession. Therefore, these books should represent the history of the profession in the most accurate ways possible.

In their quest for accuracy, most contemporary historians follow the lead of the 19th-century German scholar Leopold von Ranke, whose approach to historical writing has been summarized as "exactly as it happened," or "the past as it actually was" (Powell, 1990, pp. xiv–xv). Unfortunately, describing and interpreting what really happened is easier said than done. Historians cannot and should not report everything that happened. In fact, material selection is probably the most significant problem related to accuracy, a concept called internal criticism in historical research.[1]

As do practitioners in other fields of intellectual inquiry, historians tend to follow certain fashions. For example, most historians report on events and people that they and their colleagues deem most important, and most rely primarily upon the written word for source material. These two fashions have led historians to study political and military history to the exclusion of almost all other types of history—kings, queens, and political leaders to the exclusion of common people and professional music education organizations, exemplary music programs, and their leaders to the exclusion of more typical music programs and teachers. Although time-honored, "top-down" historiography

results in unbalanced accounts; the cumulative effects of this approach have resulted in inaccurate, inequitable views of the past.[2]

The purpose of the present study was to examine the proportionate coverage of men and women (sex)[3] and of individuals from six American regions (geographic) in two well known books on the history of music education (Birge, 1937/1966; Mark & Gary, 1992). Preliminary evidence from another study (Humphreys & Schmidt, 1996) suggests that female teachers far outnumbered male teachers in the United States during the early decades of the twentieth century, and that females predominated numerically in the Music Educators National Conference (MENC).[4] Furthermore, results of this study indicate that certain regions of the country provided disproportionate numbers of MENC members.

In addition to their function as reference works, the two books examined in the present study can be considered curricular material, because both were designed to serve as textbooks for graduate music education classes. According to Koza (1994), research on the frequency and manner of female representation in curricular materials has been conducted for many years. She cites a major review of such research, which includes a summary of research findings on the effects of sex-equitable materials on students. The authors of this review concluded that exposure to such materials improves motivation for learning, "gender-balanced knowledge," sex-role knowledge and imitation of the same, and more "flexible attitudes" (Scott & Schau, 1985). Koza summarizes several representative studies outside of music, and concludes that "most researchers indicated that the textbooks examined were in some respect sex-biased" (p. 151). She also notes that a recent review of literature found less than desirable levels of change in sex-stereotyping in school textbooks (American Association of University Women, 1992).

In her review of studies of past and contemporary music-related sex stereotypes, Koza (1994) discusses researchers' findings of biases in attitudes and practices. These stereotypes include effeminate portrayals of men who participate in music (Koza, 1988; Tick, 1983), the relegation of women to amateur music activities (Eaklor, 1982; Koza, 1988; Tick, 1983), gender associations of various musical instruments (Abeles & Porter, 1978; Delzell & Leppla, 1990; Griswold & Chroback, 1981; Koza, 1988; Tick, 1983), and sex-based musical roles (i.e., singing for women, composing, instrumental performance, conducting, and scholarly study for men) (Koza, 1988; Riegel, 1970; Tick, 1983). Koza (1994) herself found much smaller percentages of females pictured in three elementary music series published in 1988 than the 50% that she deemed equitable.

Very little research has been conducted on geographical representation in music education materials. Koza (1994) examined sex equity by geographical region of the pictured individuals. She found more males than females from every continent represented, but almost 61% of the illustrations were "unclear" with regard to geographical region.

The present study was designed to examine only one of four "manifestations" of sex bias, exclusion, or infrequent inclusion, as defined in

Schmitz's (1975) taxonomy.[5] In addition, the study was designed to examine geographical representation. To analyze the data further, the primary time periods during which individuals worked were tabulated. The number of different individuals mentioned, total number of mentions, and number of lines devoted to each individual were categorized by sex and geographical region. Photographic evidence was examined in a like manner.

Method

The two books examined were *History of Public School Music in the United States* by Edward Bailey Birge (1937/1966) and *A History of American Music Education* by Michael L. Mark and Charles L. Gary (1992). The Birge book was chosen because it was the first comprehensive work on the history of American music education. Its coverage begins with early Colonial America and extends approximately to 1936, although coverage after 1928 is sketchy. The Mark and Gary book (1992) was examined because it is the most recent book on the history of American music education. It begins with three brief chapters on music education in the Middle East and Europe prior to American colonization. Coverage extends to approximately 1991.[6]

Each person mentioned by name was categorized by sex, geographical region, and time period.[7] Sex was determined from the "given" names or from references to the individuals in the form of pronouns made by the authors themselves. Geographical regions were defined as the six current MENC divisions, plus "foreign."[8] Although the time period categories stretched from the pre-1600s to the 1900s, only the 1800s and 1900s were included in the time period analyses because of cell size limitations. Numerous other historical documents were consulted for information about individuals whose sex, primary geographical region, or time period could not be determined from the two books.

Frequency of mention was defined as the number of times an individual was mentioned by name (or pronoun) anywhere in the texts of the books. Line counts consisted of the number of lines of text devoted to each individual.[9] To account for unequal line lengths between the two books, I totaled the alphabetic and numeric characters in the first 10 lines of text from 10 pages selected at random from each book. The mean number of characters per line (Birge, 39.27; Mark & Gary, 53.97) was significantly different between the books ($t = -11.533$, $df = 198$, $p < .0001$). Therefore, each line count integer from the Mark and Gary book was multiplied by a conversion factor to facilitate direct comparisons between books.[10]

Finally, pictures in the Birge book were examined. (The Mark and Gary book contains no pictures of individuals.) Each individual pictured, whether in individual or group photographs, was tabulated as one representation.

Results

A total of 361 different music educators were mentioned by Birge and 414 by Mark and Gary, for a total of 775 individuals; however, 156 of these

individuals were mentioned in both books, leaving a total of 619 different individuals mentioned in the two books.

One hundred sixteen women were mentioned by Birge, 32% of his total, and 95 women were mentioned by Mark and Gary, 23% of their total. These differences are statistically significant for each book. However, the differences in percentages of women (and men) mentioned between the two books is not statistically significant (Table 1).

Table 1
Numbers and Percentages of Individual Males and Females Mentioned Within and Between Books (n = 775)

	Sex		
Book	*Males*	*Females*	$\chi^2(df = 1)$
Birge	245	116	47.54*
	68%	32%	
Mark & Gary	319	95	121.20*
	77%	23%	
χ^2(df = 1)	.56	.56	

*p < .001. Row and column chi-squares were computed on frequency differences within books and percentage differences between books, respectively.

The total number of mentions by sex in each book favor men even more overwhelmingly. Only 19% and 16% of the total mentions are of women in the Birge and Mark and Gary books, respectively. As with the number of individual males and females mentioned, these differences are statistically significant within each book, but the percentage differences between books are not significant (Table 2).

Table 2
Total Numbers and Percentages of Male and Female Mentions Within and Between Books (n = 1,856)

	Sex		
Book	*Males*	*Females*	$\chi^2(df = 1)$
Birge	780	179	376.64*
	81%	19%	
Mark & Gary	750	147	405.36*
	84%	16%	
χ^2(df = 1)	.06	.06	

*p < .001. Row and column chi-squares were computed on frequency differences within books and percentage differences between books, respectively.

Birge mentioned 15 individuals 10 or more times; Mark and Gary mentioned 10 individuals 10 or more times. Lowell Mason and Will Earhart rank first and second, respectively, in each book. Birge himself is the only person on the Mark and Gary "top 10" list who is not on the Birge list, probably

because of Birge's personal modesty. Nine individuals appear on both lists, including the only woman on either list: Frances E. Clark. Altogether, 16 different individuals are mentioned 10 or more times (Table 3).

Table 3
Individuals with Ten or More Mentions in Either Book (n = 16)

Birge			*Mark & Gary*		
Individual	*Mentions*	*Rank*	*Individual*	*Mentions*	*Rank*
Lowell Mason[a]	32	1	Lowell Mason[a]	51	1
Will Earhart[a]	21	2	Will Earhart[a]	19	2
Hollis Dann	20	4	Peter Dykema[a]	18	3
Peter Dykema[a]	20	4	Frances Clark[a]	15	4
Osbourne McConathy[a]	20	4	Thaddeus Giddings[a]	14	5
Philip Hayden[a]	19	6	Edward Birge	13	6.5
Joseph Maddy	17	7.5	Philip Hayden[a]	13	6.5
Luther Mason	17	7.5	Hosea Holt[a]	12	8
Thaddeus Giddings[a]	15	9	Karl Gehrkens[a]	10	9.5
Ralph Baldwin	12	10.5	Osbourne McConathy[a]	10	9.5
Frances Clark[a]	12	10.5	———		
Karl Gehrkens[a]	11	12.5	———		
Hosea Holt[a]	11	12.5	———		
Richard Grant	10	14.5	———		
W. Otto Miesner	10	14.5	———		

[a]Individuals mentioned 10 or more times in both books (n = 9).

Birge devoted 60 or more lines to 17 individuals; Mark and Gary devoted 60 or more (converted) lines to 22 individuals. Nine individuals appear on both lists, leaving 30 different individuals with 60 or more lines devoted to them. All 30 of these were men except for Frances E. Clark, to whom Mark and Gary devoted more than 60 lines (Table 4). Only five individuals, all men, received 10 or more mentions and 60 or more lines in both books: Lowell Mason, Will Earhart, Peter Dykema, Philip Hayden, and Hosea Holt.

Table 4
Individuals with 60 or More Lines in Either Book (n = 30)

Birge			*Mark & Gary*		
Individual	*Lines*	*Rank*	*Individual*	*Lines*[a]	*Rank*
Lowell Mason[b]	318	1	Lowell Mason[b]	840	1
Luther Mason[b]	244	2	Peter Dykema[b]	249	2
Philip Hayden[b]	232	3	Hosea Holt[b]	217	3
Peter Dykema[b]	186	4	Philip Hayden[b]	203	4
Joseph Maddy[b]	166	5	William Billings	197	5.5
Will Earhart[b]	132	6	Luther Mason[b]	197	5.5
Benjamin Jepson[b]	130	7	(Rev.) John Tufts	143	7
W. S. B. Mathews	123	8	Joseph Maddy[b]	100	8
Stearic Weaver	109	9	Elam Ives	92	9
Thomas Tapper[b]	101	10	Benjamin Jepson[b]	85	10
C. H. Congdon	92	11	Osbourne McConathy	82	11
Hosea Holt[b]	91	12	Will Earhart[b]	80	13
Henry Perkins	85	13	Karl Gehrkens	80	13
William Tomlins	81	14	Carl Orff	80	13
Charles Miller	76	15	Timothy Mason	76	15
Frederick Ripley	66	16	George Webb	74	16
J. M. Thompson	61	17	Thomas Tapper[b]	71	17
_____			Frances Clark	69	18
_____			Emile Jacques-Dalcroze	67	19
_____			Thaddeus Giddings	63	20
_____			Edward Birge	60	21.5
_____			Paul Weaver	60	21.5

[a]Rounded to the nearest integer.
[b]Individuals with 60 or more lines in both books (n = 9).

The mean number of lines devoted to individual males in each book is significantly larger than the mean number of lines devoted to individual females (Table 5) (SS = 30318.96, df = 1, F = 16.43, $p < .0001$). However, there is no significant difference between books or for the interaction between sex and books ($p > .05$).

Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for Number of Lines by Sex in Each Book

Book	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
Birge	17.041	2.926	12.505
	(41.140)	(6.532)	(34.703)
Mark & Gary	19.003	4.846	15.755
	(56.017)	(8.490)	(49.679)
Total	18.151	3.790	14.241
	(50.068)	(7.520)	(43.355)

The total number of lines devoted to men is also significantly larger than the total number of lines devoted to women in each book. The percentage of lines devoted to women (and men) is identical in each book (Table 6).

Table 6
Numbers and Percentages of Total Lines by Sex in Each Book (n = 11,036)

Book	*Males*	*Females*	$\chi^2(df = 1)$
Birge	4190	324	3311.02*
	93%	7%	
Mark & Gary	6062	460	4811.78*
	93%	7%	
χ^2(df = 1)	.00	.00	

*$p < .001$. Row and column chi-squares were computed on frequency differences within books and percentage differences between books, respectively.

Photographs in the Birge book mirror the coverage disparities between sexes found in the written texts. Of the 86 different individuals pictured, 65 were men (76%) and 21 were women (24%), a statistically significant difference (χ^2 = 22.52, df = 1, $p < .001$). Ten of the 86 individuals are pictured twice. The total frequency count (n = 96) consists of 74 men (77%) and 22 women (23%), a statistically significant difference (χ^2 = 28.16, df = 1, $p < .001$).

The geographical area could not be determined conclusively for 10 individuals, leaving 765 individuals in the geographical analyses. More individuals were from the Eastern Division (41%) than from any other division, followed by the North Central Division (24%), Southwest Division (9%), Southern Division (6%), foreign countries (4%), Western Division (3%), and Northwest Division (2%). The differences are statistically significant between regions in each book and for both books combined (Table 7). The correlation of geographical ranks between books is not significant (rho = .31, n = 7, $p > .05$) because of Mark and Gary's larger inclusion of foreigners, especially in their first three chapters.

Table 7
Numbers and Percentages of Individuals Mentioned by Geographical Region in Each Book (n = 765)

	Total		*Birge*		*Mark & Gary*	
Region	*#*	*Rank*	*#*	*Rank*	*#*	*Rank*
Eastern	312	1	160	1	152	2
	41%		45%		37%	
North Central	261	2	105	2	156	1
	34%		30%		38%	
Southwest	66	3	30	3	36	3
	9%		8%		9%	
Southern	50	4	26	4	24	5
	7%		7%		6%	
Foreign	32	5	7	7	25	4
	4%		2%		6%	
Western	25	6	13	6	12	6
	3%		4%		3%	
Northwest	19	7	14	5	5	7
	2%		4%		1%	
χ^2(df = 6)	830.14*		406.13*		445.48*	

*p < .001. Column chi-squares were computed on percentage differences between regions.

The total number of mentions for the 765 individuals whose geographical areas could be identified is 1,847. Almost 49% and just over 1% of mentions are of individuals from the Eastern and Northwest divisions, respectively. The differences are statistically significant between regions in each book and for both books combined (Table 8). In this case, the correlation of geographical ranks between books is significant (rho = .813, n = 7, p < .05).

There is no significant difference in the mean number of lines per mention between geographical regions despite large disparities in the mean number of lines per individual in different regions, ranging from 20.15 lines in the Eastern Division to 1.84 in the Northwest Division. However, the difference nears significance for both books combined (SS = 23746.55, df = 6, F = 2.094, p < .0518). Large cell size differences probably contributed to the finding of nonsignificance. There is no significant interaction between books and geographical regions (p > .05). In addition, all five individuals who were mentioned 10 or more times and received 60 or more lines of coverage in both books worked primarily in the Eastern or North Central divisions.

Table 8
Total Numbers and Percentages of Individual Mentions by Geographical Region and Book (n = 1,847)

	Total		*Birge*		*Mark & Gary*	
Region	*#*	*Rank*	*#*	*Rank*	*#*	*Rank*
Eastern	899	1	497	1	402	1
	49%		52%		45%	
North Central	642	2	306	2	336	2
	35%		32%		38%	
Southwest	121	3	65	3	56	3
	7%		7%		6%	
Southern	78	4	42	4	36	4
	4%		4%		4%	
Foreign	43	5	9	7	34	5
	2%		1%		4%	
Western	41	6	18	5	23	6
	2%		2%		3%	
Northwest	23	7	16	6	7	7
	1%		2%		1%	
χ^2(df = 6)	2,872.00*		1,597.88*		1,303.65*	

*p < .001. Column chi-squares were computed on percentage differences between regions.

The 86 different individuals who appear in Birge's photographs represent the following geographical regions: Eastern Division (n = 32, 37%), North Central Division (n = 28, 33%), Southwest Division (n = 9, 10%), Southern Division (n = 8, 9%), Northwest Division (n = 5, 6%), Western Division (n = 4, 5%), and foreign (n = 0, 0%). These frequency differences are statistically significant (χ^2 = 76.20, df = 6, p < .001). The total frequencies (n = 96) occur in the same geographical order and are also significantly different (χ^2 = 96.38, df = 6, p < .001). The division order represented by Birge's pictures is identical to his division order based on frequency of individuals mentioned (Table 7) and statistically similar to his division order based on total frequency of mentions (Table 8) (rho = .938, n = 7, p < .01).

The frequency counts for each chronological period by book and sex are presented in Table 9. One individual's time period could not be determined, leaving a total of 774 individuals in this analysis.

Table 9
Frequency Distribution by Chronological Period, Book, and Sex ($n = 774$)

	Book						
	Birge			*Mark & Gary*			
Period	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Total*
pre-1600s	0	0	0	6	0	6	6
1600s	3	0	3	4	0	4	7
1700s	15	0	15	26	0	26	41
17/1800s	4	0	4	1	0	1	5
1800s	83	5	88	103	8	111	199
18/1900s	21	6	27	25	7	32	59
1900s	118	105	223	154	80	234	457
Total	244	116	360	319	95	414	774

Of the 774 individuals, 666 (86%) worked primarily during the 1800s ($n = 199$) or 1900s ($n = 457$). Only 5 women who worked primarily in the 1800s were mentioned by Birge, and only 8 were mentioned by Mark and Gary. Only 6% of the 1800s individuals mentioned by Birge were women, whereas the percentage of females mentioned increased to 47% in the 1900s. Seven percent of the 1800s individuals mentioned by Mark and Gary were women; that percentage increased to only 34% in the 1900s. The number of male and female mentions is significantly different for each century in each book. However, the percentage of women of the total of men and women mentioned in each century is not significantly different between books (Table 10).

Table 10
Numbers of Females and Percentages of Females of the Total by Chronological Period (1800s, 1900s) ($n = 198$)

Book	*1800s*	*1900s*	$\chi^2(df = 1)$
Birge	5	105	90.90*
	6%	47%	
Mark & Gary	8	80	59.90*
	7%	34%	
$\chi^2(df = 1)$	.08	2.08	

*$p < .001$. Row and column chi-squares were computed on frequency differences within books and percentage differences between books, respectively.

Table 11
Total Numbers of Females and Percentages of Females of the Total by Chronological Period (1800s, 1900s) ($n = 277$)

Book	*1800s*	*1900s*	$\chi^2(df = 1)$
Birge	8	149	126.62*
	3%	30%	
Mark & Gary	15	105	67.50*
	6%	29%	
$\chi^2(df = 1)$	1.0	.02	

*$p < .001$. Row and column chi-squares were computed on frequency differences within books and percentage differences between books, respectively.

Table 12
Numbers and Percentages of Individuals Mentioned by Geographical Region and Century (1800s, 1900s) in Each Book ($n = 650$)

	1800s		*1900s*		
Region	*Birge*	*Mark & Gary*	*Birge*	*Mark & Gary*	$\chi^2(df=1)$
Eastern	56	57	71	55	
	44%	51%	56%	49%	.52
North Central	17	37	76	106	
	18%	26%	82%	74%	1.45
Southwest	3	2	27	34	
	10%	6%	90%	94%	.08
Southern	3	7	21	15	
	12%	32%	88%	68%	2.56
Western	0	0	13	12	
	0%	0%	100%	100%	.00
Northwest	0	0	14	5	
	0%	0%	100%	100%	.00
Foreign	7	6	0	6	
	100%	50%	0%	50%	50.00*
$\chi^2(df = 6)$	73.60*	125.17*	104.03*	44.09*	

*$p < .001$. Row chi-squares were computed on the percentages between books for the 1900s only; the figures would be identical for the 1800s. Column chi-squares were computed on percentage differences between regions.

The distribution of the total frequency of mentions of women by century in each book is similar to that of the numbers and percentages of different individuals mentioned. Both books are significantly different between centu-

ries in favor of the 1900s, but neither century is significantly different between books in the total frequency of mention of females (Table 11). The means and total numbers of lines by sex and century were not compared statistically because of cell size differences and lack of homogeneity of variance between cells.

The numbers of individuals mentioned in each book in both the 1800s and 1900s are significantly different between geographical regions. There are no significant differences in the percentages of total numbers of individuals mentioned from the 1800s or 1900s between books for any MENC division. There is a significant difference in favor of the Mark and Gary book in the percentage of foreigners mentioned from the 1900s (Table 12).

Similar results were found for the total numbers of mentions of individuals in the 1800s and 1900s. The total numbers of mentions in both books in both the 1800s and 1900s are significantly different between geographical regions. There are no significant differences in the percentage of total numbers of mentions for either century between books for any MENC division. There is a significant difference in favor of the Mark and Gary book in the percentage of mentions of foreigners from the 1900s (Table 13).

Table 13
Total Numbers and Percentages of Mentions by Geographical Region and Century (1800s, 1900s) in Each Book (n = 1,398)

	1800s		*1900s*		
Region	*Birge*	*Mark & Gary*	*Birge*	*Mark & Gary*	$\chi^2(df=1)$
Eastern	182	160	168	117	
	52%	58%	48%	42%	.40
North Central	43	70	197	179	
	18%	28%	82%	72%	.64
Southwest	8	2	57	55	
	12%	4%	88%	96%	.40
Southern	5	8	35	25	
	13%	24%	87%	76%	.74
Western	0	0	18	23	
	0%	0%	100%	100%	.00
Northwest	0	0	17	7	
	0%	0%	100%	100%	.00
Foreign	9	7	0	6	
	100%	54%	0%	46%	46.00*
$\chi^2(df = 6)$	748.86*	151.01*	152.34*	243.07*	

*$p < .001$. Row chi-squares were computed on the percentages between books for the 1900s only; the figures would be identical for the 1800s. Column chi-squares were computed on percentage differences between regions.

Discussion

Forty-four (64%) of the 69 people who founded the MENC in 1907 were women and 25 (36%) were men (Mark & Gary, 1992), a statistically significant difference in favor of women ($\chi^2 = 5.24$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$). Furthermore, in a survey conducted in 1990, shortly before the Mark and Gary book was published, 53% of MENC members reported themselves to be women and 44% men (3% failed to respond to that question) (Gail Crum, personal communication, December 1, 1994). That difference is not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = .83$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$). Interestingly, one reviewer of the Mark and Gary book praised the authors' discussion of women in leadership roles (Livingston, 1993), but in fact, sex equity, as measured in this study, did not improve within statistical limits in the second book, which was published some 55 years later. Given the fact that the authors of both books significantly increased their coverage of women in the 1900s and the fact that the second book covers much more of the 1900s, one would expect to find statistically significant differences between the books.

There was also unequal geographical representation at the founding meeting of MENC in 1907. Of the 69 members, 45 (65%) were from what is now the North Central Division, followed by the Southwestern Division (n = 17, 25%), Eastern Division (n = 6, 9%), and Southern Division (n = 1, 1%). There were no representatives from the Northwest or Western divisions, and no foreigners. The regional difference is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 135.44$, $df = 5$, $p < .001$).

To further examine the equity of regional coverage, the number of lines of text in each book devoted to individuals from each MENC division was computed as a percentage of the national total of membership. Next, the percentage of the national population of each region was computed from United States census data for each of the following years: 1790 (the first official national census), 1840, 1890, 1940 (Bogue, 1985) and 1990 (Mattson, 1992). For comparisons with the Birge book, the mean of the first four census percentages was compared to the mean percentage of Birge's total line count for each MENC division. Chi-square analysis reveals that Birge significantly overrepresented the North Central Division and significantly underrepresented the Southern Division (Table 14). For the Mark and Gary book, a mean of all five census percentages (including 1990) was computed for each division. These authors significantly overrepresented the Eastern Division, and, as did Birge, they significantly underrepresented the Southern Division (Table 14). One reviewer of the Mark and Gary book complimented the authors for their expanded regional coverage, but then noted the need for more of the same (Scholten, 1993). Another reviewer was more critical of the regional inequities (Lee, 1992). The present study suggests that the Mark and Gary book does not provide more equitable regional coverage than the Birge book, at least as measured by the variables examined here. A more direct assessment of regional coverage, one based on actual topics rather than on

individuals mentioned, frequency of mention, and the like, might yield different results.

Table 14
Mean Divisional Percentages of U.S. Population and Divisional Percentages of National Total of Lines of Text

	Book					
	Birge			*Mark & Gary*		
Division	*Population*[a] %	*Lines* %	χ^2	*Population*[b] %	*Lines* %	χ^2
Eastern	40.50	56.89	2.76	36.97	61.18	5.98*
Southern	30.54	1.21	27.06***	29.00	3.93	19.06***
North Central	17.48	37.09	7.06**	18.04	28.81	2.48
Southwest	8.06	3.81	1.52	9.38	4.12	2.04
Western	2.23	.63	—	4.79	.34	—
Northwest	1.20	.38	—	1.80	1.58	—
Total[c]	100.01	100.01		99.98	99.96	

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$ (df = 1).
[a]Mean percentages of total United States population in 1790, 1840, 1890, and 1940.
[b]Mean percentages of total United States population in 1790, 1840, 1890, 1940, and 1990.
[c]Totals do not equal 100 because of rounding.

Conclusions

Is Koza's (1994) criterion of 50% a valid one for sex-equity representation? In the case of elementary school textbooks, probably so. In the case of history books—even those frequently used as textbooks—the answer is less clear. After all, pictures in an elementary music series do not necessarily have to represent reality, such as the reality that there are and always have been more male than female conductors. By contrast, historians must try to represent what actually happened. Nevertheless, the population and MENC data presented in this study suggest that two leading music education history books provide inequitable sex and regional representations of historical music education activities in the United States.

One problem seems to have contributed heavily to these inequities. Men have predominated in leadership roles at the national level in music education in this country, especially prior to the twentieth century. Moreover, a disproportionate number of leaders lived in certain regions of the country, and, as mentioned earlier, there have been wide disparities in MENC membership relative to regional populations throughout much of the organization's history (Humphreys & Schmidt, 1996). Nevertheless, the history of music education in the United States is much more than the history of MENC and its members. Therefore, the problem is the "top-down" approach to historiography employed by the authors of both books, an approach that has been used by most

historians throughout the history of historiography (Sharpe, 1991). Organizations and professional leaders tend to leave voluminous, readily accessible written records, whereas more ordinary people, including most music teachers, do not. Therefore, most historiography—music education and otherwise—is written about leading individuals, institutions, and organizations.

In the 19th century, English historian John Richard Green's extremely popular history of common people (Green, 1874) was the first successful work of its type (Brundage, 1994). More recently, several historians have criticized the elitist approach and have recommended as an alternative an approach called "history from below," or histories of common people and their activities (Burke, 1991; Sharpe, 1991). In fact, some historians consider "history from below" as more than an alternative to traditional approaches: "Once dismissed as trivial, the history of everyday life is now viewed by some historians as the only real history, the centre to which everything else must be related" (Burke, 1991, p. 11).

In music education, one scholar has recommended a "post hole" technique, through which representative samples of rank-and-file music teachers and students would be studied (Lee, 1988). Clearly, the top-down approach to history contributed to the inequitable representation of women and geographical regions in these two books.

The top-down problem is compounded by the fact that authors generally rely heavily on secondary sources; that is, the historical writings of other researchers. Clearly, most music education historians have employed the top-down approach. Birge, an organizational leader himself, apparently drew much of his material from his own experiences. Mark and Gary did likewise, but they also utilized many secondary writings. For example, historians have written a great deal about MENC activities, but far less about certain other facets of music education. The present study corroborates the findings of Humphreys, Bess, and Bergee (in press), who demonstrated that the North Central and Eastern divisions have dominated in the production of doctoral dissertations on the history of music education. Excluding the "foreign" category, the division rank order found in that study is identical to the divisional rank order of mentions in the two history books combined. Not only were most of the authors of these dissertations students at universities in the two divisions overrepresented in the two books examined, most of them employed a top-down approach to historiography. In addition, a statistically significant majority of them were men ($p < .05$). Similarly, Humphreys and Stauffer (1996) found that institutional affiliation for editorial committee members of the *Journal of Research in Music Education* (JRME) during its first four decades was led by the North Central Division, with relatively little representation from the Western and Northwest divisions. Moreover, most committee members were men. Ironically, these studies themselves (Humphreys, Bess, & Bergee, in press; Humphreys & Stauffer, 1996) represent a top-down approach to history, dissertation authors and JRME editorial committee members not being representative of the music education profession at large.

The top-down/inequity problem is further compounded by the striking similarities between the two books examined in this study. For example, the between-book correlation between the number of lines devoted to the 156 individuals mentioned in both books is quite high (r = .793), and the rank correlation between the frequency of mention of persons in both books is highly significant (corrected for ties $rho = .5997, n = 156, p < .0001$). The fact that there are no significant differences between books in the numbers and total frequencies of individual males or females in the 1800s and 1900s in any MENC division reinforces the finding of a high degree of similarity between the two books.

Only two types of equity were examined in this study, but even a cursory examination of the research literature on the history of music education suggests a paucity of research on choral music education, general music education, college music education, women in music education, racial and ethnic issues in music education, and especially informal modes of music education, to name just a few topics. The extant historical literature on music education could be balanced by accounts of these topics, and by studies that focus on typical music teachers and students.

The availability of source material tends to dictate the selection of historical topics. However, reliance upon written documentary sources about and by leading people, institutions, and organizations involves "an implicit conservative bias in favor of the existing political and social order" (Powell, 1990, p. xvii). To add balance to the extant literature, music education historians should strive to identify new sources of evidence that relate to more typical people. Perhaps the most promising of these sources might be diaries and memoirs of the deceased, and oral interviews with the living. In addition, quantitative techniques could be employed to analyze certain types of data, such as those examined in the present study. In the MENC demographic study mentioned earlier (Humphreys & Schmidt, 1996), quantitative techniques were utilized to examine one activity of a large group of people about whom little specific evidence remains, but "whose behavior is included in numerical sources" (Graff & Monaco, 1980, p. 19). To a very large extent, the shortcomings identified in these two history books are attributable to the lack of a sufficient quantity of original research on a wide variety of topics and from a broad range of perspectives. In other words, the burden to improve music education historiography lies with all scholars in the field.

Nevertheless, perfect historical coverage is an unattainable goal. Despite the fact that the approaches taken by these authors were too similar to each other and to traditional, elitist modes of historiography, the books continue to serve the profession well. One can hope for much more research of different types in the future, including additional books. In the best of all worlds, each new historical study will be written from a fresh perspective, and some will deal with the difficult-to-research concerns of ordinary people (Sharpe, 1991). In the words of Will Durant:

> Civilization is a stream with banks. The stream is sometimes filled with blood from people killing, stealing, shouting, and doing things historians usually record, while on the banks, unnoticed, people build homes, make love, raise children, sing songs, and write poetry. The story of civilization is the story of what happened on the banks. (Hicks, 1963, p. 92)

Notes

[1]In addition to material selection, internal criticism encompasses the literal accuracy of verbal testimony and artifacts, including written documents. Historians must also wrestle with issues of external criticism, or the authenticity of documents and other artifacts.

[2]So ingrained is the "top-down" approach to historiography that those who take other tacks are labeled "revisionists." Musicologists, under whom music education historians receive much of their historical training, are among the most ardent advocates and practitioners of the top-down approach.

[3]Although "sex" and "gender" are often used interchangeably in the music education research literature, the two terms are not synonymous. "Sex" refers to "biologically determined" characteristics, such as whether a person is a man or a woman. "Gender" refers to "our culturally defined, or 'constructed' . . . notions of maleness and femaleness" (Cook, 1989, p. 93). Indeed, the use of "gender" to describe "a person's sex" is deemed colloquial by the editors of some modern dictionaries (e.g., Neufeldt, 1990, p. 247); others give only language-based definitions (e.g., "Any of two or more categories, as masculine, feminine, and neuter, into which words are divided . . .") (Davies, 1976, p. 298).

[4]This organization was first called the Music Supervisors Conference, next the Music Supervisors National Conference, and, from 1932 to the present, the Music Educators National Conference. The acronym MENC is used generically throughout this article.

[5]Schmitz's (1975) other three manifestations of sex bias are subordination, distortion (or stereotyping), and degradation.

[6]An earlier book titled *Music Education in America* (Davison, 1926) was written from a musicological approach. Birge's book was first published in 1928 by the Oliver Ditson Company. The same company republished Birge's "new and augmented edition" in 1937. The MENC has reprinted the 1937 version since 1966. The 1966 reprint of the 1937 version was used in this study. Three books on the history of American music education were published between the two books examined in this study (Keene, 1982; Sunderman, 1971; Tellstrom, 1971).

[7]Individuals mentioned for reasons other than their music education activities were excluded from the analysis (e.g., political leaders and publishers). Likewise, individual mentions in prefaces, footnotes, and bibliographies were excluded.

[8]MENC divisional configurations have changed over time; current configurations were employed in this study. For each individual who worked in more than one division, I determined the division in which his or her most important work was done.

[9]Partial lines were rounded to the nearest larger integer. When the work of two or more individuals was discussed together, the total number of lines was divided by the number of individuals and rounded to the nearest larger integer.

[10]Standard deviations were 6.606 for the Birge sample and 10.901 for the Mark and Gary sample. The conversion factor of 1.3743 was computed by dividing the Mark and Gary mean by the Birge mean.

References

Abeles, H. F., & Porter, S. Y. (1978). The sex-stereotyping of musical instruments. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 26*, 65–75.

American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. (1992). *How schools shortchange girls: A study of major findings on girls and education*. Washington, DC: Author.

Birge, E. B. (1966). *History of public school music in the United States* (rev. ed.). Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference. (Original work published 1937. Bryn Mawr, PA: Oliver Ditson Company).

Bogue, D. J. (1985). *The population of the United States: Historical trends and future projections*. New York: The Free Press.

Brundage, A. (1994). *The people's historian: John Richard Green and the writing of history in Victorian England*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Burke, P. (1991). Overture: The new history, its past and its future. In P. Burke (Ed.) *New perspectives on historical writing* (pp. 1–23). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Cook, S. C. (1989). Women, women's studies, music and musicology: Issues of pedagogy and scholarship. *College Music Symposium: Journal of the College Music Society, 29*, 93–98.

Davies, P. (1976). *The American heritage dictionary of the English language*. New York: Dell Publishing Company.

Davison, A. T. (1926). *Music education in America*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Delzell, J. K., & Leppla, D. (1990, March). *Gender association of musical instruments and preferences of fourth-grade students for selected instruments*. Paper presented at the National Biennial In-Service Conference of the Music Educators National Conference, Washington, DC.

Eaklor, V. L. (1982). Music in American society, 1815–1860: An intellectual history. (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1982). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 43*, 1651–1652A.

Graff, H. J., & Monaco, P. (1980). Introduction. In H. J. Graff & P. Monaco (Eds.). *Quantification and psychology: Toward a "new" history* (pp. 1–70). Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Green, J. R. (1874). *Short history of the English people*. London: Macmillan.

Griswold, P. A., & Chroback, D. A. (1981). Sex-role associations of music instruments and occupations by gender and major. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 29*, 57–62.

Hicks, J. (1963). More history from the Will Durants: Spry old team does it again. *Life, 55*, 89, 92.

Humphreys, J. T., & Schmidt, C. P. (1996). *A demographic analysis of MENC members: 1913–1938*. Unpublished manuscript.

Humphreys, J. T., & Stauffer, S. L. (1996). *A demographic profile of JRME editorial committee members, 1953–1992*. Unpublished manuscript.

Humphreys, J. T., Bess, D. M., & Bergee, M. J. (in press). Doctoral dissertations on the history of music education and music therapy. *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*.

Keene, J. A. (1982). *A history of music education in the United States*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Koza, J. E. (1988). Music and references to music in Godey's Lady's Book, 1830–77, Vols. I, II, III, IV (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1988). *Dissertations Abstracts International, 49*, 1308A.

Koza, J. E. (1994). Females in 1988 middle school music textbooks: An analysis of illustrations. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 42*, 145–171.

Lee, W. R. (1988, August). *Toward the morphological dimensions of research in the history of music education*. Paper presented at the Sesquicentennial Symposium of American Music Education, College Park, MD.

Lee, W. R. (1992). [Review of *A history of American music education*]. *Music Educators Journal, 79*, 60–63.

Livingston, C. (1993). [Review of *A history of American music education*]. *Notes: Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association, 49*, 1085–1087.

Mark, M. L., & Gary, C. L. (1992). *A history of American music education*. New York: Schirmer Books.

Mattson, M. T. (1992). *Atlas of the 1990 census*. New York: Macmillan.

Neufeldt, V. (Ed.). (1990). *Webster's new world dictionary*. New York: Warner Books.

Powell, J. M. (1990). Introduction. In G. G. Iggers & J. M. Powell (Eds.), *Leopold von Ranke and the shaping of the historical discipline* (pp. xiii–xxii). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Riegel, R. (1970). *American women: A story of social change*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.

Schmitz, B. (1975). Sexism in French language textbooks. In R. C. Lafayette (Ed.), *The cultural revolution in foreign language teaching: A guide for building the modern curriculum* (pp. 119–130). Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company.

Scholten, J. W. (1993). [Review of *A history of American music education*]. *The Bulletin of Historical Research in Music Education, 14*, 57–61.

Scott, K. P., & Schau, C. G. (1985). Sex equity and sex bias in instructional materials. In S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving sex equity through education* (pp. 218–232). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sharpe, J. (1991). History from below. In P. Burke (Ed.) *New perspectives on historical writing* (pp. 24–41). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Sunderman, L. F. (1971). *Historical foundations of music education in the United States*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Tellstrom, A. T. (1971). *Music in American education: Past and present*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Tick, J. (1983). *American women composers before 1870*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Research Press.

Jere T. Humphreys is professor of music education at Arizona State University.

Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, No. 131 pp. 87–94

Dissertation Reviews

William L. Berz
Rutgers—The State University of New Jersey
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Henry Edgar Duitman: *Using Hypermedia to Enrich the Learning Experience of College Students in a Music Appreciation Course*

PhD, The Ohio State University, 1993
University Microfilms Order No. 9401248

Abstract*

The primary purpose of this study was to develop and test an instructional strategy that incorporates commercially available, music-related hypermedia programs (CMH) into a college music appreciation course. The study also sought to ascertain the attitudes of the students toward the use of hypermedia in this strategy. A secondary purpose was to compare the musical knowledge and attitudes gained by students who used hypermedia with that gained by students who used traditional listening project resources.

The design was pretest/posttest control group. The independent variable was the type of instructional strategy used in the listening project segment of the course. The dependent variable, a pretest/posttest, was designed to be a comprehensive measure of what was generally learned in the music subcourse by those in the hypermedia group, as well as by those in the traditional group.

Subjects were assigned randomly to the hypermedia (HM) group (n = 32) traditional (TR) group (n = 51).

A test of general musical knowledge was administered at the beginning and end of the semester-long course. All students received the same materials and lectures throughout the course. However, the HM group used one of four CMHs as the only resource for their listening project research paper, whereas the TR group used the listening lab and main library.

Results showed that the HM group made a significant improvement on the test, as did the traditional group. However, the groups' pretest/posttest improvement scores showed no significant difference and no significant differences were found between the groups on any of the attitude survey questions.

It was concluded that college music appreciation students will probably increase their general knowledge about music when using hypermedia as resource material for a listening project. However, it cannot be concluded that students who use hypermedia as the sole resource for a listening project will learn more about music than those who use traditional resources for their research or that students will enjoy the hypermedia experience more. Nevertheless, all qualitative data would seem to indicate an extremely positive effect of the treatment.

**Author's Abstract Adapted*

Review

Hypermedia is receiving considerable attention as an instructional model, partly because of its practical availability. Since the late 1980s, many commercially developed hypermedia applications have been released that are content specific to music education—mostly in the area of music appreciation. The approach is especially interesting for music education, because the model allows for mixed media presentation in a flexible instructional framework.

Duitman's dissertation represents a first effort to study the instructional effectiveness of a commercially developed hypermedia program in music. As