Urban Music Education: A Critical Discourse Analysis

by

Dawn Marie Farmer

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved January 2015 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Sandra Stauffer, Chair
Margaret Schmidt
Theodore Solis
Jill Sullivan
Evan Tobias

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2015

ABSTRACT

In this study, I uncover the coded meanings of "urban" within the music education profession through an exploration and analysis of the discourse present in two prominent music education journals, *Music Educators Journal* (*MEJ*) and *The Journal of Research in Music Education* (*JRME*). Using critical discourse analysis (CDA), I investigate how the term "urban" is used in statements within a twenty-year time span (1991–2010), and how the words "inner-city," "at-risk," "race," and "diversity" are used in similar ways throughout the corpus. An in-depth examination of these five terms across twenty years of two major publications of the profession reveals attitudes and biases within the music education structure, uncovering pejorative themes in the urban music education discourse. The phrase "urban music education" is rarely defined or explained in the corpus examined in this study. Rather, the word "urban" is at times a euphemism. Based on a CDA conducted in this study, I suggest that “urban” is code for poor, minority, and unable to succeed. Relying on the philosophical ideas of Michel Foucault, I uncover ways in which the profession labels urban music programs, students, and teachers and how the “urban music education” discourse privileges the White, suburban, middle class ideal of music education. I call for an evaluation of the perceptions of "success" in the field, and advocate for a paradigm shift, or different methods of knowing, in order to provide a more just teaching and learning space for all music education actors.

Keywords: music education, urban, urban music education, critical discourse analysis, Foucault

DEDICATION

Every experience gives me an opportunity to learn and to grow. I am thankful for every student I have had the pleasure of working with, and I am indebted to every teacher who helped guide me on my own journey. All students deserve amazing teachers, regardless of where they live or go to school, and I thank those teachers who shared their knowledge with me so that I, in turn, could share it with others.

"It is our choices, Harry, that show what we truly are, far more than our abilities."

~ Rowling (1998)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It takes a village to raise a child, and solid network of friends and colleagues to get through the dissertation process. As I have spent the past two years working on the “Book Report,” many awesome people have stood by my side as I encountered hurdles and celebrated milestones. In fear of accidently excluding someone who is scanning this section for their name, please know that if you are reading this as a member of the Book Report Support Staff, I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

I do need to individually thank the members of my committee who have each in their own ways contributed to this document:

Dr. Tobias – Thank you for indirectly introducing me to Foucault. “Oppression Class” changed the way I think about life and society. I appreciate and struggle with that all at once.

Dr. Sullivan – I will always appreciate the talks we have had about women in band research, and I thank you for being an example for many others.

Dr. Solís – One of the most frustrating times of my life was sitting on the floor, experiencing “tension and stress” in the Gamelan room. I never did learn the correct patterns, but those experiences taught me so much more. Thank you.

Dr. Schmidt – Your kindness and warmth is unmatched, and I will always hold a special place in my heart for you, as will Elmo. Thank you for all of your advice, office chats, and teaching experiences. Keep the cauldron, and your heart, full.

Dr. Stauffer – You pushed me into the “gray area,” where I continue to see the gradients of black and white, and still search for balance. The past four years have not been smooth, but I was best when you supported me. Thanks for being my other Mom, as well as the other Mom to many others. My affinity for dragons and Legos is only rivaled by my sincere appreciation of your support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

Introduction

"History should be used not to make ourselves comfortable,

but rather to disturb the taken-for-granted." – Kendall & Wickham, 1999, p.4

Uncomfortable. I choose this word to describe my inner organs when the question arises. I feel "uncomfortable" when people ask me *why* I would teach at a school in an urban area. I have been asked this question numerous times, and I have always tried to engage in insightful conversation with the inquirer. There came a point, however, when I got tired of answering and instead became upset. My answers changed. When colleagues, mentors, friends, students, and strangers asked me *why*, I responded with *why not*. Unfortunately, that answer was not satisfactory for most of them. More questions followed, along with "the look"—that stare that both implies pity and questions my sanity at the same time. I would counter with the best statement I could muster: *why does it even matter?* And more times than I can count, the response I heard was something similar to *well, you know what they say about urban schools.* I asked some of these people who *they* was and what exactly *they* said? More often than not, the conversation shifted to the weather or baseball. My detractors seemed to have many opinions about this "urban education crisis," but little factual information to contribute to an honest conversation.

Don't get me wrong. I am aware of the stereotypes applied to schools in urban areas. As a music educator, I am aware of the perception that music programs in urban areas cannot be as successful as their suburban counterparts. Stories about unmanageable students and unruly classrooms constitute part of urban school lore. Although common sense should challenge the idea that only schools in city centers have disruptive students, decrepit buildings, and uninvolved parents, people in my world—friends and strangers alike—seem to believe that these issues only exist in urban schools, or for my field specifically, in *urban music education*.

I present the term *urban music education* in italics in this document as a deliberate choice. Style manuals dictate that words in scholarly documents should be italicized for various reasons: to provide emphasis, to provide contrast, and when using a foreign language term not

considered part of the English language. The discourse of *urban music education*, or what "people" say about *urban music education*, centers around the same ideas as those advising the use of italics in scholarly writing: emphasis, contrast, foreign. We seem to have a socially constructed need to emphasize perceived contrasts between education that occurs anywhere else and education that occurs in city schools, places that are so different from their suburban or rural counterparts that they get their own set of adjectives. We seldom label educational practices or people as "suburban schools" or "suburban students" or "suburban music education," but we may often use "urban" as a label to "other." The label of "urban" reads as to make foreign or contrasting; school systems, students, teachers, and practices located in cities become a separate group within music education. Such labels, these tags that serve to separate and subjugate, are code for terms that carry weight and mean much more than they say.

So when *people say things* about *urban music education*, what are they "saying" and what are they "meaning to say?" When I started working on this study, I was not wholly aware of what *I* meant or implied when referring to *urban music education*, but after investigation and introspection, I now have a better grasp of my meanings and of those of other writers and speakers. To understand how I developed the point of view articulated in the final chapter, I offer my starting place as prelude below. I recognize that the story and how I have written it are problematic. At the end of this document, I revisit the prelude story, written differently, as an example of how I have changed.

Prelude

I am a White,[1] middle-class female who grew up in a lower-middle class neighborhood in the Phoenix area. While Phoenix is defined as "urban" according to U.S. Census population standards (more than 50,000 people; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010), I lived in what my mom called "the suburbs." My brother and I rode our bikes through the neighborhood and played in the

[1] Due to the nature of my topic, throughout this document I reference race. While it is uncomfortable for me, personally, to label groups of people using color words, I am following the established APA guidelines (6th edition). I will capitalize terms "Black" and "White" when referring to people by ethnicity or race. When quoting other authors I will follow their capitalization protocol; however, if discussing their article content not through a direct quotation, I will capitalize these color words for race and ethnicity even if the original source does not.

streets alongside other neighborhood kids. I lived in the same house for my entire childhood, and I attended the local public school system. The kids I went to school with and played with were from similar households; most of us grew up in the area and came from a variety of cultural backgrounds, mostly Caucasian and Hispanic.

In fourth grade, I started band in the public school system, and over the course of my compulsory public school education, I had what might be considered “traditional” band experiences. There were band concerts, marching band competitions, jazz band festivals, and trips to the State Fair. Band was fun, and band was where my friends were. Band was a culture unto itself. The demographics of our school bands matched the demographics of my friends; bands seemed a natural extension of my social and school life. In high school, I was active on band council, received several music awards, and participated in regional festivals. Band was a defining activity of my public school years.

After high school, I enrolled at the University of Arizona as an aerospace engineering major and joined the marching band. Being in the marching band of a large (then) PAC-10 school allowed me continued experiences with band culture. I eventually joined the pep band and concert bands, and I soon realized that what I truly wanted to do when I grew up was provide these same experiences to other band students. During my second year of undergraduate studies, I changed my major to music education. I finished my degree after successfully student teaching in a middle school with similar demographics to the one I had attended back home. I was ready to take on the world.

My first job was in southern California. I wanted to move away from my home state and to see what opportunities lay in wait elsewhere. After applying to any job post for a band teaching position that had a Los Angeles zip code, I interviewed in a district in a suburban community separate from the Los Angeles Unified School District, but still classified as urban by U.S. Census definition. I was offered that job, and before I knew much about the school or the community, I eagerly accepted the position. I was to teach fourth and fifth grade band at five elementary schools and simultaneously serve as the assistant marching band director at the high school. During the hiring process, I was made aware of the expectations for the elementary and

secondary programs. The performance and festival schedule sounded similar to the band culture with which I was familiar, and I was excited to start.

Although I worked for four years in that school district, it took me less than four days to realize the differences between the area where I now taught and the area where I grew up. I was so nervous during the interview process that I had never really stopped to look around. New teacher syndrome, perhaps, but I had not noticed that most homes near the schools had at least one luxury vehicle in the driveway. The name of the city had the word “beach” in it, and to someone born in a landlocked state, it had not registered that beachfront home properties implied something about income level of at least some of the residents. It did not take too long for me to note a distinct level of wealth within the community, which was reinforced when I learned that very few teachers could afford to live within the school district boundaries.

The level of wealth in the community made it easy for band students to travel, have equipment, and experience a variety of music. My elementary band students took field trips to Los Angeles Philharmonic concerts, and parents were always available to chaperone. The honor band and orchestra ensembles regularly participated in Music in the Parks festivals, which was not remarkable to these students because most of them owned season passes to all the southern California theme parks. My elementary honor band commissioned a piece by a noted band composer. The parents of the students in the ensemble paid the commission fee, and the students premiered the work in the cafetorium with the composer as conductor. The students had rewarding and enriching band experiences that I considered to be a common part of band culture. I felt successful because I believed I had taught hundreds of kids to love band.

Feeling both successful and accomplished, I left that position to attend graduate school full time. I moved across the country to pursue a master’s degree in music education at the University of Maryland. During the next two years, I learned about research, pedagogy, rehearsal techniques, and curriculum. Armed with even more knowledge–now two degrees’ worth–I was excited to return to the public schools and create more band-loving students.

I accepted a job teaching in a middle school just outside of Washington, D.C. My new position included teaching band, orchestra, and general music to seventh and eighth grade

students. I was excited to be teaching middle school and a variety of course content, but when I told my local friends about my new job, they were *not* excited. Finally, one friend told me that my job was at a "scary" school, and when I asked for clarification, she replied, "Oh, you'll see." In retrospect, that was probably the only way to describe the situation to me, as someone who had no previous knowledge about the school, the students, or the community.

I looked forward to welcoming my new students into the band and orchestra culture. I wanted to them to love music and their experiences with it. I approached the first day as I had in years past: set expectations, show them you care, and then everything will be great. But the first class of the first day did not go as planned. After I delivered my perfected "first day" spiel, a student raised her hand and questioned, "So why do we have some crazy White cracker in here trying to boss us around?" For the first time in my teaching career I had no idea what to say. I had used my nice friendly teacher voice and smiled a lot. Where did her interpretation come from? Stunned, I stared at her for a moment. The silence was broken by the only Caucasian student in the room. "Because that is what we get paid to do, fool!" he yelled. I vividly remember thinking, "I have no idea what to do."

The rest of that day was a blur of confusion. Most classes were similar to the first one. While the seventh graders were calmer than the eighth graders, they did not hesitate to note that I was different than they were and that the teacher I had replaced was "more brown" and therefore cooler. Unprepared to navigate any of these conversations, I went home that day and cried. I had been so excited and, I thought, so prepared to be back in the classroom, and I had had an extremely rough day.

Unfortunately, not much improved over the first two or three months. I came home frustrated and upset more days than not. Eventually, I found courage to seek help from my colleagues. I befriended another teacher, a younger African-American female colleague, and asked her about students' behavior in her room. She was empathetic when she explained, "Oh man, it's crazy. But it is probably worse for you because you are White." Again, not ready for that answer, I was too uncomfortable to even ask her what that meant. I refused to believe that kids

behaved in certain ways just because they were African-American, or Hispanic, or poor, or because I was different from them.

Still not satisfied, I consulted with mentors from my graduate and undergraduate programs. They provided myriad responses to my queries, ranging from “If you are a good teacher in one place, you will be a good teacher in any place–just teach them music!” to “Kids are just kids, no matter where they are,” to “Poor, urban schools are just harder to teach in and that is why no good teachers work there.” A sense of sadness enveloped me as I began to realize that nothing I had experienced in my previous successful years of teaching and in two strong degree programs had prepared me for my current teaching position. My teacher preparation had aligned with my experiences of being a White-middle-class band member. Apparently, there were other interpretations of what being in band or being in school meant, and I did not know how to navigate or understand those. And I did not know where to go or who to ask for help.

By the end of October, I had come to terms with the fact that I would have to throw out several things I thought I knew about “teaching” and what was important about being in “band.” I would have to find different ways to reach and approach many students. “Band” meant something specific to me, as did “school,” but I began to realize that *my* reference points were dissimilar to those of my students, and *my* bias shaped planning and goals. I convinced myself to abandon *my* beliefs of music education, such as appropriate concert literature, and adopt some of *theirs*. My plan worked well enough for us to have a successful Winter Concert, after which more kids seemed willing to maybe on some days allow me to teach them about music. Still struggling with matters of identity, philosophy, and sociology, I left that program after two years. Unsatisfied with what I knew about teaching, I started doctoral coursework in music education, hoping to find answers to my questions.

Back in my hometown, and at a large (now) PAC-12 school, I remained concerned with the differences between my two jobs and the struggles I found in only one of them. The fact that I had experienced fewer difficult moments in my entire first year of teaching in California than I had in the first month of my teaching in Maryland reverberated within me. Those concerns resided in my head and heart, and they were present with every article or chapter I read or class discussion

in which I participated. I wanted to know why I had almost failed a group of students, and I knew the answer had to be something more than I was middle class and White and they were poor and Black.

In that first semester of coursework, I had a revelation. Sitting at home one night doing homework for a music education class, an assigned reading from a book chapter made a reference to Michel Foucault. There was talk about social justice and discourse and power structures and oppression and critical race theory (Vaugeois, 2009). Light bulbs went off and fireworks exploded. I used highlighter on almost the entire article. I had never experienced any of these terms in relationship to education or music education. Slowly, yet with great force, things started to come into focus. For the first time in years, I began to see answers to questions I had been accumulating, or rather, reasons for why I struggled in my second job. I felt an intense relief; maybe I was not crazy. Maybe there other things were in play, things that were bigger than me, bigger than my students, things more complex both socially and culturally than I understood, things that I did not have the tools to understand. I wanted to know more about Foucault and social justice, and for the first time in a long time, I relaxed a little.

I took control of my learning and read literature connected to these topics. The more I learned, the more things made sense, yet the more frustrated I became. As I read, I constantly thought, “I wish I had known that years ago,” or “Why was I never exposed to this before now?” Issues connected to *urban music education* and social justice had never appeared in my schooling. I reflected on why this might have been. Although my first Foucault encounter was in music education, most of my subsequent reading adventures with him were in general education literature. When I was able to find books or articles connecting issues in music education to urban education, social justice, and/or Foucault, I scoured the footnotes and bibliographies for other literature, hoping to see connections to music education; they were not as plentiful as I hoped. That lack of connection was frustrating at times, but I continued to try to find the common threads across the “discourse”–now a word with new meaning.

While I searched for Foucault, I became more critically aware of the topics presented in the undergraduate classes in which I taught and interned, especially in relation to how groups of

students were described. There was no demarcated place for conversations about topics related to urban education, and I did not feel comfortable opening them; the courses and their content belonged to someone else. Yet, there were times when discussions among the preservice teachers focused on urban schools, and usually how they were not desirable options for field teaching experiences. During these moments I interjected, hoping to provide critical thinking opportunities for the students; some were receptive to my viewpoints while others had already decided that urban schools were “bad” places to teach. How had they come to this conclusion so early in their professional pathways?

As part of a qualitative research class project, I decided to observe two first-year music educators, both of whom were teaching at Title I schools in urban areas, hoping to understand how beginning teachers thought about *urban music education*. I interviewed both teachers extensively, speaking with them about their jobs in their urban environments. To develop a detailed picture of what life was like for these beginning music teachers in these urban school settings, I carefully structured questions about their school demographics, student behaviors, other faculty, the neighborhoods in which the schools were located, and how they thought about their jobs, students, and the schools. As I analyzed the data, I was somewhat surprised to find that the two participants were so focused on figuring out *how* to be a teacher that many sociological and cultural issues never registered with them. As one teacher pointed out, she didn’t quite know the demographics of her band students at her five schools, as she was still trying to figure out where the bathrooms were at each site. These two early-career teachers had not thought about who their students were, never mind adequately considering how to address their needs.

My research project, readings, and experiences continued to provide me with questions and cognitive dissonances. Would preservice teachers not understand issues of social justice, race, and equity? Is engaging with urban education topics not negotiable at the early stages of teacher development? What about practicing teachers? Are urban education topics covered at in-service meetings? I never saw any, but maybe I hadn’t been looking. And what about the profession’s journals and publications? Did writers in these tools of our trade foster conversations

about urban music education? If not, why? If so, what were/are we talking about? I have spent several years asking some of these questions, and the answers still remain blurred. An analysis of the discourse of *urban music education* may provide some answers.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to analyze the discourse surrounding *urban music education* as it is propagated through two prominent publications of the music education profession. A critical evaluation of statements used over a twenty-year time frame will contribute to a clearer picture of the *urban music education* discourse and how–and by whom–it is shaped. In this investigation, I address the following questions:

- What is the current discourse of *urban music education*?
- How do specific publications and actors[2] of the structure[3] shape how *urban music education* is perceived and addressed within the discourse?
- What threads are present in the discourse, and what do these threads suggest about urban music educators and urban music students?
- What does the *urban music education* discourse transmit, reproduce, reinforce, and expose?

To investigate these questions, I employ a critical discourse analysis using a Foucauldian[4] lens. In Chapters 2 and 3, I review other studies using similar methods, delineate the components of critical discourse analysis methodology, provide background information on philosopher Michel Foucault, outline the journals selected for statement analysis, and share the process and results of a pilot study. The discourse of *urban music education* is complex; in Chapters 4 and 5, I provide an analysis of the discourse as reproduced over a twenty-year time span in two journals. In the penultimate chapter I expose the "truths"[5] of *urban music education,*

[2] An *actor* is any human or non-human agent such as an individual or group (organized or not) that shares a common reference frame.
[3] *Structure*, in this paper, refers to a social organization with established patterns and relationships; this concept will be discussed later in this chapter.
[4] There are multiple accepted ways to spell "Foucauldian," and in this document, I use the spelling with a "d," while Mantie uses "Foucaultian" with a "t."
[5] The idea of "truths," covered in detail later in this chapter and in Chapter 6, refers to behaviors, thoughts, and actions that are deemed to be appropriate with in a structure.

and in the concluding chapter I explore how actors in the music education structure can be active in changing patterns of thought.

In the remainder of this chapter I provide a context for this study by providing background data related to urban education. I introduce the concept of "discourse," which will be discussed further in Chapters 2 and 3. I also begin to explore the discourse of *urban music education* through a small-scale analysis of two historical *urban music education* documents.

Urban Education in the United States

According to National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data (2012b), over 49 million students participated in some form of schooling in the United States in 2010-2011. Most of these students attended traditional public schools, while others attended private, charter, magnet, and home schools. Almost 50% of public school students, or over 24.8 million students, attended Title I schools in the 2010–2011 school year (NCES, 2012). Title I schools are characterized by high poverty rates and consist of at least 35% low-income families. A school is determined to be a Title I school if 40% or more of the students are enrolled in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program.[6]

A considerable number of students in the United States attend schools in a large city. The NCES (2006) defines a "large city" as an urbanized area of more than 250,000 inhabitants within a principal city. In 2006, NCES refined its definitions of school locations, describing areas as city, suburb, town, and rural, with three size delineations within each category. In a 2005–2009 study, NCES (2012b) determined that 79.6% of the 5–17 year olds in the United States live in urbanized areas, and 18.2% are at or below the poverty level. In other words, the majority of school-aged children reside in urban communities of varying sizes (recognizing that a city of 250,000 is different from a city of 2 million or more) and approximately 1 in 5 students live in poverty conditions.

[6] The Free and Reduced Lunch Program is part of the National School Lunch Program. Families whose income falls below an established guideline are eligible for free or reduced school lunch prices. The poverty level is used as a baseline; if a family's income is at or below 130% of that marker, the children qualify for free meals. When the family's income falls between 130% and 185% of the poverty line, the children qualify for reduced price meals, the price of which cannot exceed 40 cents (USDA, 2013).

Perceived expectations of "urban" schools are tied to discourses—sets of written, spoken, and acted communications—that define and describe them. For example, Pat Russo, the Coordinator of the Center for Urban Schools,[7] outlined characteristics of an urban school in a 2004 position paper: the school is in an urban area, a high rate of poverty exists as measured by participation in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program, a high proportion of students of color attend the school, a high proportion of students have Limited English Proficiency, and the school has been designated as "high need."[8] In short, urban schools are places of learning located in cities of various sizes that serve poor students, minority students, and students who speak English as a second language, all of which are considered obstacles to high performance standards. For example, the 2007–2008 high school graduation rate was 66.1% for students attending schools designated as "urban" (NCES, 2008), notably lower than both the 79% graduation rate for suburban students and the 75% national graduation rate average.

Schools in cities may also serve students who do not live in poverty, students who are White, and students who speak English as their primary language; even so, the term "urban" is usually used within the educational discourse to refer to "other" populations (Benedict, 2006). The language of this discourse has contributed to a construction of stereotypes and perceptions of the students in city schools and their potential (McAnally, 2006; Weiner, 2006). Perceptions of factors such as lower graduation rates, more crime, teen pregnancies, and fewer resources (NCES, 1996) also contribute to the difficult-to-define concepts that surround urban education in America.

The establishment of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001 and the expectations delineated in the law brought renewed attention to language, culture, and poverty, concerns that had long been part of urban education discourses (Frierson-Campbell, 2006; Kindall-Smith, 2006). The NCLB benchmarks require that 100% of students will be proficient in the areas of

[7] The Center for Urban Schools is a program at SUNY Oswego that works with the School of Education to meet its commitment to teaching for social justice. Goals of the program include increasing the number of students who seek out and accept positions in urban schools, establishing more frequent and diverse urban field experience placements for preservice teachers, and supporting urban teachers.

[8] "High Need School" is defined by 20 U.S.C. § 1021(11) in several ways. Most frequently this label is applied to schools with significant numbers of students involved in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program (60% or more for elementary schools, 45% or more for secondary schools), but it also assigned to schools with significant populations receiving Medicaid assistance, schools serving significant numbers of students living at or below the poverty line, or schools with low achievement or graduation rates.

English and mathematics by 2014. According to several writers, urban schools find greater challenges in meeting such standards compared to their non-urban peer schools, primarily due to cultural and language barriers that are more prevalent in urban centers (Brown II, Dancy, & Norfles, 2006; Gooden & Nowlin, 2006; Rong, 2006). Both the law and those who write about its ramifications participate in a discourse in which urban is a coded language, as the term is not defined within the NCLB 700-page legal document.

Authors of journal articles in music education and general education, although quick to employ the term "urban," rarely define what makes a school "urban" (Chou & Tozer, 2008; Weiner, 2006), and when defined, definitions are inconsistent. For example, in a 2000 dissertation about high school choice, Myers includes "urban" as a classification of school type, explaining that urban schools are populated with lower income families in high-density city areas. In an article about school counseling, Lee (2005) uses descriptors to define urban schools, including:

- Population density
- Structural density
- High concentration of people of color
- High concentration of recent immigrants
- High rates of reported crimes
- Per capita higher rates of poverty
- Complex transportation patterns
- High concentration of airborne pollutants. (p. 185)

Matsko and Hammerness (2014) attempt to unpack what makes urban teaching qualify as "urban." Through an examination of documents used in urban teacher preparation programs, they evaluate specific strategies and topics deemed essential for urban teacher preparation and urban student success. Although they do not articulate a definition of "urban," the authors comment on the "variety of complicated, interrelated issues" (p. 128) surrounding the term.

Such issues epitomize the problematic discourse of *urban music education*; meanings of "urban" and "urban music education" have come to envelop meaning beyond the dictionary definitions of the words. Instead, implied and unstated meanings associated with "urban" phrases or descriptors mean more than population, density, or location, and those messages influence and are influenced by the discourse. The association of the term "urban" with "education" allows for numerous interpretations, thus labeling actors in various and potentially incorrect or harmful ways and contributing to a continuing, troubling, and possibly unexamined discourse.

In order to examine the *urban music education* discourse, I will employ a critical discourse analysis. This methodological tool allows for an exploration and critical reading of statements in the discourse, exposing what has been said about *urban music education*. Through a critical review of discursive practices, the structure may become more aware of the current discourses surrounding urban actors and purposefully act to alter such patterns. In the next section I provide an overview of *discourse*, acknowledging theories relevant to this study. I will discuss discourse and discursive theories in greater depth in Chapters 2 and 3.

Discourse: An Introduction

Although an essential component of such an analysis, there are multiple definitions and theories of discourse. Discourse, or the ways something has come to be understood and communicated about, develops over time. Parker suggests that "discourse is a system of statements which constructs an object" (Parker, 1989, p. 61 in Woofitt, 2005, p. 146). Statements consist of words, texts, documents, and actions that constitute a discourse and contribute to how the discourse is understood, perceived, and reproduced. Elements of a discourse are neither limited to spoken or written texts nor prescribed by length; statements are both "words and things" (Kendall & Wickham, 1999, p. 27). For example, single utterances, complete novels, a "thumbs up" sign, and a television program can be statements that contribute to discourses and discursive practices. Discourse is, according to Gee, "ways of combining and integrating language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity" (2011, p. 29). From a Foucauldian

perspective, “discourse is not necessarily restricted to talk and text, but rather, describes all social phenomena” (Mantie, 2012b, p. 102).

A discourse, then, is an accepted set of statements and practices of a “structure” or social group (Rogers, 2004). Actors accept these practices, which are assumed to be “correct” or “true” and generally unquestioned. *Discursive actions,* or behaviors accepted as normative in a structure, maintain power relationships and position actors relative to each other (Ball 1990). In other words, discursive actions may result in forms of oppression and repression, which are frequently accepted as “normal” by actors in the structure who participate in the discourse (Mangion, 2011).

In each discourse, actors accept certain actions while rejecting other actions. Permitted actions, deemed appropriate by those wielding power in the structure, are known as “truth.” Each discourse has established truths, and those truths are usually associated with forms of hegemony. As Foucault (1980) explains:

> Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its “general politics” of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (p. 131)

Entities in positions of power within the discursive plane[9] can wield their influence to manipulate and legitimize changes within the discourse, and such acts force the population of the structure to consider their perceptions of what is “true” (Marshall, 1990). As statements of truth are edited by actions of the people in the structure, accepted behaviors transform. Actors in the structure modify their behaviors, in hopes of being accepted, and their behaviors generate routines. Routines strengthen the structure, and practiced behaviors can advance selected truths

[9] A discursive plane is the space in which a discourse exists. A plane, while not visible, is situated historically and contextually.

in the discursive plane. In other words, actions within discursive planes shape social identities, and thus discourses shape the understanding of identities and positions.

Language contributes to the discourse, and as a product of social practices, language reproduces inequalities and domination (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000) and reinforces both sides of such relationships. Foucault (1969/2010) explains discourse as a set of statements that help define relationships between and among constituent parts of a discursive thread. These statements, written or spoken or otherwise, are discrete linguistic events that shape perceptions and communicate specific ideas within a structure. In a discourse, the appearance of a statement renders it valid, regardless of author (Foucault, 1969/2010). The appearance of a statement does not prove the statement true, but if an actor in an authorized position produces the statement, the statement is accepted. In other words, the ability for those in positions of power to communicate ideas through statements shapes the discourse and the perceptions of those actors who are part of the discourse. Actors in the structure who control the disbursement of information (statements) also control power; when specific actors within a system control what and how information is shared, they are able to limit the types of knowledge or truth disseminated.

As Lessa (2006) explains, Foucault's views on discourse are best understood as "systems of thoughts composed of ideas, attitudes, courses of action, beliefs and practices that systemically construct the subjects and the worlds of which they speak" (p. 285). Discourse is essentially a set of ideas constructed and reproduced and perpetuated by the actors and power systems within a structure. The privileged actors in the structure, Foucault (1980) argues, are the members of the culture given permission or power to speak about objects using certain rituals, inevitably shaping discourse. Those with power (the privileged) speak in certain ways (ritual) about specific things (the objects), creating—or reproducing—a discourse; this discourse may or may not be challenged or questioned, depending on the power configurations present. In this fashion, "truths" are established through knowledge that is propagated through prominent outlets or rituals, and "truths" can also be constrained by the privileged. I address the topic of discourse in greater depth in Chapter Two, and will frequently return to these concepts in subsequent chapters.

As noted above, language is part of discourse. In conjunction with spoken words, the threads of discourse occur in print, on signs, and in various publications that may be influenced by multiple entities. For example, actors, including education policy makers and the social or economic events, media releases, and print publications that derive from their actions, may affect the discourse of "urban music education." A discourse of *urban music education* exists in professional journals and in the media. While scholars in music education and general education write about music in urban schools from positions of authority, I found no published critical evaluation of *urban music education* discourse in preparation for this study. Absent a critical examination of *urban music education* discourse, actors in the structure who could benefit from such an examination do not have access to information that may help them clarify their positions or act in ways that disrupt or redefine the discourse.

As noted earlier, multiple actors may contribute to the discourse of *urban music education.* In this document, I examine the discourse of *urban music education* over a twenty-year time span in two journals of the National Association for Music Education; other contributions to the discourse exist but will not be examined unless they surface as part of the analysis. In the next section, I review influential documents in order to frame this study of the *urban music education* discourse.

Urban Music Education

Urban music education discourse is shaped by information, data, words, texts, and actions. While countless objects, rituals, and privileged actors have contributed to the *urban music education* discourse, two documents merit attention here. In 1970, Charles Fowler, then editor of the *Music Educators Journal,* collected articles and related content that addressed music teaching in urban centers, including teaching diverse students and using multiple musics in the classroom. Thirty-six years later, Carol Frierson-Campbell edited a two-volume book, *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom* (2006)*,* in which chapter authors address issues including cultural responsiveness, teaching strategies, alternative models, teacher education, partnerships, and school reform. Inspired by her association with the Urban Music Leadership Conference and other professional groups, Frierson-Campbell constructed the texts to ignite discussions about

urban music education on a national level. Although the *urban music education* discourse has a longer history than what can be covered in the scope of this study, the *MEJ* Special Focus Issue and *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom* volumes provide a sense of the existing discourse of *urban music education* and serve as historical markers. A brief overview of the discourse included in each of these documents follows.

***Music Educators Journal* Special Focus Issue, 1970.** The 1970 Special Focus Issue of *Music Educators Journal* provides an early example of the *urban music education* discourse. The publication also reflects the influence of the Civil Rights era, a movement initiated in the mid-1950s, and the subsequent strife regarding race relations in the United States, considered to be prominent in cities and urban areas. In an opening article, editor Charles Fowler reflects on the "strain" and "problems" (Fowler, 1970, p. 37) that music teachers in urban areas faced. He states that the culture gap, while prominent, is less detrimental to both the teacher and students than the class gap that he believed prevailed in most urban schools of the time. The class gap, Fowler notes, becomes most evident when comparing values of the teachers–and therefore the curriculum–to those of the student.

Fowler's writing, strategically placed at the forefront of this publication, includes several descriptors of the landscape of the "urban culture" (pp. 37–38) that are prevalent throughout the issue, including words such as disease, hunger, crime, drugs, broken families, hopelessness, poverty, segregation, and bankruptcy. According to Fowler, White, Black, and Puerto Rican children live in cities, places described with terms such as "ferment," "frustration," and "failure" (p. 37). Fowler comments that experienced teachers "flee" from these areas to the suburbs for "safety" reasons, leaving the "ghetto" teaching positions to younger, inexperienced educators (p. 37). Fowler elaborates on the idea of a culture gap between teachers and students of schools in urban areas, including differences in preferred music, language barriers, and militancy in schools.

Other authors in the Special Focus Issue address differences between White and Black cultures. For example, Kaplan (1970, pp. 39–42) suggests that "ghetto arts," such as graffiti, are different from the arts of the White culture and will eventually infiltrate suburban schools. He warns that "teachers produced by the universities had better be whole people with knowledge of

the new world around them rather than traditional salesmen of sonatas" (p. 42). He comments that the song "Three Blind Mice," which he uses as an example, will never be popular in PS 154, "PS" being a reference to an urban school. The resilience and creativity of "ghetto students," Kaplan argues, is superior to that of "WASP" students (p. 42). In what appears to be an attempt to valorize "ghetto" students, Kaplan praises their ingenuity, arguing that it is greater than that of White students; Black students, in their struggle to find ways to communicate, demonstrate superior creativity to White students since the "WASP pattern of life is not as inclined to promote noneconomic values and the needs for self-expression" (p. 42).

In a lengthy untitled editorial piece in the front half of the journal, large bold letters spell out buzzwords that suggest the direction of *urban music education*. The choice of bolded terms implies the trends of *urban music education* discourse in the 1970s: attitude, adjustment, defeatism, sex, culture, absenteeism, frustrations, motivation, apathy, prejudice, poverty, funds, budget cuts, priorities, discrimination, facilities, alienation, hostility, discipline, militancy, values, vandalism, mobility, inexperience, dope/shootings, behavior, and fatigue. These 27 terms highlight experiences and opinions about *urban music education* presented in personal stories from various actors, including music educators, arts supervisors, principals, superintendents, and students. Many of the bolded words do not have positive connotations; likewise the stories rarely position *urban music education* programs, students, experiences, and/or teachers from a positive or even neutral perspective. Writers make frequent comparisons and juxtapositions between White/Black, suburban/urban, middle class/poor, students/these students, and art music/their music. Reading these accounts is disturbing and the language choices of the time seem offensive today.

Throughout the 1970 Special Focus Issue of the *Music Educators Journal*, school administrators contribute to the discourse surrounding *urban music education* by describing their focus as larger than music programs, and in doing so, they raise concerns about racial strife, student militants, disruptions, absenteeism, vandalism, and other daily worries that take time and resources to resolve. One school administrator suggests that if urban music teachers want their

programs to be effective, they need to step up and figure out most of their problems on their own, since administrators have larger issues to consider on any given day (p. 53).

In an article entitled “The Arts Can Shatter Urban Isolation,” Briggs (pp. 56–57) posits that arts education can make schools in urban areas less isolated by bringing arts and culture into the lives of those students, but ignores the possibility of arts and cultures already being present in students’ lives, instead assuming there is a deficit. While the overarching tone is warm and inclusive, Briggs utilizes specific words and events to make his point, and these words paint a negative picture of *urban music education*. He tells stories about urban superintendents needing armed security, uses the word “poor” to describe children, describes urban teachers as receiving “combat pay” to work in city schools, and refers to the urban environment as “ugly,” drawing attention to and perpetuating negative stereotypes of urban schools and *urban music education*. Similarly, Klotman (1970, pp. 58–59, 125–127, 129–130) recommends stronger support of *urban music education* while using language that contributes to the negative stereotypes of city schools and people. He uses the word “battlefield” to describe life in an urban school, and he describes teachers as outsiders who represent the establishment and who are met with militant hostility (p. 58). His message, while encouraging better teaching in urban music programs, perpetuates the negative perceptions of urban schools and urban students.

In “Music Teachers Should Shake Their Conservatism” (pp. 60–62), Fowler interviews Edward Gillespie, an African-American principal of an all-Black middle school, who describes inner cities as economically deficient and inner-city schools as places where students and teachers are forced to meet middle-class expectations and share middle-class values, even when funding and culture create obstacles. Middle-class, code for White and majority culture values, symbolizes out-of-reach goals for oppressed populations. For example, Gillespie uses graffiti, which he describes as a tool of communication, to highlight differences in expression between urban and non-urban students, but perpetuates negative stereotypes in doing so. Gillespie explains graffiti as a “cry for help” from urban children (p. 60), a way to garner attention from the adults and society that ignore them. Like Klotman, Gillespie offers suggestions for the

improvement of *urban music education*, calling for alternative music and teaching styles in urban music classrooms, in an article marked with stereotypes and negative terms (i.e., deficient).

In an untitled spread in the middle of the journal, positive stories of urban music teaching are mixed with struggle stories. Names of urban cities (Detroit, Philadelphia, St. Louis, New Orleans, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Baltimore, Dallas, New York, Washington, Jackson, Boston, and Atlanta) are situated as headlines across multiple pages, each accompanied by a personal anecdote or opinion piece. While authors of some stories highlight financial issues prevalent in schools in urban areas, most speak to the importance of music education in their school system and how strategies such as including "soul music" (p. 64) in the classroom can be implemented in order to help students be successful in music classes. The format of the article highlights obstacles urban schools need to overcome, placing the schools in a deficit position and indirectly defining them as unattractive and difficult places of learning that serve certain students and not others.

The remainder of articles in the 1970 Special Focus Issue highlight different aspects of *urban music education*. In one untitled section, bolded terms appear alongside urban music teacher stories. Unlike the first section in the journal, these words carry more positive connotations: courage, ingenuity, enthusiasm, resourcefulness, caring, patience, firmness, fairness, understanding, leadership, musicianship, and flexibility (pp. 68–79). However, the language in the introductory section of the article describes urban teaching as risky, draining, tiring, discouraging, and a fight for survival (pp. 43–51). While the stories attempt to demonstrate how achievement is perceived in an urban music setting, the unmatched pairing of words implies that urban music teaching is difficult and maybe even disheartening.

Other articles in the issue focus on differences between urban and suburban students. Authors outline cultural differences, offer strategies for integrating alternative musical styles and approaches, and call for changes in music teacher preparation. Terms such as "Negro," "Afro," and "ghetto" are used to describe concepts and ideas. Other language such as "tribal," "alienation," "their" and "them," "racism," "segregation," and "separate but equal" shape these 1979 examples of the discourse of *urban music education*. Poor *White* students are mentioned

occasionally; however, the primary focus of the authors is on how White teachers can or should teach poor Black students or poor Puerto Rican students.

At this point in the history of music education (1970), the *urban music education* discourse as defined in the profession's most widely circulated publication includes teaching poor, Black, sometimes militant, inner-city students familiar with drugs and violence in their neighborhoods and (if they have them) families; teaching in schools with financial troubles and violent surroundings; and White teachers having to learn "other" arts and music practices to serve "them"–students who are definitely not "us."

***Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom, Volumes 1 and 2*, 2006.** More than 30 years after the *MEJ* Special Focus Issue described above was published, Frierson-Campbell (2006) edited a two-volume work entitled *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom*. Frierson-Campbell subtitles the first volume *A Guide to Survival, Success, and Reform*, implying that *urban music education* is something potentially dangerous, challenging, or life threatening. The first volume contains four divisions: Cultural Responsivity, Music Teacher Stories, Teaching Strategies, and Alternative Teaching Models. The second volume, subtitled *A Guide to Leadership, Teacher Education, and Reform*, includes four subdivisions: Educational Leadership, Teacher Education, Partnerships, and School Reform. Each of the authors across the 31 chapters explores a facet of urban music teaching. As a collection, the volumes delineate ways in which practicing music teachers, music teacher educators, and other members of the structure can work to promote change and "reform" *urban music education*. This ever-present thread of needing change occurs in both texts and the word "reform" appears in both subtitles, signaling that some aspect of *urban music education* requires repair or correction in some fashion.

An examination of the table of contents in the first volume reveals the following list of words: other, clashes, complexity, English-Language Learners, White, color, challenges, urban, motivating, differentiating, big city, rethinking, culture, and reform. Authors in the first section of volume one ("Cultural Responsivity") provide suggestions about how to address differences of culture within and through instruction. Words such as "clashes" or "complexity" shape their messages. For example, Chapter 2 (Emmanuel, 2006) is entitled "Cultural Clashes: The

Complexity of Identifying Urban Culture" and Chapter 5 (Smith, 2006), is entitled "The Challenges of Urban Teaching: Young Urban Music Educators at Work." While the authors plead for improved relationships with *urban music education* actors, word use tinges the color of the message. For example, "clash" implies that a violent struggle exists between groups of people and negates the possibility that positive relationships between groups may already exist or could exist.

In the second section, "Teacher Stories," author tone is more varied, providing a greater contrast among chapters. Some stories focus on hope while others focus on negative aspects of urban music teaching. Some authors use "tension" and "poverty" as headings, while others use "fairness." As indicated by the language choices, multiple themes emerge across the "Teacher Stories" section, touching on both stereotypes of urban schools and visions of hope and reform. In some places, authors urge the reader to treat students in urban areas fairly and with respect, implying that they are more commonly treated otherwise. Overall, this second section of volume one includes interviews and narratives that both perpetuate perceived stereotypes and aim to instill a sense of hope, sending incongruent messages.

The second half of the first volume of *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom* consists of two subsections that explore teaching strategies and alternative models of *urban music education*. Assuming that students in urban areas need instruction that is different the instruction of their peers presents a double-edged sword. This type of thinking affirms that all urban music students are similar and may not learn in the same ways that non-urban students learn, while simultaneously positioning urban music students into a deficit-learning model. Similarly, recognizing that *urban music education* students (instead of all students) might benefit from varied types of musical experiences also labels urban actors and their experiences as "different" or outside the normative. Still, the chapters within this section of the text provide reasoning and endorsement for an education that supports music students in urban areas, regardless of the connotations "alternative" or "different" may hold.

Words used in the table of contents of the second volume (urban, surviving, power, leader, alternative, real-world, building, at risk, underprivileged, heritage, collaborations,

restructuring, courage, all, and reform) retain some similarity to those in the first volume (other, clashes, complexity, English-Language Learners, White, color, challenges, urban, motivating, differentiating, big city, rethinking, culture, and reform). The words “urban” and “reform” are present in the chapter titles of both volumes, serving as unifying concept across the texts.

The table of contents of the second volume includes words with stronger positive connotations (leader, collaborations, courage) than the words of the table of contents in the first volume. The use of words such as “courage,” however, is as value-laden as terms such as “at-risk.” Assuming that urban music teachers need “courage” in order to promote change in their structure implies fear, difficulty, and obstacles. Although “at-risk” and “underprivileged” are used in both volumes, the tone of the second volume as a whole is more positive than the first; authors outline ideas to implement within the *urban music education* structure so actors can be active in altering practices in *urban music education*.

Authors in the second volume of *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom* provide strategies to improve the quality of music education for urban students. In the first section, “Educational Leadership,” authors examine views of administrators or suggest how music/arts administrators can be effective in creating change within school systems in urban areas. In the second section, “Teacher Education,” authors promote change not only in current structures of music teacher education and certification practices, but also in the types of relationships music teachers and preservice teachers have with schools and music students in urban areas. These new types of relationships are more deeply examined in the third section, “Partnerships,” where authors urge *urban music education* actors to develop school-community relationships. Thoughts of reorganization carry through to the final section, “School Reform,” in which authors describe ideas regarding city school improvement. One suggestion, the development of an “arts-infused” curriculum, provides a framework for urban school curriculum meant to serve as a catalyst for change within a school community.

Comparing the 2006 *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom* texts to the 1970 *MEJ* issue reveals a change in language and tone. The discourse of the 1970 *MEJ* issue advances a vision of teaching in the urban music classroom using stories of frustrated teachers,

administrators, and students. While the 1970 *MEJ* issue may have been designed to force readers to recognize issues within urban music classrooms, the words chosen to ignite the discussion may have othered multiple actors in the discourse and also have directed some members of the profession away from music teaching positions in urban areas. Fewer hostile adjectives are utilized in the 2006 books. Authors in the Frierson-Campbell texts note struggles in the urban music classroom and position those with strategies for success; however, language in the 2006 publications still remains problematic, perpetuating threads in the discourse that *urban music education* (not other education) needs repair. Across both sets of documents, multiple threads of discourse remain obvious and constant; urban schools and actors are othered. While word choice and tone shift, similar struggles, fears, and calls for change exist throughout the discursive plane.

These publications, representative of the *urban music education* discourse, provide examples of discursive threads that dominate the conversations regarding music programs, students, and teachers in urban areas. The *MEJ* Special Focus Issue (1970) was published 20 years before the beginning of the bounded corpus that I examine in this document, and the Frierson-Campbell (2006) texts appear near the end of corpus that I examine. In the time period between 1970 and 2006 and since then, various actors continue to influence *urban music education* discourse.

In this study I examine *urban music education* discourse as it appears in the *Music Educators Journal* and the *Journal of Research in Music Education* from 1991 through 2010. A critical examination of multiple documents over time will make salient the details of the discourse and determine what discursive threads are perpetuated over time. In the next chapter, I expand the concept of discourse in a review of methodology options and viewpoints present in the literature; also in Chapter 2 I discuss the work of Michele Foucault. In Chapter 3 I outline my methodological choices for this study and describe a pilot study that informed my work in this document. Chapters 4 and 5 include analyses of discourses of “urban” and selected terms in the corpus. In Chapters 6 and 7 I discuss the truths of *urban music education* and strategies for shifting the discourse and changing the structure.

Chapter 2

Description of Framework & Viewpoints in the Literature

This study analyzes the discourse of *urban music education* as it is propagated over twenty years in two prominent publications of the music education profession. In this chapter, I provide background relevant to multiple aspects of both the framework (inspired by the writings of Foucault) and methodology (discourse analysis) for this study. Beginning with definitions and descriptions of discourse, I explore methodological approaches of discourse analysis (DA) and critical discourse analysis (CDA). This chapter also serves as an introduction to philosopher Michel Foucault; I describe selected major works in order to articulate his ideas regarding knowledge, power, and truth. Finally, I examine selected studies in music, education, music education, and other fields, including studies by authors who employ strategies of discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, and/or Foucauldian frameworks. Examining the methodological techniques and frameworks of these studies supports my research decisions, which I describe in Chapter 3.

Discourse: Descriptions and Definitions

As Jorgenson & Phillips (2002) state, “discourses are understood as ways of thinking and talking about the world. These cultural understandings shape actions” (p. 32). Nerland (2007) advances this idea, explaining that “discourses set boundaries for what gives meaning in certain situations, and regulate what should count as good practice or valuable knowledge” (p. 401). Discourses, in the context of this study, are systems of ideas, actions, texts, and statements that construct a perceived reality. More than just language, discourses are “ways of being” in a community or group (Locke, 2004).

Discourse is not just “bodies of ideas, ideologies, or other symbolic formations, but also working attitudes, modes of address, terms of reference, and courses of action suffused into social practices” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, pp. 493–4). These practices are created by and reproduced through the “internal social perspective of members of the participants’ own discourse community” (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000, p. 574). Practices signify, in part, how members of a discourse community choose to communicate, and communication demarcates what is valuable

and what is regulated within the community. As Kincheloe & McLaren (2000) note, “discursive practices are defined as a set of tacit rules that regulate what can and cannot be said, who can speak with the blessing of authority and who must listen, whose social constructions are valid, and whose are erroneous and unimportant” (p. 769).

This view of discourse relies on the idea that language, through one of any number of discursive practices, constructs the world (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 769). Language allows members of a discursive community to articulate (or not) what is valued, important, or essential (or not). In this way, language becomes a tool used in a discursive community both to regulate and to dominate others. Discourse allows people to relate to each other, and also, as Fairclough (2003) explains, keep separate from one another, cooperate, or dominate within social practices.

For the purpose of this study, I use the term *discourse* to describe sets of statements, ideas, actions, and texts (written or spoken) that encapsulate how something (*urban music education)* is understood and perceived in a structure (music education profession). *Discursive actions* are behaviors that are expected of or common to the structure that adopts the discourse in question. A *discursive plane* is space in which the discourse is being reviewed; in this study, “discursive plane” usually refers to the corpus or collected data set (bounded collection of documents under review). Due to the fluid definitions of discourse and related terms (Foucault, 1969/2010), if these terms are used in quotes of other authors’ works, the definitions may or may not be similar and will be noted as needed.

The analysis of discourse through a critical lens can provide understanding about power within a discursive community and how power influences actors. In this study, I examine the discourse of *urban music education* with a critical lens in order to delineate how *urban music education* is perceived and reproduced within the music education structure. In the following section, I review strategies for discourse analysis and discuss main tenets of discourse analysis espoused by critical discourse analysis scholars. Additional definitions and descriptions of discourse are included.

Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis (DA) is a method of evaluating language and language use to determine its role in social networks. Although multiple scholars have approached DA with various techniques and theoretical frameworks, each researcher has a methodology with part of the focus given to language. Language, offers Fairclough (2001b), is an integral element of social processes; language is shaped by the social functions it has come to serve. Language, therefore, acts as one of dominant tools in the creation of discourse.

Multiple aspects of language have been isolated and analyzed by discourse analysis scholars in order to examine how the world is constructed and understood through the words and sentences used in communication (Wodak, 2001). The lingual decisions made in societal structures produce discourses that serve as frameworks for understanding a specific version of reality. DA scholars examine a structure, what is being said within it (either directly or implicitly), and how those messages (what is being said) frame a discursive community (Rogers, 2004).

The study of discourse interests scholars in multiple disciplines, including philosophy, sociology, social psychology, linguistics, sociolinguistics, and education. Since the definition of "discourse" is fluid among and between scholars of different disciplinary perspectives (Potter, 2008), DA scholars must choose among and between analytical approaches most appropriate for specific disciplinary projects. Because DA has been used in different disciplines and for different research questions, multiple approaches exist; there is not a single methodological standard.

Linguist scholars first utilized the term "discourse analysis" in the early 1950s. Zellig Harris (1909–1992), advisor to Noam Chomsky, is credited as the first person to analyze the role of linguistics in discourse (Potter, 2008). In a series of papers on transformational grammar (started in 1952), Harris discusses sentence transformation and the development of discourse. After the publication of the Harris papers, John Sinclair and Malcolm Coulthard (1975) analyzed the dialog between a student and teacher, examining the words exchanged and the meanings inherent in the interaction. They posited that phrases used in the conversation would have a different meaning outside of that context. Potter (2008) claims that Sinclair and Coulthard (1975)

were the first to publish the term DA in print, with Sinclair and Coulthard using a similar structure and methodology as that which Harris employed.

Since the beginnings of DA in the 1950s, researchers have developed differing strategies for this mode of inquiry, and the use of discourse analysis in various disciplines has subsequently increased. One discourse analysis strategy is associated with French cultural historian and philosopher Michel Foucault. Foucault's treatment of discourse allows for an examination of sets of statements that shape knowledge of and within a structure. These statements construct objects and affect subjects, ultimately defining how a group acknowledges and knows reality. Statements take various forms, and Foucault explains that "this is because it (the statement) is not in itself a unit, but a function that cuts across a domain of structures and possible unities" (1969/2010, p. 87). Foucault's work examines statements in order to uncover the strands present in the discourse that shape our knowledge and understanding of specific practices.

Some contemporary DA practices have ties to Foucault's work or his theories on discourse. Two specific branches, critical discourse analysis (CDA) and Foucauldian discourse analysis (FDA), have been shaped by his influences. CDA examines discourse with an emphasis on social critique and aims to uncover structures of power and inequality (van Dijk, 1997). In CDA studies, the researcher analyzes texts to determine patterns of discursive actions. In FDA, a variant of CDA, the analysis focuses on power relationships as expressed through language and routines. The analysis strategy may be similar to CDA, but accounts for political influences on the discourse (Potter, 2008).

CDA is both a method and a technique (Rogers, 2004). In this study, I have chosen printed text as the source material; therefore I will utilize a CDA as the research methodology. According to Fairclough (2001a), CDA can be seen as critical implied linguistics and should be used in conjunction with other theories. For this study, I have elected to use both CDA and Foucault as influences for design and analysis. The next two sections describe aspects of CDA and then the work of Michel Foucault. I return to a description of methods selected for this study in Chapter 3.

Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA is an investigative method that examines how interpretations of statements reinforce power and shape ideology within a social system. As Van Dijk (2001) describes, CDA "focuses on social problems, and especially on the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse or domination. Wherever possible, it does so from a perspective that is consistent with the best interests of dominated groups" (p. 96). In other words, a CDA can create for dominated actors an awareness of deceptions perpetrated in the discourse regarding their roles or positions within a structure. In this overview of CDA, I will briefly discuss issues of power, language, oppression, and change before describing CDA research methods. I also explore each of these topics in subsequent sections of the study in greater detail.

When discourse privileges some people over others, power exists as a relation between actors (Kendall & Wickham, 1999). Power does not manifest on its own; power exists where differences in a structure occur. Through examinations of discourse, CDA scholars uncover tensions and social inequities to determine how power and control are produced, supported, and permitted through the use of language and texts (van Dijk, 1997). As Habermas (in Wodak, 2005) warned, language is a tool of domination and social power; it can legitimize the power structure through the articulation or inference of ideology. Using such a tool, powerful actors oppress those in subordinate positions, promoting behaviors in the structure and situating the discourse.

Relationships of power can be studied in order to produce a critical analysis of different aspects of a structure, including its constituents and the internal power relations, both hidden and visible. For example, critical theorists may view ideology as a tool in the maintenance of unequal power relations and then work to expose discursive actions in order to challenge and expose accepted ideologies (Fuchs & Hofkirchner, 2009). In this study, the structure in which the discourse under examination is located is the music education profession, and multiple components exist within the music education structure. In this structure, actors in positions of power compare urban actors, one faction of the structure, to other parts of the music education structure, most commonly a suburban ideal. The continued comparison of urban actors to other groups emphasizes the tension, inequity, and power present in the music education structure.

When opposition occurs in a structure, language is employed as a weapon of control. As Kendall & Wickham (1999) explain, “power is only exercised in relation to a resistance” (p.50), and in this power struggle, language becomes a shared tool. The powerful and dominant actors of the structure can manipulate the shared language and texts in order to subvert and control other actors of the structure. Language is a tool used by those in a dominant position in order to promote a version of social order and specific ideology. Language remains inert until used by those in power to propagate discourse.

Discursive statements influence practices that marginalize populations or oppress groups of people, thus inscribing practices of inequity. These practices of inequity manifest in perceptible, descriptive threads in the discursive plane that are the result of adherence to and statements of the dominant ideology in society. CDA illuminates the inequalities created through discursive practices and recognizes the disparities forced upon the non-dominant actor group, through discursive practices. As Rogers (2004) explains:

> researchers who use CDA are concerned with a critical theory of the social world, the relationships of language and discourse in the construction and representation of this social world, and a methodology that allows them to describe, interpret, and explain such relationships. (p.1)

Through CDA, the relationships between multiple discursive threads and societal practices can be examined, including notions of power, history, and ideology and as Meyer (2001) notes, “CDA scholars play an advocacy role for groups that suffer from social discrimination” (p.15).

While CDA studies vary based on methods, framework, or topic analyzed, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) outline eight common elements of CDA research:

1. CDA addresses social problems.
2. Power relations are discursive.
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture.
4. Discourse does ideological work.
5. Discourse is historical.
6. The link between text and society is mediated.

7. Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory.
8. Discourse is a form of social action.

Because CDA commonly advocates for an oppressed population within a structure, critics note that the attention to social action fosters a tendency to be overtly political (Meyer, 2001), causing detractors to argue that in some forms of CDA social scientific research becomes entwined with political argumentation (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, & Vetter; 2000). This and other such criticisms of CDA research are discussed later in this chapter.

With considerable ties to advocacy, power, and social justice, some fields more commonly employ CDA as a research strategy than others. Scholars working in fields with ties to social justice or sociology most commonly engage CDA strategies to expose biases that are hidden or blindly accepted within societal structures, thus providing a form of social critique. CDA scholars aim "to make transparent the discursive aspects of social disparities and inequalities" (Meyer, 2001, p. 30). Education researchers, while interested in these topics, have not used CDA methods until recently (Rogers, 2004).

In education, Rogers (2004) urges researchers to examine fundamental problems through a CDA lens in order to provide new clarity or different viewpoints regarding the structures of schools and schooling. For example, she offers that "one of the central concerns in education is the discrepancy in achievement between mainstream and working class and minority children" (p. 11). A CDA could reveal practices and assumptions within the achievement discourse that perpetrate specific ideas or policies and that negatively affect certain groups of children. Similarly, "opportunity" is an abstract idea, given shape by current discourses. Cultural models of opportunity could manifest differently in each student's home discourses; however, the prominence of "opportunity" as seen through a White middle-class lens has come to dominate the school discourse (Rogers, 2004). Rogers maintains that researchers, including scholars in music education, can "describe, interpret, and explain the relationships among language and important educational issues" using CDA (Rogers, 2004, pg. 1), and the same can apply to music education researchers.

As Rogers (2004) notes, “sociocultural learning theorists have not attended to matters of inequity and privilege, nor have critical discourse theorists attended to matters of learning” (pg. 12). CDA is underutilized in educational research and can serve as an effective tool in examining persistent problems. Music education scholars who have an interest in equality issues, social practices, and similar topics have employed CDA in their own research (Dobbs, 2012; Mantie, 2009; Mantie, 2013; Talbot, 2010; Thompson, 2002). Through an investigation of discourse, scholars critique society while simultaneously offering possibilities for more just spaces; CDA could be effective in contributing to a more equitable structure. In this study, I employ CDA techniques to examine the *urban music education* discursive threads present in part of the music education structure.

Elements of Critical Discourse Analysis

No specific method or design for critical discourse analysis studies exists (Meyer, 2001). The researcher must use strategies, tools, and methodologies that work best for her particular project. Since each discourse materializes through different actions and communications, and because a variety of lenses can be used to view each discourse, the researcher must determine a path and tool kit that will be the most beneficial for her work. Data collection and analysis are not standardized, although Meyer (2001) offers that data collection will usually not be completed before the analysis phase begins.

While CDA approaches are as numerous as the researchers who employ them, each study must include elements of “critical,” “discourse,” and “analysis.” In this section, an examination of each of these three elements–in the order of discourse, analysis, and then critical–will help frame contemporary views of CDA as well as this study. Although all CDA studies employ these three elements, the detail of each varies, per the need of the researcher and the project. All CDA is problem-oriented, and yet individual studies may use diverse theoretical and methodological means.

Discourse. Each CDA study examines a specific discourse. As noted earlier in this chapter, a discourse is a system of meanings or organized collection of statements, ideas, and actions that define value and demonstrate meaning within a structure (Jäger, 2001; Kress, 1985;

Rogers, 2004). Discourses simultaneously construct and reflect the social world; discourses are performed because they are expected to be, and as they are performed, they shape the reality of the structure.

Brown and Yule (1983) offer that the analysis of discourse is the analysis of language in use. More contemporary discourse scholars expand that view to include actions other than speech as important factors in discursive formation. As Fairclough (1992) explains, “discourse is…more than just language use: it is language use, whether speech or writing, seen as a type of social practice” (p. 28). In later writings (2001a), Fairclough posits that discourse is not “closed” or “rigid,” but open and therefore susceptible and malleable due to actual interactions and practices within the discourse.

Discourses contain viewpoints and opinions; they are ideological in nature and therefore “other” certain actions or groups. Internal criticism does not affect discourses, for once an opposing opinion is expressed within the discourse, the opposing actor is automatically moved outside the discourse and “othered.” As Rogers (2004) explains, “discourses are always socially, politically, racially, and economically loaded” (p. 6). As previously defined, for the purpose of this study, I will use the term *discourse* to describe sets of statements, ideas, actions, and texts that encapsulate how something is understood and perceived in a specific community.

Analysis. Myriad approaches to analysis exist for CDA projects. Norman Fairclough, James Gee, and Siegfried Jäger, prominent CDA figures, each utilize different methods in their CDA research. Each of their strategies is described below.

Fairclough (1995) utilizes a three-dimensional analytic model of discourse and discourse analysis, which includes three dimensions of discourse and three types of analysis. The three dimensions of discourse are Sociocultural Practice, Discourse Practice, and Text (capitalized in source material). Sociocultural Practice focuses on the immediate situation or present practices that produce discursive conditions at institutional and societal levels, or the “social and cultural goings-on which the communicative event is a part of” (p. 57). Discourse Practice refers to the formation of “text:” how it is produced, how is it disseminated, what relationship is present with other texts, and how it is consumed and interpreted by subjects, or “the processes of text

production and text consumption" (p. 57), especially in ways in which the readership is guided to a preferred reading. The Text dimension "may be written or oral" (p. 57) and focuses on how the text positions actors within the structure, and should not be confused with "text" in the Discourse Practice dimension (Fairclough, 1995; Locke, 2004). This third dimension involves critical linguistics (Fairclough, 1992, p. 73).

In this model, researchers may use three modes of analysis: Explanation, Interpretation, and Description (Fairclough, 1995; Locke, 2004; capitalized in source material). Explanation, the most basic function, is a social analysis and can be applied to the Sociocultural Practice and Discourse Practice dimensions. The second type of analysis, Interpretation, focuses on how text is produced; Interpretation is used with the Discourse Practice dimension and the Text dimension. Description, the third analysis type, is a text analysis and only used with the Text dimension. These six components interact in order to define or clarify a discourse and its actions.

Another essential component of discourse analysis for Fairclough is semiosis, or the performance of a position within a practice. Fairclough sees semiosis as "an irreducible part of material social processes" (2001a, p. 23) that involves verbal and visual language (2001b, p. 24). Reproduced social practices are structured in specific ways that imply and enforce a social order. CDA, in this framework, is the analysis of dialectical relationships between semiosis (the performance of a position) and other elements of social practice, or the social-semiotic perspective of language. According to Fairclough (2001a), each and every practice is a practice of production, and includes productive activity, means of production, social relations, social identities, cultural values, consciousness, and semiosis; all are interrelated. His framework for CDA can be abbreviated as follows:

1. Focus on a social problem with a semiotic aspect.
2. Identify obstacles to deconstructing the problem through analysis of:
    a. the network of practices surrounding it.
    b. the relationship of semiosis to other elements within the particular practice.
    c. the discourse itself (structure, interaction, interdiscursive, linguistic).
3. Consider whether the network practices "need" the problem.

4. Identify ways past the obstacles.

5. Reflect critically on 1–4.

Fairclough's work examines the effects that discourses have on such social behaviors and practices. His work with CDA has influenced numerous scholars, and he is seen as one of the major figures in discourse studies.

Another major figure in CDA, James Gee, focuses on making connections between language "bits" and cultural models or situation meanings/identities (Rogers, 2004). Gee has written extensively on discourse, demarcating the differences between "discourse" and "Discourse." The former refers to bits of grammar or what is said, whereas the latter explains how we value or act in regard to the former. These two ideas, discourse and Discourse, are interrelated, as one cannot exist without the other (Gee, 1996). Gee also argues that discourse is closely tied to the distribution of power within society and is therefore ideological. Language use, then, is not neutral and has specific connotations within a structure.

In his text *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*, Gee (2011) outlines the seven building tasks and four tools of inquiry involved in his method of discourse analysis. The following overview provides a summary of Gee's strategies, clarifying his thoughts on Discourse.

Gee's seven building tasks—Significance, Practices (Activities), Identities, Relationships, Politics (Distribution of Social Goods), Connections, and Sign Systems & Knowledge—represent seven areas of reality constructed through language. Language constructs:

- Significance because we communicate how we value (or do not value) objects/actors;
- Practices (Activities) through language that recognizes sequenced and/or combined actions as an event we engage in;
- Identities by defining our position through word choices (am I speaking like a supervisor or like a co-worker?);
- Relationships because communication is a social act and how we communicate shapes the relationship;
- Politics (Distribution of Social Goods) by building perspective on social goods and contributing praise, guilt, blame, etc.;

- Connections through rendering objects as relevant to each other (or not); and
- Sign Systems & Knowledge through privileging certain language types or varieties over others. (2011, pp. 121–122)

Gee employs four tools of inquiry to examine how people construct practices and build identities: Social Languages, Discourses, Conversations, and Intertextuality (2011, pp. 46–51, capitalization in source material). Social Language inquiry dissects different languages, including vernacular language and technical language. The use of different social languages frames identity; an actor can talk "like" a lawyer at work, but use different language when at home playing with an infant. Discourse enables an actor to develop an accepted identity and discourse inquiry peels back layers to determine if an actor can "talk the talk and walk the walk" (p. 28). For example, a person identifying as a police officer will have to speak like an officer (know codes, recite rights, etc.), but will also need to know how to dress like an officer, act like an officer, use a weapon like an officer, and other actions (not all verbal) that are regulated in the Discourse of "police officer." Conversation Inquiry focuses on talk and writing in a social group; the conversation is centered around themes. Themed conversations have multiple sides (consider healthcare, for example) and when actors participate in conversations they know various arguments of the topic and take sides. Participants in the conversation group people into sides of the debate, knowing who stands on which side (Gee, 2011). The most different inquiry tool in Gee's set is Intertextuality. In Intertexuality, a cross-reference is made from one text to another text, across text type or category; one text is quoted or alluded to from another source. An example would be a poster of the composer J. S. Bach with the text "I'll be Bach" inscribed on it. Here a reference is made to the Terminator/Arnold Schwarzenegger on a poster of a classical music composer: a cross-textual reference.

Language influences Discourse in multiple ways, thereby necessitating strategies that provide a comprehensive framework for analysis. Gee's methodology is helpful because it provides numerous strategies to address the various ways that language can influence Discourse, and offers different levels of analysis to consider. According to Gee (2011), "a discourse analysis involves asking questions about how language, at a given time and place, is

used to engage in the seven building tasks" (p. 121). The seven building tasks are "big questions" that force the CDA scholar to examine meaning, social context, discourse, and perceived reality from various perspectives.

Jäger, a third prominent CDA scholar, believes that text has a cultural connotation and that media can influence the meaning of texts. He summarizes his methodological approach in a five-step plan (Jäger, 2001). In the first step, the researcher must provide a concise description and characterization of the discourse plane. The "discourse plane," in Jäger's writing, is the detail under examination and is couched within a specific discourse (Jäger & Maier, 2009, p.48). Selecting the corpus involves investigating an appropriate collection of materials and therefore in the second step the researcher must develop and process the archives for data collection. Meyer (2001) states that CDA studies frequently examine smaller corpora determined to be typical to a discourse. Determining what will be analyzed and how to approach that material is pertinent to the process and affects the process in the subsequent steps of Jäger's method.

Next, in step three, the researcher performs a structural analysis. In a structural analysis, materials must be evaluated with respect to the discourse in question; the investigator determines how artifacts are connected to a larger discourse. A detailed analysis of one to a few items occurs next, in the fourth step, with the researcher's selection of items being representative of materials that are typical to the collection. These few texts are thoroughly examined and analyzed, and the researcher draws connections between that analysis and the discourse or discursive practices. In the final step, an overall analysis of the entire collection is completed, inclusive of reflections and concluding statements.

Obvious differences and similarities can be found in the approaches of Fairclough, Gee, and Jäger. Fairclough and Jäger draw more heavily on Foucault than Gee. Jäger relies on the use of metaphors while Fairclough applies what other scholars describe as functional systematic grammar (Kendall, 2007). CDA researchers often draw from one or more of these techniques as they develop their own methods. Regardless of the approach employed, a thorough CDA analysis examines what is said as well as what is left out. The production, as well as the exclusion, of information is paramount in CDA, for local, institutional, and societal structures construct and are

constructed by discourses. Historical context may cause discourses to shift or change over time, and the inclusion and exclusion of particular information bits within a discourse at a specific point should be examined in the analysis phase of a CDA. In Chapter 3, I will delineate methods used in this CDA study.

Critical. The third element of "critical" in CDA, with "discourse" and "analysis," implies that the investigator will employ an element of critical theory in the project. This "critical" component of CDA is not neutral. Analysis is marked with political undertones and seeks to uncover sources of inequality. Critical theory researchers want to expose how and why some patterns or discourses are privileged over others, and they look for and interrogate links between discourses and social positions. As Fuchs and Hofkirchner (2009) explain, "critical theory does not accept existing social structures as they are, it is not interested in society as it is, but in what society could be and can become" (p. 118).

Critical theory deconstructs and shows possible alternatives to accepted ideologies. It "questions the hidden assumptions and purposes of competing theories and existing forms of practice" (Bronner, 2011, p.1). Social struggles and upheaval usually benefit the non-dominant population and therefore possess the potential for social change and improvement (Fuchs & Hofkirchner, 2009). Using a critical lens or lenses, a scholar examines structures of oppression and investigates the benefits received by certain classes at the expense of others.

Furthermore, critical theorists argue that the people in the positions of power create discourse in order to control the functions of the structure, causing an eradication of neutrality. Although absolute truth is not wholly shared among all actors in the structure, those assuming a position of neutrality also assume that "truth" does not favor any particular instances, while from the critical theory perspective "truth" is anything but unbiased. Critical theorists question the "arbitrary exercise of institutional authority" (Bronner, 2011, p. 2), a form of structural control that fosters selected "truths" for individual actors. Critical theory involves examining the tensions between structural control of the individual and personal agency of the individual and attempts to account for injustices and discrimination within the structure (Fairclough, 2001a). Gee (2004)

surmises that a CDA that does *not* combine a textual analysis with sociopolitical theories of structures is not a complete CDA.

From a critical perspective, all thought is mediated through power relations, allowing language to play a major role in the formation of subjectivity[10] (Locke, 2004). Therefore, inequity present within power relations appears as a social norm. When such oppression is accepted as consensus, a form of hegemony emerges, allowing for control of the less powerful by those with power. Critical theory contests hegemony. The role of a CDA scholar is to pierce "the opacity of these arrangements of social dominance" (p. 32), which are usually constructed via power and discourse.

In these relationships of dominance, "the dominant culture produces habits of subservience on the part of the ruled" (Bronner, 2011, p. 22). A CDA can "produce and convey critical knowledge that enables human beings to emancipate themselves from forms of domination through self-reflection" (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). In other words, discourses reproduce social domination, and if a CDA can create an awareness of domination and how it is produced and reproduced, the possibility of a more just space becomes more probable. The goal of critical theorists centers on an awakening of the oppressed, allowing the oppressed populations an understanding of their current situation and how it may become different (Bronner, 2011; Friere, 2000) while also helping others who are not oppressed or part of the normalized aspects of society become aware of discourses, etc.

Critiques of CDA

Some scholars take issue with the use of CDA as a research method. Critics perceive the use of political and social ideologies within CDA frameworks as a major issue (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Meyer, 2001), and opponents of CDA argue that CDA scholars simply promote their political opinions by finding texts that may be manipulated to support their statements

[10] Subjectivity is the collection of experiences, beliefs, and understandings that influences a person's interpretation of truth or reality. Used in opposition to "objectivity," subjectivity is an organization of reality based on personal perspectives whereas objectivity is a view of truth free from any personal influence (Solomon, 2005).

(Rogers, 2004). In CDA, it has been suggested, political and social opinions are projected onto the data rather than being discovered through the analysis of the data.

The potential for prejudice and selectivity of texts bothers CDA critics. Therefore, CDA scholars must be explicit about their position within the discourse they are exploring. Citing Kant, Fairclough (1995) reiterates that research cannot be free of value judgments and researchers will inadvertently reflect their own ideology into their work; therefore CDA scholars must be aware of and disclose their biases. CDA does involve a tone and voice in hopes of uncovering disparities within a structure.

Accusations of bias within CDA focus on the possibility that scholars select an ideological position and commit to it before the acquisition of data. In other words, those who use CDA may select texts that will support their preferred interpretation. To combat this opposition, authors of CDA studies must be diligent, explicit about their positions, and forthcoming about their commitments (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). As Meyer (2001) suggests, scholars should want to do work in areas that are of interest to them, and because of that, research always is value-laden to some extent.

The most frequently cited criticisms of CDA, however, encompass the lack of systematic methodology and rigor (Meyer, 2001). Since each CDA is unique, no methodological consistency and therefore no established means of checking for rigor exist. CDA scholars have offered ways to assess quality and completion within their respective frameworks. Meyer (2001) collected multiple strategies from major figures in the field: Jäger, van Dijk, and Wodak. According to Meyer, Jäger posits that a CDA is complete if a new analysis of the same material would yield a similar result; Van Dijk offers that once the results of a CDA are made accessible to the population being investigated, the work is complete; for Wodak, triangulation of multiple components, including text, social practices, and historical or sociopolitical functions, assures a complete and thorough analysis.

Critiques of CDA have drawn negative attention to the method, and it is left to the individual CDA scholar to account for these potential objections as she constructs her study and composes her final document. Being able to justify political stances and provide evidence of rigor

give credence to a CDA study and help it to be better received by the broader research community. I will describe my strategies to ensure quality and completion in Chapter 3. In the next section I focus on Foucault, providing biographical information and describing some of his major ideas and works.

Michel Foucault

Downing (2008) describes the work of Foucault as a set of texts that does not necessarily provide readers with any new knowledge. Foucault tells us what we already know and does not teach us new ways of knowing that knowledge. What Foucault does do, however, is invite "us to share in a radical calling into question of the ways in which knowledge itself operates" (p. vii). It seems appropriate, then, to utilize a Foucauldian lens within this CDA. I expose threads of the *urban music education* discourse, and I question the ways that the music education profession has been taught to perceive and reproduce *urban music education*. As Foucault wondered, "if you know when you began [writing] a book what you would say at the end, do you think that you would have the courage to write it? The game is worthwhile in so far as we don't know what will be the end" (Foucault, 1982). Such philosophical ideas serve as a foundation for this study.

Michel Foucault (1926–1984) was a French social theorist, philosopher, historian, and critic. He is most noted for his writings on power, knowledge, and control. Using these ideas as a foundation for works in his *oeuvre*, Foucault produced critical studies of institutions, examining established systems of psychiatry, prison systems, and medicine. Foucault employed various strategies of investigation across his work, which is commonly divided into three groups: archaeology, genealogy, and care of self. This division represents various foci of Foucault's writing: knowledge, power, and ethics (Mantie, 2012b).

The examination and documentation of discourses relies on the analysis of language. Foucault questioned, in *The Order of Things* (1966/1994), whether experiences and the ability to think were limited due to the constraints of language. Is what we are able to experience limited by our ability to express ourselves? Our thoughts may be restricted, he offers, through our inability to escape a narrow framework of words. Our limited vocabulary controls how we experience and perceive our reality.

Foucault “refused to align himself with any major traditions of Western social thought” (Ball, 1990, pg. 2), and yet his work continues to influence scholars across multiple disciplines. The man who refused to fit into any pre-existing discourse became the most cited author in the humanities (*Times Higher Education*, 2009).

Background. Foucault, born into a middle-class family in Poitiers, France, became interested in philosophy during his schooling. While his father urged him to become a surgeon, Foucault followed a different path, spending considerable time with Jean Hyppolite, a French philosopher interested in history and existentialism (Horrocks, 2009). Foucault’s early philosophical thoughts were positioned within similar frameworks and eventually expanded to include Nietzschian ideas and concepts.

In 1960, Foucault assumed his first academic position. During his six years at the University of Clermont-Ferrand, Foucault published his first three works, including his important first text, *Madness and Civilization* (1961). During this era of the early 1960s, Foucault examined how ideas were historically constructed, and thus was labeled a structuralist. At this point in his career, Foucault aligned himself with structuralism, and conceded that his writings during this time period reflect structuralist concepts. Structuralism attempts to construct universal templates that explain all situations, and Foucault did this from a historical standpoint, looking for patterns and changes in the patterns, but he did not offer his templates to explain multiple different episodes and instances. Later experiences shaped Foucault’s philosophies, and changes in thought are evident in his work.

After some time teaching in Tunisia (1966–8), Foucault returned to France and became involved in left-wing movements. He advocated for organizations and individuals associated with the liberal or left end of the French political spectrum, and during the 1970s he wrote some of his most influential work. His studies on prison systems and human sexuality were written at the prestigious Collége de France, where he held the chair of the History of Systems of Thought. He served in this position from 1970 until his death in 1984. Foucault died in Paris in 1984 as a result of complications from AIDS. He was the first famous French figure to have their death attributed to the disease.

While he has been labeled both a poststructuralist and a postmodernist, Foucault rejected those labels and preferred to view his work as products of modernity (Markley, 1999). Even with Foucault's objection to such labels, authors continue to write about his works and refer to him as a post-structuralist. Foucault "rejected the notion central to structuralism as a system of *universal rules* or *elementary structures* that underpinned history and explained it in surface appearances" (Olssen, 2010, p. 192). His position "assumes that the regularities identified are not the same in all historical periods and in all cultures, but rather are specific to particular times and places" (p. 192). Foucault also rejected the structuralist concept of the subject; the idea of a timeless subject as the source of meaning making established a status quo and connected immutable identities to individuals, diminishing the possibility for change.

Oksala (2007) describes Foucault as a social constructivist. Social constructivists posit that people and their experiences are the result of social practices, not natural ones, and that these social practices construct identity. During his lifetime Foucault recognized differences among the patterns of thought in Europe, and his focus on non-homogeneity caused him to reject the label of "structuralist." Structuralism, Foucault (1969/2010) argues, looks at the similarities within a discourse, and his methods uncover the differences in discursive practices in order to determine what did or did not change over time and how actions historically affect the discourse. Foucault accounts for the differences in behaviors accepted as normative in a structure, noting what promotes change in discourse.

Foucault's shift in thinking about discourse and discursive practices was in part a reaction to the Existentialism prevalent among scholars of his time, which neglected to consider how language constructs reality. Existentialists focused on a subject-centered philosophy, whereas some post-structuralists removed the subject from the center. Foucault's work is more aligned with French historical epistemology, which explores discontinuities in discourse and rejects typical historical narratives (Oksala, 2007). Scholars working in these frameworks take a critical view of history and historical narratives. Historical narratives partly shape subject matter through current discursive ideas, and current thoughts and perceptions may interfere with documenting historically accurate discourses.

To situate Foucault's philosophical views as part of my methodology and analysis, I will now discuss two of Foucault's approaches, archaeology and genealogy, and summarize three of his major works most relevant to my study.

Archaeology. Parts of Foucault's earlier examination of discourse and knowledge systems involved the use of what he referred to as archaeology. Archaeology, at its core, is the examination of the past to better understand the present. Hacking (1986) offers that Foucault's methodology reorganizes the past in order to rethink the present. In this type of historical account, the researcher meticulously evaluates sets of statements to determine the content of available discourses at a given time. This assessment of statements uncovers the systems of values present during a specific period. In an archaeology, these values demonstrate the "history of what operates on people to make them think in a certain way, without their being necessarily aware of these forces of influence" (Downing, 2008, p. 33).

Archaeology "turns familiar truisms into doubt or chaos" (Hacking, 1986, p. 27), forcing the reader to evaluate how past practices have shaped current behaviors and beliefs. Foucault's methodology examines how the past still governs and delimits our "ability to think in certain ways" (Downing, 2008, p. 10) and how the past may still retain control over discourses. A thorough dissection of the past can expose the current state of the present, providing an articulate "history of the conditions necessary for given things, phenomena, or people to occur" (p. 10).

Gutting (2005) posits, "in a given domain, there are substantial constraints on how people are able to think" (p. 32). Unseen and unarticulated forces restrict the range of thought; archaeology attempts to address some of those undiscovered forces within a history that so shape known structures. Within structures, actors function in a "conceptual environment that determines and limits them in ways they will not know" (Gutting, 2005, p. 33). The role of the archaeologist, then, is to analyze the "conditions necessary for a given system of thought to come into being and impose itself authoritatively" (Downing, 2008, p. 8). Foucault states that "knowledge appears to be profoundly linked to a whole series of power effects. Archaeology is essentially this detection" (Foucault, 2004).

Archaeology allows the researcher to focus on what has been said or produced by a set of statements, instead of decoding meaning. Archaeology "treats discourses, such as medicine, as practices that form the objects of which they speak" (Horrocks, 2009, p. 64). This "excavation of unconsciously organized sentiments of thought" (p. 64) ignores individuals and their histories, and rather examines impersonal "structures of knowledge." Foucault uses archaeology in *Birth of the Clinic* (1963/1988) to trace the development of the medical profession. He also utilizes this methodology in *Madness & Civilization* (1964/1988) and *The Order of* Things (1966/1994), although none of these works employ the exact same procedures for analysis. In a subsequent document, *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969/2010), Foucault expounds on his methodology and here explains more about his methodological choices than he does any in other works in his *oeuvre*.

Genealogy. Foucault's later historical works employ a methodology that involves an examination of discourse and power. This method, genealogy, utilizes a "wider scope than archaeology" (Davidson, 1986, p. 224) and imitates procedures used by Nietzsche (Downing, 2008). *Discipline and Punish* (1975/1995), Foucault's most famous genealogy, traces the history of the penal system and connects changes in the system to changes in power. This work, like his other genealogies, incorporates themes of power, oppression, and the body (Downing, 2008). Although genealogies document historical moments and connect them to changing discourses, Foucault's genealogies are "suspicious of grand narratives" and "single causes for historical change and value-laden teleologies of progress" (Downing, 2008, p. 15). Instead, these histories focus on small, multiple changes over time that lead to changes in thought. Gutting (2005) explains that Foucault called genealogy "a history of the present" (p. 50) that looks at a current, present structure and then deconstructs it to better understand both the present and any "unjustified claims of authority." Discourse can become a system of constraint, and genealogy searches out the "truths" or the origins of the "specific claims to truth" (Davidson, 1986, p. 224).

As CDA scholars note, "truth," while socially and historically situated, has connections to power. Foucault calls truth into question and catalogues "the invention of forms of knowledge and the conditions of their crystallization into institutions of authority" (Downing, 2008, p. 13). The area

of focus in a genealogy is the relationship between these systems of truth and power structures; the actors of the structure have the power to create the truths that are accepted as discourse. As Davidson (1986) offers, genealogy "shows rather that the origin of what we take to be rational, the bearer of truth, is rooted in domination, subjugation, the relationship of forces – in a word – power" (p. 225).

Whereas archaeology seeks to be neutral in its discoveries, genealogy aims to expose the effects of power on the conception of "truth." As Downing (2008) explains, power struggles have occurred throughout time, but if the outcomes of power struggles had been different, our ideas and notions regarding what we know and claim to be "truth" would now manifest in radically different ways (p. 13). Foucault's genealogical method allowed a "new approach to the problems of power in modern societies" (Davidson, 1986, p. 225) that forces an evaluation of truths and perception of power. As Downing (2008) warns, Foucault's work forces us to examine "whose discourse is being evoked and how seriously we are to take it" (p. 16).

Using These Tools. The discourse of *urban music education* exists within the connections made between statements, beliefs, and actions in the discursive plane. Statements form within a given discourse, provided that established rules and rituals allow them to manifest. Foucault argues that the author of statements is irrelevant; the fact that the statement exists in the discourse is the only idea worthy of investigation (Foucault, 1977). The author exists in a structure, and that structure governs what can be produced in terms of discourse.

According to Foucault, an individual must make an attempt to understand how the discourse is shaped without pondering about the intent of the author (Foucault, 1977). As he asks in the essay "What Is an Author?," "what difference does it make who is speaking" (p. 1)? Foucault argues that statements should be evaluated based on *what* is said, not on the intentions of the writer. Author prominence and what is a "truth" are historically and culturally determined and changing; the author of a statement therefore remains a constraint and a contingency.

Attributing a discursive statement to an author implies that the author is solely responsible for the thought in the discourse, when rather the author is acting as an *agent of the structure*—the structure remains the controlling actor of the discourse. Because of this, Foucault

and other authors (i.e., Mantie, 2009) elect to omit the use of proper names in their archaeology and genealogy research. The inclusion of proper names, according to Mantie (2009), suggests "autonomous agents" instead of complete discursive systems (p. 111).

While I agree with the reasoning that leads them to this decision, I am consciously making alternate decisions in this study. One of my goals in this CDA of *urban music education* is to demonstrate how rampant discursive statements are within the corpus over time, in multiple places, and from multiple actors; therefore I will cite author, journal, and year of statements used in this analysis. While I agree with Mantie when he writes that the names of singular authors have no bearing on the "regimes of truth," I have decided that the inclusion of these data will contribute to additional discussions of *urban music education*.

I consider *urban music education* a socially constructed discursive formation rather than an existing, natural object. Archaeology, from a Foucauldian perspective, assists in uncovering potential reasons for how claims come to exist as accepted statements in the discursive plane and thrive in the corpus. As Prado (2000) explains, "to do archaeology is precisely to understand how something like a discursive structure comes to be considered an underlying reality" (p. 28). Using Foucault's work as inspiration for a methodological framework, this investigation examines potential conditions for the production of truth and knowledge.

Truth and knowledge, according to Foucault (1975/1995), are products of power. This component of power is essential to the genealogical aspects of my investigation. Uncovering the power-knowledge-truth nexus within *urban music education* may help articulate how beliefs in the discursive plane have come to be accepted, or at least uncover what ideas in the corpus are frequent and believed. This examination does not aim to articulate "why" these ideas exist, but rather provide an explanation of "how" these ideas emerge in the structure. This type of approach involves a look at the past in order to see how the discourse was historically constituted.

Disciplines and behaviors are reproduced through discourse, and both social and historical aspects contribute to the power structure that controls a discursive plane. Some archaeologies and genealogies "reconstruct history through the study of linguistic debris" (Jacobson, 2001), allowing "torchbearers of a discourse [to] construct the narrative" (Khalema,

2011). This analysis will examine how the *urban music education* narrative is being created, furthered, and defined through discourse. The "torchbearers" in this study are the named authors who write about *urban music education* and construct and perpetuate the discourse. Unconscious rules govern the structure and produce discourse accepted and reproduced by what Foucault refers to as the docile bodies.[11] An investigation into *urban music education* opens discursive practices to questions. As asked in Chapter 1, what does the *urban music education* discourse transmit, reproduce, reinforce, and expose? And furthermore, do classification and labeling serve as tools for normalization? A critical examination may start to provide a framework to address such questions. An overview of selected Foucault texts provides additional foundation for such an examination.

***Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, 1961.**

Foucault's first major text, *Madness and Civilization*, was a product of his dissertation work; the book explores discursive practices related to the concept of madness. Foucault examines ideas, institutions, and practices related to madness, as well as art and literature referencing the topic. Foucault begins his analysis with the Middle Ages (5^{th}–15^{th} centuries), when lepers were treated as undesirables in society, and as leprosy decreased over time, madness took the place of leprosy as a category used to marginalize people. In the Middle Ages, it was customary to "display the insane" (Foucault, 1964/1988, p. 68), allowing the public to view those labeled as mad. Over time, this practice altered and the "mad" were hidden from view. Removing selected different groups or people from society due to madness has been employed since the late fifteenth century, and Foucault prepares a timeline that demonstrates actions against those determined to be suffering from madness: the use of a ship of fools to remove them from society, the use of institutions to house them away from "normal" people, the establishment of ideas that madness is the opposite of reason, and the declaration of madness as a mental illness.

[11] I will discuss the term *docile bodies* in more depth in later sections of the document. Foucault uses the term to describe "one that may be subjected, used, transformed, and improved…through strict regiment of disciplinary acts" (1995, p. 136) instead of violence or torture. People in authority can easily control docile bodies because they have been conditioned to reproduce acceptable/normal behavior.

As these practices were accepted in societies, madness and eventually mental illness became more defined, which allowed individuals in positions of power within structures to categorize others as "mad" and justify actions that separated them. Similarly, actions that were seen as having the potential to normalize madness—straightjackets, aversion therapy, etc.—were brutal and yet accepted by most in society because such actions were explained as methods to help outsiders (those deemed mad) become more homogenized. Foucault explains that people reproduce actions, even if they are not aware of the consequences of those actions.

Foucault also explores the role of poverty in a well-governed state in *Madness and Civilization* (1964/1988). While no citizen desires poverty or chooses to be poor, Foucault explains that poverty is a necessary part of economic management. He argues that poverty was "necessary because it could not be suppressed, this role of poverty was necessary too because it made wealth possible" (p. 229). In other words, the pauper becomes a needed fixture in society, serving as a marker for how a lack of wealth manifests. Foucault's comment that "a people would be poor which has no paupers" (p. 230) demonstrates the role of divisions, labels, and norms he sees within society. I will connect these ideas from Foucault to music education, focusing on the need to label "urban" as other so as to elevate non-urban actors. Foucault's interest in power and knowledge is evident in *Madness and Civilization*, and such themes are evident throughout his *oeuvre*.

***The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, 1969.** In this text, Foucault delves deepest into his methodology. In his description of his methodological choices, Foucault explains his treatment of "statements." He admits that his definition of "statement" varies as he needs it to, writing "must we admit in the end that the statement cannot possess a character of its own and that it cannot be defined?" (p. 84)

Statements, generally, are items to be considered for analysis, and Foucault's intent in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969/2010) is to determine how statements become discursively meaningful within specific discourses. Statements can be words, phrases, or longer strands of texts, and while syntax and semantics help shape the content of a statement, Foucault posits that more is needed to grasp understanding (p. 84); grammar alone is inadequate for finding meaning

in statements. Statements are understood through a complicated network of rules that provide context and understanding for the recipient. Context and understanding are transmitted through discursive actions, previously defined as behaviors accepted as normative in a structure, but not through semantics, according to Foucault.

As noted earlier, Foucault is interested in the development of truth and meaning, and in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* he examines the conditions necessary for their existence. Since discursive actions propagate what is true or has meaning, and all discursive actions are contextual and historically based (Wodak, 2005), Foucault examines what has been *presented* as a truth and how that truth was validated rather than engaging in deep interpretation or validation of what is *considered* to be true. Similarly in this study, I will examine what has been presented as "truth" in statements made about *urban music education*.

***Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 1975.** In *Discipline and Punish*, one of his most successful and important works, Foucault describes the emergence of prisons in Europe. In a detailed explanation of the European prison system, Foucault delineates his views on power and knowledge, which he frequently links together as one entity, power-knowledge. He explores the gradual differences over time in the punishment of convicts through the juxtaposition of "Monarchical Punishment" and "Disciplinary Punishment," two of the "Technologies of Punishment" he outlines.

Foucault (1975/1995) describes how, over a span of eighty years, punishment moved from brutal public executions (Monarchical Punishment) to a professional-controlled system of punishment (Disciplinary Punishment). During the Monarchical period, those in authority could publicly use brutal force in disciplinary actions, such as public hangings or stockades (p. 8). In a mere eight decades, however, power over punishment moved from the single Monarch to members of the general public, such that "a whole set of assessing, diagnostic, prognostic, normative judgments concerning the criminal have become lodged in the framework of penal judgment" (p. 19). The types of disciplinary and punishment actions altered in ways that allowed for the general population to have more of an effect on the prisoner. Actors such as wardens,

lawyers, psychologists, psychiatrists, and policemen could affect the type of punishment, length of confinement, and other details regarding the prisoner and his sentence.

In the text, Foucault also describes how power affected discipline and the selection of soldiers in different historical eras. Soldiers in the seventeenth century were selected based on their general characteristics, such as height and marksmanship. In the eighteenth century a shift in thought occurred, changing the military selection process in Europe. Soldiers, once thought of as men "born" to become soldiers due to their physical traits, instead became trainable products of a society's disciplined regimen. Power and discipline became skills that could be learned or trained; this discipline produces "subjected and practiced bodies, 'docile' bodies" (p. 138) that help the controlling actors retain power.

Knowledge and power are central to Foucault's analysis in *Discipline and Punish*. He forces the reader to question concepts such as justice and equality; he raises concerns about the origin of these terms, who benefits from their use, and whose power or knowledge changes with the incorporation of these ideas. A notable and often-cited discussion about power is included in this work; Foucault references Jeremy Bentham's panopticon, a prison structure in which one guard is able to watch over multiple prisoners at the same time while remaining unseen. The prisoners are aware of the guard's presence, yet are unable to determine if they are being observed. Foucault, in support of the panopticon's surveillance system, notes that in this structure, "power should be visible and unverifiable" (p. 201).

Foucault elaborates on the structure and the power of the unseen guard within the panopticon, then compares that to modern prisons, where the guards and disciplinarians are more visible. Through this visibility, control increases on an individual level. "Visibility," says Foucault, "is a trap" (p. 200) allowing for substantial surveillance. More information can be recorded and then tracked through multiple systems throughout life, and not just in prison systems. Foucault likens this power-knowledge control idea to schools and corporations. He suggests that all people are connected through the surveillance of some humans by others. Foucault asks, "is it surprising that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which

all resemble prisons" (p. 228)? Later in this study, I return to themes of surveillance and docile bodies in analysis and discussion sections.

Foucauldian Themes

Across his body of literature, Foucault revisits a variety of ideas that have become synonymous with Foucault and are part of his legacy. Here I present selected legacy themes that are relevant to the framework of this study of *urban music education*. Foucault's methods result in writings that force the reader to reconsider what they know to be true, framing the theme *Reconsider*. Foucault's thoughts on labels and categories are an essential underpinning of this study, and will be explored in theme *Labels*. Labels are related to both power and surveillance; those topics are explored throughout the document, including a section of Chapter 6.

Reconsider. As a thinker, Foucault constantly questioned how society viewed itself; he explored questions that do not have defined answers and ones that force us to think about how we can challenge and change the accepted normalcy surrounding us. He reasoned, in a 1983 interview, that "since these things have been made, they can be unmade, as long as we know how it was that they were made" (Raulet, 1983, p. 202). Those words provide the reader a sense of Foucault's motivations: he challenges us to discover *how* things came to be, and then to decide how they can be something else or exist in a different way. For example, in his work on the concept of madness, Foucault's goal was to change the reader in order to prevent the reader from "always being the same or from having the same relations with things and others" (Foucault, 1964/1988, p. 246).

The concept of rethinking accepted realities reappears in Foucault's texts, including his 1976 text *The History of Sexuality, Volume 2*: *The Use of Pleasure,* where he writes that the aim of philosophy is different than history because in the former, the purpose is to "learn to what extent the effort to think one's own history can be free thought from what it silently thinks, and so enable it to think differently" (Foucault, 1984/1990, p. 9). Evaluating histories allows us to criticize the character of our practices and form of thinking, urging us to question what we do and why we do it. Histories allow us to understand the past, but also influence the way we perceive the

present. Foucault's *oeuvre* examines histories and challenges the reader to consider how accepted practices become truths.

As previously stated, Foucault's works examine how truths come to be accepted. In his histories of madness, medicine, and prisons, Foucault challenges perceived understanding of these discourses and interrogates our accepted truths. Archaeology and genealogy, after all, outline how "what is" came to be, and a critical examination can suggest how "what is" may have become something else (Foucault, 1969/2010). In this CDA, I follow Foucault's lead and examine the discourse of *urban music education*, excavating truths in order to clarify and question the discourse.

Labels. Labels and categorizations are other common themes in Foucault's work. In *Madness and Civilization* (1964/1988) Foucault explains that the categories in which we place people come into use only when there is a need to sort people into such categories. Categories are created to organize, or as Foucault suggests, control people (power). Identities of people are constructed through their labels, or lack of labels, the latter insinuating that they are normal, healthy, or acceptable. The production and projection of labels exists to announce or categorize something as deviant or not deviant.

For example, in his discussion of the concept of "madness" (1964/1988), Foucault articulates the following development of such a label:

- Actors that fall outside of a normal range become linked with a need for confinement.
- Actors become excluded or ignored, then later feared.
- Fear leads to punishment; the fear manifests in cultural attitudes and practices and labels.
- Labels become a variable social construct, not rooted in scientific data.

Other terms or concepts can be considered through this lens, including urban. Urban actors have been portrayed in the discourse as abnormal, labeled as different, and relegated to an alternate category based on school address. Once noticed as not adhering to an ideal of "normal," non-dominant actors are viewed as deviant and therefore subjected to negative treatment courtesy of the dominant population.

Foucault describes how social and political interests of the dominant group fund and encourage specific projects, therefore promoting their preferred truths, which in turn influence societal beliefs and needs (Foucault, 1975/1995). In myriad structures, including schools, actors work towards the advancement of specific beliefs. Actors in the positions of power within the structure advance their own agendas through encouraging specific projects that produce desired results in order to shape the discourse of the broader society and establish norms. Norms then become associated with certain terms or labels, or absence of such; usually norms are defined by the absence of a label, and labels are reserved for deviant behaviors.

The establishment of norms reduces individuality, which causes a retreat to the societally accepted version of "normal" (Oskala, 2007). The definition of what is considered to be "normal" forces most non-dominant peoples to adapt to dominant discourses, all the while empowering the dominant population to control what is seen as acceptable. However, when individuals free themselves from one set of norms, they immediately adopt a different set of norms, which could be just as or more normalizing. Rejecting a label causes one to accept a different label, continuing the categorization of self and others, and adherence to defined norms within the power system.

In society, norms and categories are established through dominant members in the power structure. Once these norms are in place, those who are not considered "normal" become othered through sets of labels or categorization. Foucault (1969/2010) addresses the practice of surveillance and labeling as means to subjugate a population. The dominant group is frequently unkind and not accepting of others, who may be punished for being different; the punishment may be physical, mental, or societal. These norms that allow for punishment are arbitrary, not based in factual data, and therefore are malleable in order to continue to serve the dominant group as it changes. In this study, I will examine how the music education structure labels urban actors, in turn labeling a population and forcing urban actors into a lesser position.

So Why Foucault?

Foucauldian frameworks force researchers to question accepted "truths" and to consider how things may have been otherwise if other strands in the discourse had become dominant.

Foucault's own discourse analysis studies examine how accepted societal labels, categories, and systems of power developed over time, focusing on points of change within historical contexts. Using a Foucauldian lens allows me to question not only what the *urban music education* discourse is, but also to examine how control relegates other actors in the structure to positions of less power, knowledge, and/or resources. In the next section, I will address other studies that have utilized Foucauldian lenses, discourse analysis methodologies, and similar frameworks to those of my own study.

Viewpoints in the Literature

In this section, I review studies that utilize discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, or Foucauldian frameworks, focusing on aspects of those studies that are similar to my own study. The literature review highlights music education studies using Foucauldian lenses and discourse analysis, music education studies examining discourse, arts education studies including critical discourse analysis (CDA) and Foucault, and education research that employs discourse analysis (DA) and Foucauldian frameworks. I also highlight studies in other disciplines that utilize similar strategies.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA), discursive studies, and Foucauldian framework studies appear in multiple disciplines and with increasing frequency in the last ten years. Authors examine varied texts and structures in multiple ways, with some scholars using CDA with or without a Foucauldian lens. Although locating studies with keywords of "Foucault" and "critical discourse analysis" is not difficult, adding the term "music education" severely limits the search results. Music education researchers have been less receptive of CDA practices, and few utilize the theories of Foucault within their studies. Because of this, each study reviewed is unique.

Mantie (2009) uses CDA strategies in his dissertation entitled "Stylizing Lives: Selected Discourses in Instrumental Music Education" in which he examines the content of the *Canadian Band Journal*. Employing corpus linguistics,[12] Mantie teases out selected statements, then delineates the discourses associated with "band." Using a Foucauldian framework, he then

[12] Corpus linguistics is the study of language as it is expressed in texts and documents. This mode of inquiry focuses on natural language used in real life events.

examines how the discourses of school band generate "themes of truth" (p. 1). He posits that over time, band/music has become something to know or learn versus something to do or experience. By analyzing what actors in the band structure say about band, Mantie determines that what we do in band is heavily influenced by what statements we accept about the discourse.

Using DEVONthink Professional computer software, Mantie examined a bounded set of data extracted from the *Canadian Band Journal* (99 issues). The concordance[13] generated from this set of journals allowed Mantie to examine word frequency across the publication and to derive a list of keywords. With the list of keywords established, Mantie returned to the journals in order to extract statements using those terms, which he then analyzed. Drawing from Foucault's ideas on discourse and truth, and through the analysis of the language used to describe "band," Mantie establishes how statements reproduce perceptions of band and how the pedagogical tenets of band have changed over time.

I use a similar process in this examination of *urban music education*. I examine a bound set of data (two journals, 20 years of publication each) and develop a concordance, then extract references made to *urban music education* using specific keywords from the concordance. I analyze those statements and articulate the threads in the discourse of *urban music education* over time. This analysis, similar to Mantie, relies on Foucault's theories of discourse and how truth is produced and reproduced within the music education structure.

Mantie's interest in discourse can be found in other publications. In 2012–2013, Mantie contributed two articles and a book chapter that each focus on a unique aspect of discourse and music education. The book chapter, "Music Education and Avocational Music Making: Examining Discourse Using Techniques from Corpus Linguistics" (2012a), explores the language use of musicians. Mantie compares the language use of band directors (through the analysis of a band journal) to the language use of avocational musicians (in interviews). The avocational musicians were convenience-selected from a university-based ensemble consisting mostly of community members; music majors in the group were not interviewed as part of the study.

[13] A concordance is a list of words that appear within a text. Depending on the software used, concordance information will vary, but concordances do contain the frequency of each unique word in the document or data set.

Using computer software as a tool, Mantie compared the language of the professional band journal and the avocational musician interviews. Most outstanding is the different word frequencies between the two groups. For instance, the word “fun” was present in almost all interviews but largely absent from the band director journal. Furthermore, “literature” was prominent in the band director journals, but not in the interview data. Mantie’s (2012a) study suggests that the way avocational musicians talk about music is different from the established patterns and language of the profession. Differences in language and discourse could provide a reason for the decline of avocational participation in music making post secondary school.

A further inspection of band discourse appears in Mantie’s (2012b) article “Striking Up the Band: Music Education Through a Foucauldian Lens.” In this article, Mantie excavates “the ways in which people constitute their relationship with and to music in and through large ensemble music participation, primarily as this manifested in sites of formal education” (p. 99). Through a critical examination of statements, Mantie offers that over time, “the discourse of band performance changed from one of supplying music in order to create a sense of community and personal enjoyment to one of edification through exposure to Art” (p. 99). In this study, Mantie relies heavily on Foucault in both his treatment of statements and his use of a care of self/ethics framework.

Mantie (2013) also analyzed the discourse of popular music pedagogy. Examining 81 texts mentioning popular music pedagogy, Mantie compared discursive threads present in statements originating in the United States to statements originating in other countries. Using content analysis, Mantie determined that American authors produce popular music pedagogy discourse in ways dissimilar to authors in other countries. For example, “American-based authors focused on issues of legitimacy (repertoire and teaching), whereas non-American based authors focused on matters of utility and efficacy” (p. 334). Mantie again utilizes Foucault to support his methodological decisions about treatment of statements; Mantie also refers to discourse scholar Blommaert when explaining choices on how to approach the discourse and analysis. Each of Mantie’s studies (2009, 2012a, 2012b, 2013) provides a solid theoretical foundation and description of process. His careful treatment of statements and discourse are appropriately

crafted for each of his endeavors. Common to CDA, none of his studies follow the exact same path.

In a CDA about models of disability present in *JRME*, Dobbs (2012) reviews 17 articles published in *JRME* between 1990 and 2011 in order to interrogate the current discourse regarding disabilities and music education. Due to *JRME*'s "influence on scholarly discourses within the music education field" (p. 7) and "attendant social power" (p. 8), Dobbs utilizes these texts to map the discourses and examine normative constructions. She determines that children are labeled in comparison to a norm and this "discursive construction of human variation from an arbitrarily chosen norm" (p. 7) limits, separates, and marginalizes students. Any deviation from the established norm becomes a deficit that must be fixed or repaired or accommodated. The use of labels to describe deviations is public, and therefore political, contributing to the social construction of "disabilities."

Following common CDA procedures, Dobbs (2012) analyzed each reference to disability in the articles in order to "expose and resist social inequity" (p. 12), and determine how disability is socially constructed. In the description of her theoretical frameworks, she describes that the objectification of the "other" occurs upon the placement of labels and the subsequent marginalization. She summarizes Siebers' view that "knowledge is socially situated, identities are socially constructed, and some bodies are excluded by dominant social ideologies" (Siebers, 2008, p. 33, in Dobbs, 2012, p. 10), noting that social constructivism creates public labels for private/individual matters. When discussing her findings, Dobbs refers to her own struggle with the use of words and terms, aware that labels are a form of cultural oppression. She recognizes/d that labels promote a "hegemony of normativity" (p. 19) that infers that those who are labeled require repair in able to seen as docile or compliant (or normal). My own study has similar tenets to that of Dobbs (2012), and I used her study as a model, noting her procedure and methods in regards to using *JRME* as a source and corpus.

In an earlier study, Dobbs (2010) reflects upon her own use of discourse analysis in order to better understand the utility of the methodology. In her 2010 article, Dobbs reviews selected prominent music education research studies to examine word use and/or discourse. Interested in

how music education researchers use verbal data, she explores such concepts as “talk” and highlights how “talk” is used in music rehearsals. Dobbs examines teacher talk, student talk, the role of talking, and other instances when music learners may rely on language. In a critical review of her own 2005 dissertation (Dobbs, 2005), she reflects on the assumptions made within the discourses in which she participated; she finds her previous use of speech act theory as limiting and as positioning her students in a structure that she had not intended. Dobbs acknowledges that discourse can be both helpful and limiting, and challenges music educators to consider the ways our words impact our students.

In an earlier study, Nerland (2007) uses a Foucauldian-inspired discourse analysis framework to examine the discourse that applied lesson professors at a university create within the bounded systems of their studios. Nerland studied two teachers to determine how they developed discourses within their studio teaching and then within their profession, and also examined the subsequent effects of those discourses on the students. In her analysis, Nerland focuses on the Foucauldian-inspired notion of discursive practices. Nerland did not use computer software. Instead, she videotaped and then transcribed interactions between the teacher and student. These transcriptions were “read and reread in search of regularities and recurring modes of thinking that could identify dominating discourses in the teaching practices” (p. 403).

Nerland suggests that teaching strategies are shaped by the discourses within the studio; how music learning and doing are perceived have significant impact on the individual teacher and therefore their students. As Nerland explains, “discourses are understood as cultural ways of thinking, talking about and understanding the world that shape actions” (p. 401). Similar to Nerland, I examine the discourse of *urban music education* as a concept that has come to be understood within a structure, but I investigate the ways in which the discourse has been established in written texts from professional publications instead of in transcribed personal interactions.

Although not a discourse analysis study, Hess (2012) explores music education structures through a Foucauldian lens. More specifically, her study focuses on the concepts of agency and power within a choir rehearsal setting. Hess relies heavily on Patricia O’Toole’s 1994

dissertation—an examination of O'Toole's own power and agency within a choir—and refocuses the topic from a director-centered model to a self-centered model, centering on her own experiences. Hess determines that in a self-centered model of performance, decisions are a "negotiation rather than a dictation" (p. 44). Hess describes that the director's knowledge, which assigns voices and parts to the music, privileges those decisions over the knowledge of choristers; meanwhile choristers, Hess notes, assume the role of a "docile chorister," practicing acceptable behavior patterns in order to belong. Making comparisons to Foucault's panopticon descriptions and his thoughts on power structures, Hess implies that traditional choir/ensemble models create docile bodies that defer to the director and that director-centered ensembles squash creativity. Her search for agency and empowerment, while similar to O'Toole's, emerges from a different space and creates new questions about ensemble structure. One of the few music education papers referencing Foucault, Hess highlights struggles of power among actors in the music education structure she experiences. Such power struggles are points in the discourse where change may manifest, and these points are uncovered in CDA studies.

Music education researchers have investigated discourse through multiple lenses using different types of texts and analytic tools. Kopkas (2011) examines the discourse of aesthetics in music education from 1907 to 1958. In particular, he investigates the positions of prominent music educators regarding aesthetic versus utilitarian philosophies of music education. Through archival research, philosophical analysis, and discourse analysis, Kopkas posits that the debate regarding music aesthetics began before the time usually earmarked in music education history texts (1958, as determined by Kopkas) and that opinions during that time period were not as cohesive as suggested by historical accounts. Kopkas suggests that all, or even most, music educators of the time did not reproduce the previously accepted discourse, and based on his examination of texts and documents from early leaders in the profession, Kopkas establishes that aesthetic music education had extensive support before the 1958 *Basic Concepts* publication (determined to be an influential text in the aesthetic education movement), suggesting that the time frame commonly associated with the start of aesthetic music education movement (1958) is

incorrect. His careful evaluation of statements in the discourse allows him to clarify the discourse of that time.

Schmidt (1999) uses discourse analysis to examine the discourses of multiculturalism within music education and society as conveyed in general music textbooks published in 1995. Meticulously reviewing textbooks from two grades (3 and 5) and from multiple publishing companies, Schmidt outlines the discourses present in music education, education, and society. She proposes that the sentiments and discourses shared in general music textbooks, while inaccurate, are representative of how society viewed multiculturalism at that time. An examination of multiple aspects of the texts reveals that explanations and portrayals of cultures were stereotyped and oversimplified, fostering value-laden judgments and solidification of power structures favoring those in the dominant culture.

Talbot (2010) observes how the discourse of the Gamelan was created and propagated in three different United States settings—a university class on gong kebyar,[14] a community gamelan, and an ad hoc group preparing to perform at the Percussive Arts Society International Conference. Using discourse analysis to study music transmission, he collected data through video recording and detailed transcription, which was coded in detail in terms of language, action, and music.

Talbot posits that at times the discourse was shaped by direct instruction and speech, whereas at other times there was minimal talking but other types of mediation. The author explains how relating an unfamiliar concept to people of a different culture can cause an alteration in the original discourse, in this case, the Gamelan. He explains that the concept of musical "time," for example, is not the same in Bali as it is in Western music; trying to explain Balinese ideas of "time" to a Western musician results in a separate discourse, as one "forces" the Balinese idea to fit within a previously established Western discourse that, in his study, was most closely relatable to those participating in the groups in the study. Talbot finds that the

[14] Gong kebyar is a style of Balinese gamelan music that is characterized by sudden changes in style, dynamics, or tempo.

general meaning of a discourse can “travel, but meaning, value, and function of a discourse have to be granted by others” (p. ix).

Through interviews with an Australian music educator, Thompson (2002) used CDA to investigate the place of world music in music education. She determined that world music is marginalized and othered within music education curriculum discourse because her data suggest that Western music is favored and given a more prominent place in the canon. This article, part of a larger study, focuses on the perceived canon of Western art music and how the prominent location of the canon others all non-Western music. Thompson describes the “binary opposition” (p. 17) between different types of music and how that binary affects music teachers. Thompson challenges the music education research field to utilize CDA as a methodology and to better examine our practices and discourses. She advocates the potential for discovery using CDA strategies.

Foucauldian frameworks and CDA are also used by scholars to examine discourses and practices in education. In a dissertation titled “‘It’s Not Cheating If You Don’t Get Caught’: Critical Discourse Analysis of Academic Integrity Policies in Public High Schools,” Dukes (2012) uses Foucauldian lenses to explore issues of power and discipline within high schools. He presents a CDA of ten academic integrity policies then in use at ten different high schools across the country. A primary text analysis revealed four key themes within these statements, and a subsequent CDA exposed that these academic integrity policies were not motivated by a sense of ethics and care. Using a Foucauldian lens to examine power, authority, discipline, and punishment, Dukes asserts that in these schools “integrity” is defined as not doing anything wrong within a system that the teachers control and in which the students are silent, producing a negative discourse rather than one defined by ethics and care.

Arts policy scholars have also employed Foucauldian frameworks and CDA in their research. Cataldi (2004) examined arts education policy discourse, specifically how arts education policy becomes established through multiple discourses. Using a Foucauldian framework, she applies discourse inquiry and textual analysis to investigate three organizations with ties to arts education policy. Following an in-depth review of texts (statements made by the

Arts, Education, and Americans Panel; The Getty Institute for Education in the Arts; and The Consortium of National Arts Education Associations), Cataldi posits that advocacy mechanisms are prominent parts of the policy discourses. Through tracing the statements created by those respective organizations, Cataldi suggests how discourse and policy within arts education has developed over time. She connects advocacy ideals to the formation of accepted mainstream arts education policy discourse in her study and utilizes text statements produced by arts organization to assist in her investigation. Similarly, I also analyze statements in my investigation, albeit statements produced by actors in the music education structure, usually academics and practitioners.

Arvast (2008) examines issues of power within education from a different angle through a Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) of the Ontario, Canada Community College system. Arvast's analysis of program reviews suggests a shift in discourse from education seen as something that the community should have to education seen as an economic entity that produces capital. Discursive thoughts about students, then, shift as well: students move from being receptors of knowledge to being products of a capital-generating system. Using a Foucauldian lens to examine relations of power and control, Arvast calls attention to power and silence in the community college system discourse.

CDA has also been used as a tool in the examination of organizational practices within the education system. Risolo (2011) examines changes in policy discourse practices in the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) since No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (2001). Risolo uses a Foucauldian lens to examine the use of language in the NCTE documents to determine how the language affects voice and discourse within the larger education framework. Through her analysis of the NCTE's documents on literacy and an examination of the process through which those documents were created, Risolo describes the process of discourse negotiation. The NCTE, a once-marginalized organization, has shifted to the center of policy discussions and decisions, promoting a shift in discourses and power. The political use of language to broker power is central to the Foucauldian framework of Risolo's analysis, and supports the position that language use by actors is specific and motivated.

Through an analysis of intermediate-level university textbooks, Ducar (2006) examines Spanish Heritage Language textbooks in order to determine how United States Spanish speakers are defined. Ducar determined that these documents provide nothing more than a "selective presentation" of information. By favoring Castilian Spanish to Hispanic Spanish in the texts, the discourse portrays Hispanic Americans and their culture in a negative light and constructs a dreary "representation of immigrant and minority cultures" (p. 11). Ducar's CDA reveals biases and power in discourse that create systems of repression.

Scholars in disciplines other than education also employ discourse analysis tools. Goldberg (2005) examines issues of power and policy in a CDA dissertation entitled "Ideology, Policy, and the (Re)Production of Labour Market Inequity: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Access to Professions and Trades." Goldberg explores discourse surrounding Access to Profession and Trades (APT) policies in Ontario, Canada. She posits that by framing policies with specific language, racism and limited access become justified. Policy, she offers, exists as a discursive web with myriad strands that both individually and collectively influence reality. Goldberg champions critical language awareness and recognition of visible and assumed power structures as a means of troubling discourses that oppress.

In a different textual analysis, Jensen (2011) seeks to articulate the ideologies present in foundation organizations (non-profit, non-governmental organizations with their own funding sources, p. 4) that focus on addressing racial inequalities. After collecting documents produced by over 50 foundations and conducting interviews with leaders within 25 of them, Jensen performed a CDA in order to articulate the ideals espoused by these entities and compared this discourse with the entities' objectives and missions. An analysis of interview and printed texts suggested that the foundations are most focused on philanthropy rather than combatting issues contributing to racial inequality. Her CDA explores issues of power and relationships in order to address the themes of privilege and race that emerge in the data.

Race is a prominent topic in Khalema's 2011 dissertation, "'Race Talk' in Epidemiology & Public Health: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Canadian and Brazilian Texts." In this document, the researcher examines the discourse of "race" in public health circles in both Canada and

Brazil. Employing a CDA and philosophical ideas of Foucault, Khalema discovers that "race" is constructed in specific ways to meet the needs of the systems of power that create the documents he examined. The concept of "race" allows for *research hegemony*, reproducing inequities in the discourse. Khalema explains that "researchers consent to the leadership of authorities and the dominance of their institutions, practices and values. In short, this equates with consenting to unequal class relations" (p. 11). Noting the different ways that "race" data is defined, determined, and collected, Khalema concludes that uncritical uses of "race" perpetuate power at local, national, and global levels. As with the term "urban," "race" carries connotation and value-laden associations that are yet to be thoroughly examined across multiple disciplines.

Using these studies, writings about CDA, and Foucault's works as a guide, I have developed strategies for conducting a CDA of *urban music education*. In Chapter 3, I outline my methodology choices for this study and describe my pilot study.

Chapter 3

Methodology

In this chapter, I describe the methods that I use in this critical discourse analysis. Since no standardized method for a CDA exists, I have adopted techniques from multiple scholars and adapted them to fit the scope of this study. Relying on published scholarly examples for study design, in this chapter I describe my methods and discuss my pilot study.

Restatement of Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to analyze discourse of *urban music education* as it is propagated through two publications: the *Music Educators Journal* and the *Journal of Research in Music Education*. A critical evaluation of statements used over a specified length of time (1991–2010) may contribute to a clearer picture of *urban music education* discourse in the music education profession. Through this investigation, I address the following questions: What is the current discourse surrounding *urban music education*? How do specific publications and actors of the music education structure shape how *urban music education* is perceived and addressed? What does the discourse say about *urban* music educators and *urban* music students? What does the *urban music education* discourse transmit, reproduce, reinforce, and expose?

To investigate these questions, I employ a critical discourse analysis using a Foucauldian lens. In the next sections, I delineate the components of critical discourse analysis methods I use, outline the journals selected for analysis, and describe the process and results of a pilot study.

Method Selection

In this study, I conduct a critical discourse analysis examining the discourse of *urban music education* in two journals disseminated by a large, national organization in the United States, the National Association for Music Education. Through a careful investigation of these documents, I articulate the situatedness of *urban music education* within the discourse of the discipline. Since discourse is shaped over time and affected by social context, history, and related events, I track the discourse of *urban music education* over a twenty-year time span in order to examine some strands in this complicated discourse.

As stated in Chapter 2, CDA is an investigative method that examines how practices and language reinforce power and influence behaviors in a structure. Actions and texts are discursive elements of larger societal structures, and discourses produce power configurations within social groups. Since structures and resulting power configurations are unique, each examination requires careful planning. CDA methods are diverse, with each researcher using methods and techniques derived to best fit their project. In this study, I selected data collection, data organization, and data analysis strategies after thoughtful and careful readings of similar studies in multiple fields. In this section I outline my choices of methods for this CDA and describe my data source (texts). I also summarize a pilot study as a means of demonstrating my interrogation of the data collection and analysis processes.

Data source. Discourses are established through text, actions, and practices. In a structure, such texts, actions, and practices are produced, promoted, and maintained through actors in the power configuration. Those in controlling positions of power advance rules, regulations, and rituals that enforce hierarchies, order, and the structure. These positions of power propagate information towards the docile bodies that absorb information and continue to enforce the established expectations for the community. Within the music education profession in the United States, one of the entities with the ability (or power) to disseminate information to music educators is the National Association for Music Education (NAfME). There are approximately 60,000 paid members of NAfME (B. Cook, personal communication, September 10, 2013); this figure includes active, retired, and collegiate members. The membership of NAfME includes K–12 public school music educators, collegiate/university faculty, and industry members.

NAfME has multiple tools available to spread information, including print and web media, sponsored events and programs, and publications and activities of state organizations. In some states, membership in the national or state organization is required in order for students to participate in music performance events, guaranteeing some level of interaction with the organization in certain locations. NAfME content reaches multiple constituencies of the music education community and can shape discourse through the production of specific materials and events.

In terms of print media, NAfME distributes multiple publications to its members. I selected two of these publications, the *Music Educators Journal* and the *Journal of Research in Music Education,* for this study. Both are peer-reviewed journals, and these two journals have the longest continuous publication history within NAfME. All paid members receive *MEJ* in the mail and the publication is also available online. *JRME* is a separate paid subscription and boasts an approximate circulation of 3,000 subscriptions, roughly 5% of the *MEJ* circulation.

Music Educators Journal is currently produced four times a year, although in the past it has been published with greater frequency (monthly, every other month, and other distribution patterns). *MEJ* is mailed to every paid member, is available online, can be accessed in libraries, and is sent in bulk to college music education departments for distribution to preservice music education students. Both accessible and visible, *MEJ* is one of the documents that has significant potential for shaping discourse and advancing ideas within the music education community. According to the NAfME (2014) website, "*MEJ* offers peer-reviewed scholarly and practical articles on music teaching approaches and philosophies, instructional techniques, current trends and issues in music education in schools and communities and the latest in products and services." Authors, usually practicing teachers or university professors, write content and featured articles for *MEJ*. Advertisements for music-related products , NAfME news, and announcements coexist with authored content across the publication. A range of services and goods are displayed throughout the published content.

The *Journal of Research in Music Education* is the oldest research journal published by NAfME. A peer-reviewed journal aimed at music education research scholars, *JRME* has been noted as the most influential of the music education research publications due to the publication's citation frequency (Hamann & Lucas, 1998). Available online to paid members, the journal is also distributed in hard copy to libraries and members who elect to pay for a subscription; *JRME* content is also available through many electronic research databases. The online publisher, Sage (2014), provides this description:

> *JRME* is a quarterly, peer-reviewed journal comprising reports of original research related to music teaching and learning. The wide range of topics includes various aspects of

> music pedagogy, history, and philosophy, and addresses vocal, instrumental, and general music at all levels, from early childhood through adult. (website)

Although the content of *JRME* is not aimed directly at practicing teachers, discourse propagated through *JRME* reaches or has the potential to reach music education faculty in higher education, who directly effect what is being taught or advised for practicing music teachers. Strands of music education discourse can be sculpted and disseminated through this publication.

Time frame selection. For this study, I elected to examine the discourse of a twenty-year time span, with the introduction of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation at the center of the time frame (2001). One of the most widely recognized educational policies, NCLB changed the landscape for education, forcing educators and society to view education through a different lens. With the initiation of NCLB, teachers and schools became more accountable for students' learning, as measured according to established guidelines and standardized tests. Under NCLB, schools are required to adhere to norms, and norms, as Foucault (1964/1988) argues, create categories. Under NCLB, categories such as pass/fail or successful/failing label schools, the administrators, staff, and students. Being "othered" by the label "not successful" creates a negative connotation for all members of that community.

NCLB was established in 2001 under President George W. Bush. Since discourses change gradually with the introduction of new practices, I chose to use the start of NCLB legislature as a time marker in this study. Using the year 2001 as a midpoint for this study, I investigate the threads of the discourse of *urban music education* for the ten years both before and after the enactment of NCLB. For *JRME*, I include articles ranging from volume 39, issue 1 (Spring 1991) through volume 58, issue 3 (October, 2010). For *MEJ*, I include articles starting with the fifth issue of volume 77 (February, 1991) and continuing through the second issue of volume 97 (December, 2010).

General Outline of the Method

In this study, I examine texts in order to analyze the discourse of *urban music education*. Using *MEJ* and *JRME* as the textual corpus in this CDA, I investigate how knowledge regarding this discourse has been reproduced. Similar to the 2012 Mantie study, I designed my methods by

borrowing from the tenets of archaeology and "from Foucauldian genealogy, a primary goal of which is to expose the workings of power that masquerade as objective, ahistorical knowledge" (Mantie, p. 101). I identified a bounded set of data (articles from the journals within a specified time frame), then created concordances. Using key words drawn from these concordances, I derived a list of statements that include terms or phrases associated with *urban music education.* Similar to the 2009 Mantie study, I then critically analyzed these statements with a Foucauldian lens to generate "truths" about *urban music education* and to describe how this discourse has been reproduced in the literature. To determine the functionality of my methodological choices, I performed a pilot study that is explained in the next section.

Pilot Study

I completed a pilot study in order to determine whether the strategy I designed for locating statements in the discourse would yield usable data. While I utilized 20 years of article content (1991–2010) in this dissertation, I elected to study content from one year for the pilot study; I randomly selected the calendar year 1997. After reviewing the methods of other authors cited in the literature review, I designed a data collection process using elements from various studies. Similar to Mantie (2009), I elected to use a set of articles as my corpus. Then, based on a set of search terms related to "urban," I used computer software to identify potentially viable statements within the corpus for analysis. I next located the statements using those keywords within the 1997 *JRME* and *MEJ* issues, and analyzed use of language and discourse. I describe this procedure in detail below.

In preparation for analysis, I downloaded all content for every *JRME* and *MEJ* issue published in 1997. For *JRME*, I downloaded a total of 40 articles from the four issues of that volume (45); for *MEJ*, I downloaded 60 documents across 6 issues and two volumes (83 & 84). For the *MEJ* data set, these 60 texts included feature articles and MENC[15]-authored news pieces, book reviews, and video reviews. I included these items in the pilot study because discourse is created through multiple sources (Rogers, 2004). I used both JSTOR and the Sage website to

[15] MENC, the Music Educators National Conference, was renamed to NAfME (the National Association for Music Educators) in 2011.

access these articles. JSTOR limits the numbers of downloads one can complete within a certain time frame, and my account was frozen multiple times due to excessive usage. For this pilot study, the *JRME* content and volume 83 of *MEJ* were retrieved from JSTOR, while the remaining articles were found on the Sage website.

I saved the 100 articles to a computer (MacBook laptop) in folders separated into levels; first, I sorted the articles by journal (Level 1) and then within that level, I created subfolders for each year (Level 2). During the pilot study, I had only two subfolders: JRME>1997 and MEJ>1997. I then duplicated the two folders and imported them into a software program, DEVONthink Pro Office (version 2.4.3). Within this software program, I created separate database folders for each subfolder and moved all articles into the appropriate folders. In this setup, I could access the block of *JRME* articles separately from the *MEJ* articles or combine them if needed for a larger analysis. For the purpose of the pilot study, I kept the *JRME* articles and data separated from those of *MEJ*.

Next, I created a short list of terms that might be considered part of the current discourse of *urban music education*. I designated this list as the "pilot search terms" to be used for an initial examination of the articles. The initial pilot search term list included: urban, cultural, socioeconomic, minority, and social justice.

To discover whether these words appeared in the article content and to determine the frequency of their occurrence, I created a concordance of each database folder. First, I examined the *JRME* database folder and ran the concordance command through DEVONthink Pro Office. The concordance tool produces a list of all words that appear in the content folder. The concordance lists words in decreasing frequency order, the rank order according to frequency of the word, and other data I did not use in the pilot study. The *JRME* concordance included a total of 348,388 words, with 13,008 unique words. A search for "urban" in the concordance revealed that "urban" was the 2,249th most common word in the data set, appearing 12 times in the collection in a total of 8 *JRME* articles.

Next, I accessed each instance of the word "urban" in the 8 articles and examined how the word was used. In *JRME* in 1997, "urban" was typically used as a category to describe a type

of school, at times adjacent to “rural” and “suburban” schools. One author connects racial diversity to the urban school setting and leaves no such modifying word connected to other school category types (suburban, rural). The most blatant use of “urban” appears in an article positioned as a review of women’s names used in music education textbooks, in which “urban education” appears as a “special needs” area, alongside “special education.” Any such sorting of schools, even into urban/rural or urban/suburban/rural categories, furthers the idea that these categories exist for reasons, and my study offers additional examination of the establishment of such labeling. Also, “urban” appears within words like “suburban” and those statements were also recorded. An abbreviated summary of “urban” in *JRME* 1997 articles can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Use of "Urban" in JRME Articles, 1997

Author	How “Urban” Is Used In Context
Cutietta	Sample draw; categories are rural, suburban, urban
Fredrickson	Sample draw; actual word is “suburban”
Goolsby	“half taught in a large city school district, five in suburban districts, and one in a rural district;” “at a large, urban state university”
Killian	Sample draw; “large, urban, racially diverse schools to small, suburban, and rural schools”
Lee	Opposite of rural, a label; city people
Livingston	Explains “urban education” as one of several “specialized needs” of students in a textbook chapter
Teicher	Used as a synonym or modifier for “multicultural”
Wang	Sample draw; categories are urban and rural

After reviewing the concordance and developing the above occurrence grid for “urban” in the *JRME* list, I selected the “Similar” tool from the DEVONthink Pro Office menu bar. The “Similar” tool, according to the DEVONThink Pro Office online manual, derives a list of words that

are “contextually similar” to the selected word from the concordance. Consulting the online help forums, a DEVONthink moderator explained the “similar” function in the following way:

> DEVONthink uses proprietary algorithms to determine the contextual similarity of content of documents, e.g., the Classify and See Also artificial intelligence assistants. Contextual similarity is more complex than similarity of words per se, as it involves frequencies and contextual patterns of words among a document collection.
>
> For example, if I've got documents about dogs and select one that doesn't mention that dogs are canines, See Also may suggest other documents that mention wolves but not dogs, if there are documents about the canine family in my database. In such a case the algorithms will have "bridged" the relationship of dogs to other members of the canine family. (B. DeVille, personal communication, September 8, 2013)

Even with algorithms, the Similar tool lists words that may not be contextually relevant to this study; I disregarded these Similar terms. For example, I eliminated “city” as a term due to its unrelated prominence in the corpus; the term is used too frequently with limited relevance for this study. Related words appearing in the “Similar” list for “urban” included: minority, culturally, and European. I noted I had already included two of those words (minority, culture) on my pilot term search list. I started a second list for potential future analysis with the word “European.”

Still in the *JRME* folder, I examined three additional words from the concordance based on the pilot keyword list: cultural, socioeconomic, and minority. I had planned to examine “social justice,” however, I found it was not possible to search for a two-word phrase. Instead, I searched for “justice,” which appeared zero times in the concordance. I used the Similar command to identify associated words in the same articles. A summary of results for the keywords and Similar word searches can be found in Table 2.

Table 2

Selected Concordance Segment, JRME, 1997

Word	Rank	Appearances	Articles	"Similar Words" added to List B
cultural	492	76	8	Ethnicity, Black, Afro, & African
socioeconomic	1901	15	5	SES
minority	4612	4	3	--

After examining issues of *JRME* from the year 1997, I enacted a similar set of procedures for the 1997 issues of *MEJ*. First, I ran a concordance for the collection. The 60 article downloads included 167,254 words and 13,010 unique words. I again examined all instances of the word "urban." "Urban" was the 936th most frequent word, appearing 20 times in 8 articles, and I read these articles to examine how "urban" was used. A summary of the use of "urban" is included in Table 3.

Table 3

Use of "Urban" in MEJ Articles, 1997

Author	How "Urban" Is Used In Context
Allsup	Urban classroom; used frequently; implies city, diversity, SES, and cultural differences
Brahmstedt	Urban teachers have different roles than rural teachers; urban teaching in China
Howle	Knowledge deficits more likely in urban areas
Krueger	Category; nervous to teach there
MENC	Implies urban means no resources
MENC	Category: urban/rural/suburban/overseas
Sinor	Urban growth threatens folk song tradition
Stewart	Implies urban means no resources

The word "urban" had different and multiple uses in the eight 1997 MEJ articles. Although at times the word was used as a category or descriptor for a type of school, Foucault (1964/1988)

would argue that no category is neutral. Even if used to describe how success could be achieved in an “urban” school (Allsup, 1997), that discourse thread implies an assumption that it is not easy to be successful in *urban music education* settings. The discourse, in this case, perpetuates certain stereotypes about *urban music education*.

Other articles include passing references to “urban” and comment on the lack of music and/or resources and/or funding in “urban” schools, again, creating a discourse of deficiency. Most surprising was a statement that suggests that in “urban” areas students might not understand farming terms (e.g., “miller”) and which advised readers that an explanation will be needed when working with urban students (Howle, 1997). That assessment attaches a deficit of knowledge to the *urban music education* students only, without questioning how many suburban elementary school children know what a “miller” is. Using the word “urban” to associate a lack of knowledge with urban students attaches negative stereotypes a specific population of students, in effect, othering them.

In the *MEJ* search, finding the specific word “urban” was difficult and at times misleading. *MEJ* contains advertisements, and the pdf documents of articles from the *MEJ* issues contain the words from those advertisements. The computer software cannot differentiate between article content and advertisement, hence select instances of “urban” existed as parts of longer words in ads (i.e. disturbance). While it was frustrating to navigate the data at times, the process did not affect the results of the concordance or the analysis of data in a negative way. However, after this pilot study, I concluded that I would limit this study to articles only. While non-article data (reviews, association/NAfME news reports) are part of the larger discourse of urban music education, they are beyond the scope of this study and can be investigated at a later date.

Next, I examined how other words from the pilot keyword list appeared in the concordance for the 1997 *MEJ* database. The rank in the concordance, the frequency of the word, the number of articles in which each word appears, and “Similar” words appear in Table 4.

Table 4

Selected Concordance Segments, MEJ, 1997

Word	Rank	Appearances	Articles	"Similar Words" for possible examination
Cultural	528	36	14	Streets, Rap, Unprepared
Minority	10,541	1	1	--
Socioeconomic	--	0	0	0

In summary, the pilot study of the 1997 content reveals characteristics of the discourse across journals. In this set of data, the word "urban" was used 32 times: 12 times in *JRME* and 20 times in *MEJ.* Reviewing the statements using the term "urban," four strands of the discourse become visible. One strand is a matter of location of a school, usually either as a standalone descriptor or a comparison to rural/suburban. A second strand deals with race, as in racial, diversity, or multicultural issues. The third strand of the discourse is related to deficit, which emerges in two ways: poor as in under-resourced schools, or deficit students seen as being culturally or intellectually deficient. Perhaps the most disconcerting strand is the fourth strand, one that alludes to danger. This segment of the discourse suggests that urban music settings are unsafe and teachers do not desire teaching positions there. This fourth strand includes an articulated fear about ruining traditions of the dominant culture. After this initial venture into the discourse, it became obvious that a more thorough examination of these journals would yield more information about how urban music education is situated within the discourse of the profession.

After the completion of the pilot study and proposal defense, I initiated correspondence with Roger Mantie. Armed with a better understanding of the data collection and analysis process in this type of study, and more articulate about the limitations and benefits of my software and methodology choices, I approached him in order to learn from his personal reflections on his own study. Through a series of emails, he explained to me why he had selected DEVONthink Pro Office software for his own 2009 study and offered suggestions regarding other software

considerations. He also offered advice regarding choices of framework and philosophical lenses. I considered his advice, and as he once did, I chose to continue using DEVONthink Pro Office software for this specific study. Mantie also provided additional resources for my consideration, which I read and studied.

During the pilot study data analysis, I listed potential keywords to be included in the main study data collection. “Urban” was the most obvious choice, and I determined that other words with the same intended meaning as “urban” in certain circumstances should also be included. This decision brought “inner” (for inner-city) and “risk” (for at-risk) to the list of keywords as each was frequently paired with urban. The pilot study also revealed that “race” surfaced with considerable frequency, and so I added that term to the list as well. The pilot study informed the main study procedures, which I describe in the next section.

Main Study Collection

In order to compile data for this study, I gathered the appropriate articles for the corpus and sorted them to access data effectively for the remainder of the study. For issues of *JRME* inclusive of 1991–2010, all available online from the Sage Publications and JSTOR web sites, pdfs of articles were relatively easy to acquire and download. Since *JRME* rarely includes matter outside of the featured articles, extensive sorting was not required. In other words, few selections in *JRME* were *not* featured articles. I excluded editor’s columns, errata, and calls for papers from the data set, and data from these were not included when generating the concordance. I created as spreadsheet listing each volume, issue, and article author/s to check for completed data gathering (see Appendix A).

I downloaded searchable pdf documents of each *JRME* article and saved them to my desktop in leveled files. My file organization consisted of a folder for all *JRME* articles, and within that folder, files for each year of the sample. As I completed downloads for each year, I cross-checked the file contents with the tables of contents of issues for that year. Once assured the year’s file was complete, I continued to the next year. When I was ready to create concordances, it became necessary to reorganize. I moved all of the *JRME* articles from 1991–2000 to one

folder and articles from 2001–2010 to another. Each of those data sets were imported into DEVONthink Pro Office as separate folders and also saved in a combined *JRME* folder.

The collection of articles from *MEJ* was more tedious and required more frequent assessment and cross checking. Initially, I was determined to use every downloadable article from *MEJ* in the data set, and I downloaded all pdf files from each issue of *MEJ* that were available from the Sage Publications and JSTOR web sites. I saved electronic documents in a similar fashion to those of *JRME*; I created a file for each year in the data set, and each downloaded pdf was placed in the corresponding year's file within the *MEJ* folder. Through the process of the pilot study and initial concordance review, however, I determined that the inclusion of every downloadable text (including reviews, news items, and advertisements) was not consistent from volume to volume and would be difficult to manage. I determined that comparing the content of discourse between issues and volumes required me to collect consistent data, limited to articles only.

To identify and locate consistent article content from each *MEJ* issue, I consulted the tables of contents across the data set and created a spreadsheet that contained the volume/issue, year, and authors of the main or "featured" articles (Appendix B). I was then able to sort through the collected pdf downloads and remove extraneous content. Because the format of the tables of contents in *MEJ* changed frequently, I also consulted hard copies of the journals and examined the placement and positioning of the article titles to ensure accurate selection of featured articles. Hand searching each *MEJ* issue and reviewing each table of contents allowed me to be confident that the articles analyzed in this study are representative of the discourse being propagated in articles of the publication between from 1991 through 2010.

Table 5 outlines another hurdle in the *MEJ* data collection. During the first three years in the data set (1991–1993), *MEJ* volumes contained eight issues per year, averaging 59.67 articles per year in the data set for those years. Over time, however, the number of issues per year decreased, as did the number of articles per year. For eight years in the sample (1994–2001), *MEJ* decreased publication to six issues per year, averaging 33.75 articles per year. The next seven years (2002–2008) contain only five issues per calendar year, averaging 28.86 articles per

year, and the final two years in the sample (2009 & 2010) decrease to four issues per year with an average of 26.00 articles per year. This final figure (26.00) is less than half of the average of for the first years within the sample.

Table 5

MEJ Article Count by Year & Issue, 1991–2010

Year	Issues	Articles	Average Article Count Per Issue
1991	8	59	7.38
1992	8	64	8
1993	8	55	6.88
1994	6	43	7.17
1995	6	36	6
1996	6	34	5.67
1997	6	30	5
1998	6	29	4.83
1999	6	31	5.17
2000	6	38	6.33
2001	6	39	6.5
2002	5	32	6.4
2003	5	27	5.4
2004	5	29	5.8
2005	5	31	6.2
2006	5	29	5.8
2007	5	27	5.4
2008	5	27	5.4
2009	4	28	7
2010	4	24	6

The establishment of *Teaching Music,* which first appeared as a NAfME publication in August of 1993, impacted the frequency with which *MEJ* was published and therefore lowered the number of articles per year occurring in *MEJ*. An examination of the number of articles per issue shows that while the number of issues per volume changes, the number of articles per issue of *MEJ* has a smaller variation. The highest average article count was in 1991 with 7.38 articles per issue; the lowest was 1998 with 4.83 articles per issue. Across the sample, the average article per issue count is 6.11. While the number of issues per year steadily decreases in the *MEJ* sample, the average number of articles has less fluctuation.

Reviewing the tables of contents and reducing the data set for *MEJ* to include only featured articles allowed me to have more confidence in my methodology and procedures; I knew that my data collection process was consistent. After eliminating non-article material from the *MEJ* folders, I imported the articles into DEVONthink Pro Office in order to run concordances. All *MEJ* articles from 1991–2000 were saved in one folder and articles from 2001–2010 were saved in a second folder. The two folders combined as all *MEJ* files were saved as a third folder.

To preserve data, I saved articles from both journals (*MEJ* and *JRME*) together in three ways: 1991–2000, 2001–2010, and 1991–2010. I saved these folders on my hard drive, an external drive, a flash drive, and in the Cloud. The entire set of 9 folders (saved as a master folder) took up 1.85G of space and contained 1,206 articles with 4,524,530 words (see Appendix C). The master folder was imported into DEVONthink Pro Office.

In this study, I used keywords to identify statements within the corpus surrounding the concept of *urban music education*. Establishing appropriate keywords enabled me to gather robust data for analysis. Keywords served as tools or clues that point to statements; statements were then analyzed in order to articulate the threads present in the discourse. These steps allowed me to establish the set of keywords used in the main study.

Using the master folder, I produced a concordance for the corpus. Using the pilot study keyword list, I reviewed the concordance for four terms (urban, inner, risk, and race). I extracted articles that included one or more of the keywords and reviewed with detail articles that contained more than one keyword. I examined the entries for those articles in electronic library holdings at three universities to view how those articles were tagged in their respective library systems. This procedure allowed me to identify other potential keywords. Reviewing article tags, I added justice (for social justice), reform, gap (for achievement gap), climate, diversity, minority, cultural, and SES as possible keywords for examination. I entered each word into DEVONthink Pro Office to determine which keywords were most likely to appear in statements within the corpus. The term

"diversity" had the most robust output, and was included as the fifth and final keyword for data collection. The final keywords for this study were: urban, inner-city, at-risk, race, and diversity.[16]

Table 6 outlines keyword frequencies within the master folder: the frequency of each keyword, the number of usable statements for keyword for analysis (after eliminating words-in-words, etc.), and the number of articles in which each keyword appears (with some articles containing multiple keywords). In Table 6, I have listed the keywords in the order in which I performed the analysis presented in Chapters 4 and 5. In the next section, I discuss the process used to determine data saturation, in other words, the process I used to determine whether the identification of useable statements was robust and complete.

Table 6

Frequencies of Keywords, Statements, and Articles

Keyword	Frequency in Corpus	Useable Statements	Article Count
Urban	403	264	135
Inner	138	41	28
Risk	460	214	33
Race	282	202	66
Diversity	229	117	63

The Problems of Text Mining. Digital humanities scholars interested in text analysis utilize various methods and strategies in order to gather data. One such method, text mining, allows researchers to analyze bodies of texts and examine various patterns and components of a corpus. The goal of text mining, according to Aggarwal and Zhai (2012), is to analyze "information to discover patterns" and to go "beyond information access to further help users analyze and digest information and facilitate decision making" (p. 2). Different text mining software choices allow for specific types of data discovery. Text mining software uses algorithms to discover patterns and interesting outliers within bodies of text. Corpus contents are selected specifically for

[16] Because of the limitations of the computer software, I needed to search for single words within a corpus or concordance. When those single words' statements are located in the corpus, I can analyze each one to determine if they are connected to the keyword. For example, I can locate statements with "inner" in the corpus and then determine if "inner" appears as "inner-city" or "inner city," both viable, or rather "beginner," which would be excluded from the data set.

the type of data or relationships that require examination; one examined corpus may include newsfeeds while a different corpus may contain social media streams. While text mining is used across multiple disciplines, the method is “still not robust enough to work well in unrestricted text domains to generate accurate semantic representations of text” (p. 3). “Shallow word-based representations” (p. 3) may result from text mining, limiting the type of analysis the researcher can produce.

One component of text mining requires a summary of the corpus based on the data produced by the text mining; however, one issue with such software-produced summaries is that “a summary many contain ‘synthesized’ information units that may not necessarily occur in the text documents” (p. 4). This method of “clustering” groups together documents/statements/data pieces based on word use while ignoring context. The absence of context may be detrimental to analysis, shifting author intentions, and within a larger corpus such repeated acts contribute to discourse. Text mining frequently locates names of “entities” (persons, locations, and organizations are most common) and explores semantic relationships between these entities (Jiang, 2012) while excluding both other types of entities (such as abstract nouns or adjectives) and contextual setting. As Aggarwal and Zhai (2012) explain, “in many applications, it is important to consider the context as well as user preferences in text mining. It is thus important to further extend existing text mining approaches to further incorporate context and information networks for more powerful text analysis” (p. 9).

Within the CDA methodology I designed for this study, I implemented some procedures that are also used in text mining; specifically I searched a corpus of text for specific words and terms in hopes of finding relationships between and among multiple entities. Text mining, however, does not allow for contextual, historical, or other influences to be considered in analysis. In this CDA, I do not ignore context, although I do not always focus on it. I explore connections between types of entities that are not as common in text mining research methodologies; I examine adjective and abstract nouns versus persons, organizations and locations. Text mining can be limiting in some aspects, as it is scientific and therefore reductive, and I acknowledge that my CDA strategies were also reductive in different ways. In looking for occurrences of terms, my

database searches produced statements that, when taken out of context, could be interpreted in ways different from the original author's intent. I acknowledge that multiple readings and multiple analyses of a singular statement are possible, and that this reading and analysis is mine and therefore impacted by my processes and my biases, including how I accounted for (or did not account for) context. While I did not ignore context, I followed the tenet of Foucault and tried to ignore intent.

Recognizing Data Saturation

As previously mentioned, an option in the computer software used in this study allows the researcher to select a word from the concordance (i.e., urban) and view a list of "Similar" terms. In this study, I searched the designated corpus using five keywords (urban, inner, risk, race, and diversity), in order to identify statements and articles for analysis that would allow me to unravel some of the threads of discourse that contribute to the overarching concept of *urban music education*. While I felt that the methods I used were thoughtful and yielded considerable data for analysis, it was difficult to discern whether this segment of the data collection process was complete.

To help determine my position on "being finished with collecting data," I reread other works to discern how some researchers determined that data collection was complete, how they chose their collection methods, how they determined whether they had used "enough" keywords, and if they articulated when they knew their data were saturated. I developed this strategy and deemed the task relevant because I was uncomfortable deciding how many keywords or search terms should be used to produce the sets of statements in the articles I would analyze in this study. In other words, I had to address my own developing questions, including "How will I know that I have gathered adequate data to represent the sample and provide me with the information I need in order to construct the best image of the current discourse?" I decided to use other documents as models and then determine whether my methods were sufficient. However, that strategy was easier articulated than completed.

To find documents for comparison, I searched electronic databases. In ProQuest, for example, I completed multiple keyword searches, combining different terms in various

combinations: music education, music, Foucault, discourse, discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, urban, and keyword. My search returns were not numerous and not always relevant. Since discourse analysis can be approached in numerous ways and there is no one standard methodology, I found that some authors did not use keywords for their discourse analysis and/or data collection. Some authors did begin with a corpus and then searched for specific words within it (similar to my process). Others used keywords to *locate* a corpus (determining publications that frequently used those terms), while others did not employ any specific keywords or term searches within their analysis, generally because they examined the entirety of a smaller corpus. Several examples follow:

Jensen (2011) completed a discourse analysis about racial inequality and utilized seven terms in her search. Although she used seven terms, each term had two words; five of those terms used the word “racial” and the other two “social.” She searched for those seven terms within her corpus of foundation policy documents and interview transcripts to analyze the racial inequality discourse.

Kouper (2011) took a slightly different approach in her analysis of science knowledge as a discourse. To investigate specific threads within science, she searched the Internet and science databases with certain terms in order to find current publications that were contributing to the discourse on that topic. Her keyword set continued to be refined with each search, aiming to uncover more aspects of her topic. In the third and final round, she had eight keyword phrases.

Hahn (2003) examined the power structures in International Baccalaureate Programs. Her analysis began with a single keyword, and then her search produced themes that spawned from that single search term, which in turn produced other searchable phrases.

Laliberte Rudman (2003) investigated how newspapers constructed the discourse of “retiree.” To determine how this concept was being discussed, she searched using one key term (retiree) and then separated the results in categories. These categories demarcated how retirees were viewed through different lenses and situations.

Finally, Schwartz (2011) sought to delineate how special education students are viewed in different publications. Schwartz searched the corpus of Canadian special education textbooks using four key terms.

These studies are representative of the methodologies I uncovered during my own investigation, and while there are similar methods in some of these studies, others differ from the methods and procedures I chose. Methodologies had variances of structure and collection procedures, which allowed researchers to use different evidence as indicators for completion of their data collection. Through this evaluation of texts and studies, I determined that, for any study, data collection is complete and the keyword list is exhaustive when the author has been thoughtful and thorough with data handling. In my attempts to review how data were collected in the current study, I took many steps to ensure thoughtfulness and thoroughness. I examined multiple models and noted their inconsistencies, attempting to determine strategies that would allow me to thoroughly process appropriately saturated data. I feel assured that no further data collection would alter the results of the completed data collection. In other words, I believe that I was able to locate the appropriate articles that contained the statements in the discourse for the subsequent analysis.

After collecting statements containing the five keywords (urban, inner-city, at-risk, race, diversity) and checking statements with the context of the articles, I determined that the data collection was thorough and complete for the purpose of this study. In the evaluation of the fourth and fifth terms (race and diversity), previously articulated themes, statements, and discursive threads were regularly present with frequent repetition, allowing me to know that data collection had been thoughtful and careful. The analysis of the data set follows. In Chapter 4, I present a critical analysis of “urban,” and examine statements including the other four terms in Chapter 5. Chapters 6 and 7 expose the truths of *urban music education* and propose action for a paradigm shift in the profession.

Chapter 4

Examining the Discourse of "Urban"

In this chapter, I analyze statements that include the word “urban” occurring across twenty years of two journals of the music education profession. After locating each statement containing the term “urban” within issues of *Music Educators Journal* (*MEJ*) and the *Journal of Research in Music Education* (*JRME*) from 1991 through 2010, as described in Chapter 3, I examine how statements contribute to or reproduce ideas present in the discourse of *urban music education*. After a careful overview of such statements within this music education corpus, I continue to deconstruct this complicated discourse in Chapter 5 through an analysis of statements that include four additional terms related to “urban”: “inner-city,” “at-risk,” “race,” and “diversity.”

“Urban” in the Discourse

Language used by those with power and influence within the structure of music education shapes the discourse of *urban music education*. Those who control the dissemination of ideas in the music education profession, in this case through two prominent refereed journals, have furthered certain ideas and specific ideologies through the tools of propaganda[17] they produce. Both *MEJ* and *JRME* include articles in which uses of the word “urban” and related terms portray *urban music education* in a specific way. Although relatively few articles in either publication focus on *urban music education*, an *urban music education* discourse is clearly evident in the corpus, where the word “urban” is rarely defined but frequently used.

This analysis examines what is said about *urban music education* and also explores what is said about urban music classrooms, urban music students, and urban music teachers. Other words used near, adjacent, and in place of “urban” broadcast opinions about the actors of *urban music education*. While what is stated directly shapes the discourse of *urban music education*, what is *not* being said or what is implied also contributes to the discourse. Looking at how words

[17] A tool used to influence a community, propaganda communicates truths towards a position. Foucault notes in “Society Must Be Defended” that the dominant population of a social struggle utilizes their dominance to oppress an alternate version of events (1997).

are used, or not used, demonstrates how value-laden and contextual the discourse of *urban music education* has become.

In the process of writing this document, I have become aware that my own writing is problematic. Terms and phrases that have become part of a normative music education research discourse, including “urban teachers” and “urban music classrooms,” and such phrases carry the same connotations, weight, and prejudices as *urban music education*, discussed in Chapter 1. For the remainder of Chapter 4 and Chapter 5, I will also italicize these phrases in order to demonstrate the proliferation of labels and categorization present within the music education structure.

Using the Term “Urban”

To begin the examination of the discourse of *urban music education* within the corpus, I charted all occurrences of the term “urban” into a spreadsheet. For each occurrence, I created a spreadsheet row that included the author, year, and complete sentence as it appeared in the publication. After all statements were entered into the data sheet, I removed all non-relevant uses of “urban,” such as within the word “disturbance” or “Urbana.” Following this step, 264 data statements in 135 articles remained suitable for further analysis, and I read the articles in which each statement appeared. I then added an additional column for describing how “urban” was used in each statement, which served as an initial analysis. Next, I read through my analytical descriptions and searched for recurring themes and common uses. This second analysis yielded categories for statements in the discursive plane that include the term “urban”:

- Urban as different or abnormal (urban schools and classrooms as different, urban teachers and teaching as different, urban students as different, and success in urban schools and music programs as different)
- Urban as challenging
- Urban as unequal (not ideal, substandard)
- Urban as unwanted (less desirable, broken, pitiable)
- Urban as culturally disconnected
- Urban as a demarcation (category, undefined label)

Groups of statements within these categories formed threads within the *urban music education* discourse and will be examined below in order to analyze how these threads contribute to or reproduce discourse.

Urban as different or abnormal. Within the discourse, discussion about *urban music programs, teachers*, and *students* includes ideas about being "different." The dictionary (Random House, 2014) defines "different" in various ways, including "not alike in quality" and "abnormal." The juxtaposition of "urban" with the term "different," which occurs in the corpus, signals that *urban music education* or its students, teachers, and programs are "not alike in quality" or, more simply, "abnormal" when compared to their counterparts in other (suburban, rural) locations. This comparison sets up a value-laden hierarchy and positions *urban music education* actors in a subordinate or less attractive position than their non-urban peers. While the term "different" may acknowledge how one actor is dissimilar from a second comparable actor, in the discourse examined, "different" frequently implies *lesser*.

While some statements in the corpus contain the term "different" in proximity to urban, more typically statements *suggest* that *urban students, teachers*, and *programs* are somehow different than their counterparts. While I do not believe that any authors, especially those intending to foster support for *urban music programs*, mean to position *urban music education* as "abnormal," a critical analysis reveals that statements from even those most concerned with the quality of *urban music education* contribute to an existing disparaging discourse and inadvertently position *urban music education* as something requiring specific attention. Following Foucault (1977), the intent of the author is not considered in this analysis, but rather what is said.

Article titles demonstrate how *urban music education* is "different" from status quo and imply a need to address *urban music education* separately and specifically. For example, "The Rewards of Teaching Music in Urban Settings" (Bernard, 2010) infers that *urban music programs* are different from programs in other locations and that the presence of rewards in urban locations needs to be articulated to the audience. Substituting "suburban" in the place of "urban" seems odd and out of place, and creates an article title that implies a different message. Similarly, the title of another article, "Urban Music Education: The Teachers' Perspective" (Fiese & DeCarbo,

1995), suggests that *urban music teachers* have different perspectives due to the location of their experiences. Changing the title to "Suburban Music Education: The Teachers' Perspective" seems strange, as "suburban" is the norm and therefore not typically articulated, but rather assumed. These articles titles, from opposite ends of the corpus timeline, demonstrate a continued and consistent discursive thread over time.

Throughout the corpus examined in this study, statements that include the word "urban" position *urban schools, teachers*, and *students*, as well as their ability to be successful, as abnormal or different, and such actions continue to place *urban music education* in an othered and pejorative position. Statements in the discourse implicate that *urban schools* are different, *urban teachers* are different, *urban students* are different, and success in *urban music programs* is different. I organize the following analysis of "urban-as-different" by these categories.

Urban schools and classrooms as different. Throughout the corpus, a discourse of urban-as-different materializes through juxtapositions of terms. Descriptors in statements such as "Susan, a bright, energetic, young music education student, has been placed in an elementary school in an urban area" (Fallin & Royse, 2000, p. 20) imply differences between a typical student teacher (bright, energetic, and young) and the school to which she is assigned (*urban*). The word "urban" occurs only once in the article and in context most likely refers to a city area, but this and surrounding statements emphasize differences, describing the *urban school* as "older" (p. 20) and the students at the school as being on reduced or free lunch and non-native English speakers. No descriptors of Susan's socioeconomic status or first language are included, and are assumed to be, respectively, middle class and English.

Other statements in the corpus connect *urban music classrooms* with difference through a racial lens through phrases and words such as "black performed" (McCrary, 1993) and "ethnic" (Volk, 1993). McCrary's statement refers to a 1970 special issue of *MEJ* that focused on "teaching black performed music styles in urban schools" (p. 210), while Volk quotes Mark & Gary (1992) in an article about multicultural music education, writing, "Mark and Gary mention 'ethnic' music when discussing the changing music of urban classrooms" (p. 138). These statements rearticulate components of a discursive thread that connects "urban" to "difference" via race and

ethnicity, which will be examined in more depth later in this chapter and again in Chapter 5. Although such statements position *urban classrooms* or *schools* as "different," additional statements in the corpus position other urban actors, including teachers, in similar subordinate positions.

Urban teachers and teaching as different. Statements regarding *urban music teachers*, *urban music teacher preparation*, and *urban teacher experiences* contribute to the discursive thread of urban-as-different within the discursive plane. For example, a statement in an *MEJ* article reads, "in a recent survey, researchers asked successful urban music teachers, 'Do you feel that your undergraduate/graduate education courses prepared you to teach in the urban setting?'" (Allsup, 1997, p. 33). On the surface, the question seems innocuous, aimed at gathering information from participants. From a critical perspective, however, the question places *urban music teachers* outside the norm by implying that they require additional or other preparation and strategies when compared to non-urban teachers, or that those who decide to teach in *urban locations* will be unprepared as they enter the classroom. Non-urban teaching experiences are silently positioned as the normative ideal, moving other experiences to "different."

This "different preparation" thread is present throughout the corpus. For example, in an article about music teacher preparation, one statement notes that members who attended a 2003 MENC Biennial In-Service Conference workshop voiced "concerns" regarding "the need for innovative methodologies for students who might eventually teach in urban settings" (Greher & Tobin, 2006, p. 52). The articulated need for quality *urban music teachers* implies a dearth of competent, skilled music teachers in *urban music programs* (but not other programs). This discursive thread is consistent with inferences that *urban teachers* are different or need different preparation for schools and students who must also somehow be different than teachers in suburban, middle-class (normative) schools.

Statements in both journals isolate *urban music teachers* and contribute to this urban-teacher-as-different discursive thread. For example, in a study in *JRME* in which data about daily decisions and interactions of instrumental music teachers are used to develop teaching cases

reflective of current practices, “music teachers in urban schools” (Conway, 1999, p. 353) are listed as a group for consideration, thereby separating *urban music teachers* from the general teaching population. In an *MEJ* article*,* a description of a reception to celebrate and recognize *urban music teachers* at a state conference instead labels and segregates them, removing them from the norm under the guise of support. *Urban music education* may have “uniqueness” about it (Kindall-Smith, 2004, p. 43), but using such terminology places *urban music teachers* outside the scope of “normal” and into a different, usually inferior, category.

The association of “urban” and “unique” occurs elsewhere. In an *MEJ* article entitled “Urban Music Education: The Teachers’ Perspective,” the authors interview music educators in urban areas and inquire about “the unique teaching situations they face” (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 27). “Unique” is synonymous with “unusual,” insinuating differences and abnormality. In the same article, statements such as “the subject of urban music education must be explored from various viewpoints in order to provide the clearest and most realistic vision of the state and future of music in our urban schools” (p. 27) contributes to the different/abnormal discursive thread. The statement does not imply concern with the state of music education, which appears not to need examination, but rather with the state of *urban music education*, positioning urban actors into a “different” position within the structure. Again, suburban experiences are assumed to be normative while urban experiences are not.

Other statements in the discursive plane describing the *urban music teaching* experience imply that *urban music education* has a different set of realities or that *urban teachers* experience music education differently. For example, a suggestion that conversations within the profession must expand so that “preservice and in-service music educators who seek positions in urban schools will be well informed about the realities of the aspects of teaching music in the urban settings” (Bernard, 2010, p. 57) gives agency to the teachers who seek *urban music teaching* positions but also implies a warning that something is not quite right in the “urban setting.”

Still other statements in the corpus imply that *urban music teachers* have different experiences and different students than their non-urban peers. For example, a statement in a *JRME* study about teacher mentoring describes a program “designed to address the needs of

urban music teachers, who were teaching in schools with diverse student populations having a variety of learning needs and styles" (Conway & Holcomb, 2008, p. 56). Here *urban music teachers*, not teachers in any other school location, are connected to diverse student populations, and "diverse" is not defined but rather code for demographic differences discussed later in this document. In other words, the statement implies that *urban music teachers* work with *different* students and must deal with *different* circumstances and therefore need *different* mentoring. The statement also others *urban students* who are moved to a category separate form their non-urban (and therefore conforming) peers. Additional statements that connect *urban music students* with "different" appear in the next section.

Urban students as different. Comments in both decades of the corpus position *urban music education* students as different or abnormal. For example, in a *JRME* article regarding the presence of women in music education history texts, text contents are summarized and a book chapter entitled "Music Education for Specialized Needs" is described as including "minority groups, urban education, and special education" (Livingston, 1997, p. 137). This demarcation connects *urban music students* to special education and to "minority," and relegates *urban music students* into a category removed from the normal population. Statements in other articles point to differences in "the psychology of urban students" (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 29) and in the needs of students in *urban schools* (p. 28). In an article about introducing world music into the general music curriculum, the only use of the word "urban" occurs in a statement noting that "urban students will have different concerns from rural students" (Carolin, 2006, p. 41). How *urban students'* concerns are different or what is at the root of these different concerns is not unpacked; the statement, instead, juxtaposes *urban students* and rural students and marks urban students as "different."

Other statements in the corpus label *urban music students* as different by connecting them to specific (different) musical practices, and also enforce conceptions of "traditional" and "nontraditional." For example, an *MEJ* article about how to best serve *urban music students* explains that "*nontraditional* music experiences are often very important to urban children, who come from very diverse cultural backgrounds, because these experiences make a connection

between their lives and school" (Hinckley, 1995, p. 33, emphasis added). This statement is problematic in three ways. First, non-Western music, determined to be *nontraditional*, becomes othered in the statement, as do students who share culture with the types of music practices not associated with Western art music, explained in the article as including "Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven" (p. 33). Second, the inclusion of "world" musics may or may not connect a student from home to school any more than would another type of music. Third, the statement implies that *urban students* have "diverse cultural backgrounds" (not defined), which may or may not be the case, and ignores potential student diversity in other types of schools, including those that serve suburban and rural populations.

While the examples above connect difference to race and ethnicity, difference is also connected to SES in a *JRME* article that examines participation in middle school band among "urban middle school students" (Kinney, 2008, p. 145). One statement suggests that analyzing SES data, "especially with urban school students, might clarify who is served by or potentially excluded from curricular offerings in music" (p. 157). The results of this examination of *urban student* test scores and music participation suggests that band attracts higher achieving students in the school population and that band students generally come from a higher SES bracket, due to expenses associated with instrumental music. One thread in the article offers that urban low-SES students do not have the same (therefore abnormal) attendance figures in music or musical participation when compared to their more financially able peers, and that "higher SES has been linked to greater participation in music and the arts" (p. 157). Taken together, the statements position *urban music students* as having less, therefore placing them outside the norm and into a separate category.

Success in urban schools and music programs as different. Other statements in the corpus imply that success for *urban music education* actors also looks different. In one *MEJ* article, the authors ask interviewees about "specific teaching techniques, strategies, and approaches that you found to be particularly effective for teaching music in the urban situation" (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 28), as well as factors contributing to personal success as an *urban music teacher* (p. 29). Using the word "situation" to describe *urban schools* epitomizes the

threads in the discourse that position *urban music education* as different or not ideal. Such statements imply that *urban music teachers* must find different ways or use alternate strategies in order to be successful, or that *urban students* require different means in order to attain "success" as verified by compliance to a structure without interrogating what "success" might be.

"Success" can be found nine times in a 1997 *MEJ* article describing *urban music classrooms*, yet statements imply that *urban schools* are difficult places in which one can be "successful." Language such as "failure is easy to find in the city" (Allsup, 1997, p. 36) solidifies the idea that *urban music programs* struggle to meet normative expectations of an implied White middle class majority. "Success" in the article is defined in one instance as "watching my players believe in themselves" (p. 36), which while desirable, says nothing about music making, and the statement "altering traditional perspectives and expectations can help promote success in the urban music classroom" (p. 33) implies that urban students cannot reach the markers of success of the "traditional" (and unquestioned) music education structure unless given alternate (different or abnormal) parameters or benchmarks. Such statements place *urban music students* at a deficit, mark them as not able to reach goals that the music education structure has codified, articulate different versions of success for urban music actors and their non-urban peers, and label *urban schools* as struggling actors of the music education structure.

Similarly, statements in an *MEJ* article entitled "Building Your Instrumental Music Program in an Urban School" imply that success, or even simple functionality, must be attained differently in an *urban school music program* than in a non-urban setting (Mixon, 2005). Lists of resources about "what has worked for me and other urban music teachers" (p. 16) suggest that *urban music teachers* and *students* need alternate materials because *urban music education* defies the norm. In statements comparing fundraising opportunities in urban and "affluent" areas (p. 22), *urban schools* are positioned against and lower than non-urban schools. The comparison reminds the audience that success for urban actors is "different," and that reaching the suburban standard is not expected.

In another *MEJ* article published at nearly the same time, threads in the discursive plane suggest that *urban schools* and *teachers* need "special" or "additional" work in order to be

successful (Kindall-Smith, 2004). The article byline, “Professional development, recruiting, and mentoring initiatives for music teachers in Milwaukee may serve as a model for other urban programs,” positions *urban school systems* as different from other school systems. The article calls for reform (the word “reform” occurs in six statements) and repair, but does not articulate what is broken: are the programs broken or is the structure faulty? Words such as “disadvantaged” (p. 42), “poor” (p. 42), “transient” (p. 44), “hesitant” (p. 44), and “fears” (p. 44) paint a bleak portrait of *urban music education*, as these and other negative threads in the discourse challenge the perception that *urban music programs* can be successful.

Statements in an earlier article suggest that success in *urban schools* is elusive because *urban students* have special needs (Hinckley, 1995), and to accommodate those needs, *urban school systems* have established alternative schools, vocational schools, and magnet programs (p. 34). The same types of programs are available in suburban school systems, but only *urban school systems* are mentioned, supporting the implied claim that *urban students* have different (abnormal) needs and cannot be successful without “alternative” settings. *Urban students’* success becomes a target in the discursive plane.

Multiple statements contribute to discursive threads that position *urban music education* and the teachers, students, programs, and their success as “different.” Even the most vocal advocates for improving the state of *urban music education* construct a landscape of *urban music education* as abnormal and relegate actors within the *urban music education* structure using language that separates them from the “normal” population.

Urban as challenging. Statements that include a form of the word “challenge” or a synonym for challenge, such as “demanding” or “difficult,” also shape the discourse of *urban music education*. A challenge, according to Random House (2014), is a call or summons to engage in any contest or battle, or something that by its nature or character requires skill, strength, or special effort. A closer examination of statements that include “challenging” reveals patterns in the discourse that connect perceptions of “challenging” to *urban music programs*, *teachers*, and *students*. In this section, I critically examine statements that contribute to this discourse of urban-as-challenging.

Across the 264 statements in the discursive plane that use the term "urban," 90 statements contain a direct reference to "challenge" or an implied reference to being challenging. Terms from the root word "challenge," the most frequent indicator, appear 17 times. The earliest statements in the corpus that include a form of "challenge" occur in a 1995 *MEJ* article about *urban music education*. Statements such as "there is a commitment on the part of each of these [urban] teachers to overcome the unique set of challenges of the urban school" (Fiese & DeCarbo, p. 30) insinuate that urban music programs have challenges particular only to *urban schools*. Further, these challenges are "unique," which, as discussed earlier, is code for "different from those challenges of suburban school."

The pairing of "urban" with "challenging" in a different 1995 *MEJ* article portrays the *urban music education* system as bleak and difficult. The first statement encountered in the article, "the nature of urban life has created profound challenges for schools throughout America's growing number of urban centers" (Hinckley, 1995, p. 32), associates "challenges" with "the nature of urban life" and urban actors. The negative label "profound" further emphasizes a damaging image of "urban." By extension, students are positioned as unfortunate to reside and be educated in urban centers, yet in 1995, the majority of the United State's population lived in such areas.[18] The same article describes "the challenge [teachers] face in designing and delivering music education to urban youth" (p. 32), promoting the idea that teaching in the *urban setting* is not normative or is more difficult than teaching elsewhere in part due to the presence of undefined characteristics of the young people who live there. Such statements in the discursive plane infer that *urban schools* and *students* are places and people to avoid.

The next combination of "urban" and "challenging" occurs nine years later in a 2004 *MEJ* statement describing music teachers as working in "extremely difficult school environments with challenging students" (Robinson, p. 38). Although the article, which is about at-risk students in the music classroom, presents viewpoints of master teachers from both urban and suburban schools,

[18] In 1995–1996, 72.6% of elementary and secondary school students attended schools in areas considered urban, large, city, or urban fringe. (NCES, 1999).

when discussing “at-risk” students, the majority of the teachers quoted are from urban areas, not suburban areas.

In the following year (2005), an article about building instrumental music programs in *urban schools* contains statements that couple “challenging” with multiple urban actors. While advocating for strong and successful *urban music programs*, statements such as “teaching instrumental music may present some extraordinary challenges in urban schools” (Mixon, 2005, p. 16) infer that success is more difficult to attain in *urban music programs* than in their non-urban counterparts. In similar statements, such as “urban schools present some different challenges from other schools, and you may need to work harder to secure funding and other support to keep your program growing” (p. 22), the juxtaposition of “urban” and “challenges” strengthens this thread of the discourse, as the phrase “different challenges” others *urban schools* without explanation. The suggestion that *urban teachers* will need to “work harder” than non-urban teachers to achieve success relegates urban actors to a subordinate position without providing the option of altering the notion of “success” in the music education structure, and protects codified images of successful music classrooms.

A single statement in a 2008 *MEJ* article about an urban general music class project pairs “urban” with “challenging” and other deficit labels: “As a music educator and team player in urban schools, I have often felt the burden that many teachers who teach in underachieving schools feel – the challenge of teaching children so that they will learn” (Jenkins, 2008, p. 42). The statement cements the connection between *urban music students* and difficult or unfavorable conditions as well as the absence of success or even the ability to learn.

An *MEJ* article titled “The Rewards of Teaching Music in Urban Settings” (Bernard, 2010) suggests a positive turn in the discourse of *urban music education*, yet the need to articulate the notion that *urban music education* has rewards infers that such rewards may be difficult to find. In the article, the word “challenging” appears six times in descriptions of *urban music programs*, *teachers*, and *students*. Statements point to the “challenges facing music educators who work in urban settings” (p. 53), “the challenges most urban kids face” (p. 55), the “challenges that music educators in the city face” (p. 55), “the challenges and rewards of urban music teaching” (p. 57),

and how “challenging (it is) to create effective relationships with students in urban schools” (p. 57). By the end of the article, the word “challenge” coupled with negative descriptors regarding urban actors inundates the reader/consumer-of-discourse, forcing the words “urban” and “challenging” to become inseparable within the discursive plane. These statements, in conjunction with other deficit-laden terms such as “scarcity” and “difficulties” (p. 53) in the same article, continue the idea propagated in the discourse that *urban music education* is anything but rewarding.

The corpus includes recurring attempts to support or even to celebrate teaching in urban locations. Even through attempts at praise, however, the discourse continues to position *urban music education* as “challenging,” which is code for an undesirable place for both music students and music teachers.

Urban as unequal. While the analyses above focus on urban-as-different and urban-as-challenging in the discourse, statements in two related discursive stands position urban actors as unequal to their non-urban peers. In this section, statements from these two sub-strands delineate how urban is viewed as unequal: urban as not ideal and urban as substandard.

Urban as not ideal. Within the discursive plane, statements directly connect *urban students* with not ideal. The word “ideal” occurs in some statements while in others “not ideal” or “less than ideal” is implied or inferred. For example, the following statement categorizes non-urban students as “ideal,” labels *urban students* as non-conforming, and demotes “most” *urban students* to a deficient position: “While several (*urban music teachers*) felt musically prepared, they said their pre-service education prepared them for teaching the ‘ideal’ student and left them unprepared for the reality of urban schools, where most of the students do not conform to the ideal” (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 28). This statement first appears in an *MEJ* article in 1995 and is quoted in a subsequent *MEJ* article in 1997 (Allsup), further enforcing “urban” and “not ideal” connections in the discursive plane over time.

In a later *MEJ* article based on interviews with five *urban music teachers*, two teachers are described as noting “that some people mistakenly believe that children in urban schools are less capable than other children” (Bernard, 2010, p. 54). Although this statement intends to

further the idea that *urban students* are capable, the presence of the phrase “children in urban schools are less capable” demonstrates how the *urban music education* discourse is constituted, regardless of the negating word “mistakenly” that precedes it. Also, the statement provides corroboration that *urban music students* are “less capable” and therefore less ideal than their non-urban (suburban) counterparts.

Other language in the discursive plane implies similar notions about urban-as-less-than-ideal. For example, statements such as “sometimes urban areas are little more than incubators of indifference; they can scarcely be said to be an appropriate environment for children’s education” (Hinckley, 1995, p. 32) include strong language that describes urban areas. Such descriptions inappropriately label urban areas, and by extension the schools and students within them, as deficient based on location. Throughout the corpus, other specific qualifiers point to a disadvantaged status or condition, and position *urban music education* as “not ideal.” For example, “several factors, such as lack of access to private instruction or not owning a quality instrument, can place students from urban or rural programs at a disadvantage in state and district competitions” (Barnes, 2002, p. 43) assumes both that *urban students* do not have access to private lessons or own quality instruments and that all *urban music programs* (and rural ones too) share the same goals in relation to an idealized notion of performing and ratings at festivals, likely tied to the suburban actors who are *not* mentioned. Through gross generalizations, statements such as these propagate an idea within the discourse that the majority of *urban schools* are not ideal while reinforcing the perceived suburban ideal.

Similarly, descriptions of “often unfavorable publicity [that] urban schools receive” (Mixon, 2005, p. 18) connect *urban music programs* with negativity and being less-than-ideal. Such actions can be detrimental to the status of *urban programs* within the music education structure, and that connection and affiliation with “less than ideal” is difficult to sever, given the preponderance of negativity tied to *urban music education*, as described in the next section.

Urban as substandard. The discourse in this corpus portrays *urban music education* as unequal to music education that occurs elsewhere via statements that position urban as substandard to or lesser than non-urban (suburban, or in some cases suburban and rural) peers.

Both flagrant and subtle terms and descriptions contribute to this urban-as-substandard thread in the discursive plane.

Numerous statements label *urban music programs* as substandard, whether through implication (e.g., “do you have any general observations for ways to improve music education within the urban schools?”, Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 29) or more directly (e.g., “comparisons between affluent suburbs and urban settings often reveal stark differences between the music resources available to students and the level of community support for the arts” (DeLorenzo, 2003, p. 38). Yet not all references to *urban music education* as substandard manifest in obvious ways. A statement in a 1996 article about choral breathing exercises, for example, notes that students must acquire “kinesthetic awareness” which is “not a natural physical development, particularly for those with sedentary urban lifestyles” (Doscher, 1992, in Boardman, 1996, p. 27), implying that *urban students* lead less active lives than their non-urban counterparts, may struggle to adequately develop their senses, and thus are compromised. Labeling an entire population as sedentary is troublesome, as the labeling statement becomes a fixture in the discursive plane. In statements such as this, urban actors are compared to the suburban “ideal,” and any differences become faults that force “urban” to become code for “substandard.”

Phrases such as “incubators of indifference” and not “an appropriate environment for children’s education” (Hinckley, 1995, p. 32), previously noted in the “urban-as-less-than-ideal” analysis, also label *urban school* settings and music programs as substandard. Language in the same article describes *urban schools* as “bleak and forbidding” (p. 32), and other statements note a lack of access in *urban schools* to resources that non-urban schools possess and which help non-urban students succeed. The assertion that “the contrast in our urban schools between what should be and what is cannot be ignored” (p. 35) homogenizes *urban schools* and marks them as deficient in comparison to an imagined standard that exists elsewhere, particularly in the idealized suburban setting.

In some instances, the substandard inference occurs when *urban schools* are compared to a suburban ideal alongside statements that advocate for all music programs to meet an idealized model of excellence. An *MEJ* article supporting *urban music education* outlines the

conditions and practices essential to a "successful" K–12 music program: ample time and space for music rehearsal, appropriate funding, and the hiring of qualified music teachers (Mixon, 2005, p. 15). A subsequent statement in the same article notes that "sadly, these requisite conditions are presently inadequate in most urban schools" (p. 15). Suggestions that "urban schools are plagued with inadequate funding and often have older instruments – probably too few in number and too many in disrepair" (p. 21) and that "many urban schools do not have feeder programs, and you may need to start beginners in the higher grades" (p. 16) continue a discursive thread of *urban programs* as substandard and unable to meet idealized expectations of success. Such statements and ideas permeate the *urban music education* discourse. Stereotypes thrive in the *urban music education* discourse, reinforcing notions that *urban schools* and suburban schools (and by extension their music programs) do not share the same levels of resources, prohibiting *urban music programs* from meeting the perceived (and unquestioned) idealized benchmarks of success celebrated by the music education structure.

Throughout the discursive plane, statements that support *urban music students'* participation in experiences perceived as markers of success (including district and state competitions) occur alongside claims about inadequate "resources and support" (Barnes, 2002, p. 53). Further, arguing that "students in urban schools can do everything that other students can do" (Bernard, 2010, p. 53) effectively demonstrates that a discourse of *urban music education* as substandard and unequal exists. Using the qualifier of "urban" in contrast to "other" in order to describe students as able demonstrates the existence of a discourse that suggests otherwise.

The thread of less money and fewer resources occurs throughout the discursive plane, along with frequent allusions to the inability of *urban school districts* to fund *urban music programs*, *urban teachers* and *urban teacher development*. In *JRME,* findings of a study about attitudes of music education majors regarding occupational status include the observations that "teachers are more respected in rural areas [than in urban areas]" (Bergee, 1992, p. 108), and that salary was an area of concern (p. 110). In an other study published in *JRME*, principals and mentors in an *urban school district* mention that "our district just does not have the resources like the suburban schools do to provide training or pay for mentors," and "we have so many things to

fix out here that the mentor program is just not a priority" (Conway, 2003, p. 11). Statements in a later *MEJ* article continue that thread: "wealthy suburban districts often have detailed beginning-teacher programs, whereas other districts frequently do not" (Conway, 2006, p. 56). The implication is that *urban teachers* may not receive the same assistance or support as their non-urban peers. These statements focus on formal mentoring programs without exploring other options, including informal mentoring practices, and blemish the *urban music education* community.

Statements in the discursive plane connect *urban music education* actors to ideas of poverty, absent resources, struggles for success, and poor mentorship for teachers, furthering the urban-as-substandard discourse thread. Several statements originate in advocacy articles, which include descriptions of perceived shortfalls while attempting to suggest that an idealized and undefined "success" is possible. The dichotomy presented between *urban music education* and the idealized non-urban teaching situation perpetuates threads of urban-as-not-ideal and urban-as-substandard, or urban-as-unequal. It should be no surprise, then, that *urban music education* actors are also portrayed as unwanted, as presented in the next section.

Urban as unwanted. Threads in the discourse portray urban actors as an unwanted population, placing *urban music students*, *urban schools*, and *urban neighborhoods* in a pejorative space. The word "unwanted," according to Random House (2014), is synonymous with undesirable, annoying, and unsolicited, and statements in the discursive plane include such descriptors of urban actors. As demonstrated in the subsequent analyses, *urban music education* actors are described as less desirable, broken, and pitiable.

Urban as less desirable. Throughout the twenty-year corpus examined in this study, *urban music education* actors are described as less desirable than their non-urban counterparts. While some inferences of "less desirable" occur through direct comparisons between or juxtapositions of stereotypical urban and suburban classrooms, at other times *urban music programs* are characterized as less desirable through negative prose associated with undesirable conditions, including poor funding and high transiency. In this section, I analyze lists of

inadequacies outlined in selected statements in the corpus and examine other “less desirable” ideas brought to the surface within this discursive plane.

As suggested in the previous section, money, specifically the lack of funds in or for *urban school music programs*, appears throughout the discourse. This fiscal issue occurs across multiple threads in the *urban music education* discourse, including threads described earlier in this document.

In an early *MEJ* article, “urban schools” are described as “frequently underfunded, understaffed, and overpopulated” (Hinckley, 1995, p. 32), and a different description in an *MEJ* article 15 years later accomplishes the same goal of ostracizing *urban music programs*: “the scarcity of instruments, textbooks, and other resources; a lack of parental and administrative support; and difficulties with classroom management are just a few of the issues that confront music teachers who work in urban communities” (Bernard, 2010, p. 53). Both of these statements portray *urban schools* as undesirable due to a lack of monetary support, ill-behaved children, and large class sizes, which though not unique to *urban school systems*, are positioned as “urban” problems.

Urban teachers, for example, are less likely than their suburban counterparts to receive mentoring or beginning teacher assistance because *urban school systems* “do not have financial resources for providing beginning teacher support” (Conway, 2006, p. 56). A *JRME* study about district-sponsored music teacher mentor programs for various types of schools includes statements noting that mentors to teachers in suburban school districts were paid and prepared for their mentorship roles with new teachers, but in *urban school systems*, mentors were neither paid nor prepared (Conway, 2003, p. 11). In this scenario, both the position of beginning *urban music teacher* and the position of mentor become less desirable because those who choose to accept such positions may not receive the same level of support as their suburban counterparts.

Some statements connecting financial concerns related to teaching in *urban schools* derive from teachers who note, for example, that “in spite of my frugality, like most urban teachers, I spend a good deal more of my own money than is allowed as a deduction on my income taxes” (Mixon, 2005, p. 21). Out-of-pocket spending may be a reality for teachers

regardless of where they work, yet this positioning specifically names “urban” and creates a negative space in which *urban music programs* become less desirable for teachers due to financial concerns and added personal expenses. While suburban or rural programs may also be underfunded, neither those issues nor the causes of poor finances are discussed. What *is* articulated focuses on the lack of funds in *urban music programs*, adding to the urban-as-less-desirable thread in the discourse.

Similar to funding, transiency among *urban music education* students also emerges in the discursive plane as a condition that contributes to the urban-as-less-desirable thread. The following two statements connect transiency to urban locations and suggest that transiency is particularly problematic in this environment: “in most districts, attrition in music ensembles is high between schools, but in large urban districts it is probably higher, often because students will transition to several different schools,” and “another factor to consider with urban schools is that some students may move several times throughout their experience in the district” (Mixon, 2005, p. 20). Statements in another article assert a “preponderance” (Kinney, 2010, p. 337) of transience in urban areas and suggest that “mobility, or student transience, is a reportedly a growing problem in urban schools, in general, and has been highly negatively correlated with student achievement and parent involvement” (Kinney, 2010, p. 334). Such statements link *urban music programs* and transient students, who are also labeled in the latter statement as low achievers with uninvolved parents. Although the statements above include words that suggest speculation (“reportedly”), the connections between urban and less desirable have been forged in the discursive plane.

Like students and their families, teachers in urban areas also move. A study about music teacher attrition and migration published in *JRME* suggests that music teachers may leave *urban schools* for various reasons (Hancock, 2008). Yet statements in the same article, such as “larger salaries do not compensate for all the issues that teachers face in urban settings” (Lankford, Loeb, & Wykcoff, 2002, in Hancock, 2008, p. 132), continue a discursive thread of urban-as-less-desirable economically and for other unidentified reasons. Non-urban actors are not paired with words assumed to have negative connotations, such as “issue” or “problem.”

While scant resources and transient populations are recurring themes within the discursive plane, other language also positions *urban music education* actors into less desirable categories. For example, an *MEJ* article about *urban instrumental music programs* describes such programs as having "limited funding, high levels of poverty, and high ethnic minority enrollments" (Mixon, 2005, p. 16). The statement not only projects a discourse of urban-as-less-desirable for economic reasons, but also less desirable because of "ethnic minority" students who are connected to "high poverty" in this list. Additional lists in the same article contribute to the negativity in the discourse of *urban music programs, schools*, and *students*, such as:

> urban schools typically have a higher number of students who are described as at-risk, meaning that their living environment or behavior indicates a greater possibility of dropping out of school, criminal activity, pregnancy, or other behaviors that can prevent a desirable future. (p. 17)

While these same activities may also be part of the youth cultures in suburbs and rural areas, this statement connects criminal and sexual activity among American youth populations to *urban schools* and students, suggesting that urban places and people are less desirable than their non-urban peers.

In another *MEJ* article*,* statements such as "urban schools have the highest percentage of at-risk students, the most pervasive problems, and extraordinary negative publicity" (Kindall-Smith, 2004, p. 42) pollute the discourse. At-risk students, multiple types of problems, and bad press exist not only in *urban schools*, but also in rural and suburban schools. The context of the article requires an initial positioning of *urban music education* as less desirable and struggling in order to describe the perceived issues present for urban actors. The entirety of the piece includes more positive messages about urban actors; yet surrounding the word "urban" with numerous negative descriptors forces *urban music education* into a specific position in the discourse, a position more aligned with less desirable than hopeful.

As noted earlier in this chapter, words such as "harsh" (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 30) and "bleak and forbidding" (Hinckley, 1995, p. 32) appear alongside "urban" in the discursive plane. This use of language contributes to the "urban-as-less-desirable" thread and, possibly, to

the difficulties described regarding the recruitment and retention of teachers in *urban schools* (Hancock, 2008). Additional statements proclaim that *urban schools* and their music programs "suffer the most" (Kindall-Smith, 2004, p. 41), have less resources available and less support for the arts within their communities (DeLorenzo, 2003), and lack parental support (Kinney, 2010). These perceived difficulties foster a negative perception of *urban music programs*, and negative perceptions may contribute to the "high demand for specialized teachers in areas such as music" in *urban schools* (Madsen & Hancock, 2002, p. 7).

Statements such as "contact time with students is a coveted commodity, especially in urban schools where added pressure is put on teachers to help students raise low scores on mandated tests" (Mixon, 2005, p.18) solidify the idea that both *urban schools* and *urban students* are deficient. It should not be surprising, then, that preservice teachers, having been exposed to this discourse of *urban music education*, carry negative ideas about the environment and are both "hesitant to teach in urban classrooms" (Kindall-Smith, 2004, p. 44) and more likely to apply for jobs in suburban or rural areas than in urban areas. Statements in the same article claim that student teaching placement requests tend to cluster outside of urban areas, even if local *urban schools* have outstanding and recognized music programs (p. 42). Influenced by the discourse, preservice and even practicing music teachers understand *urban music education* to be less desirable, and these perspectives in the discourse continue to remain dominant.

The pairing of *urban music education* with ideas of how it is or could be "less desirable" affects the discourse, and once these threads are woven into the larger context of the music education structure, they become difficult to disentangle. Across the timeframe of this corpus, urban music actors have been positioned to be *less* than their peers. Whether *less* capable, *less* resourceful, *less* prepared, *less* involved, *less* sustainable, *less* stable, *less* safe, *less* funded, or simply *less* desirable, the way we speak about and of *urban music education* has positioned it to be what we describe it as: *less.*

Urban as broken. The discourse depicts urban communities–and by extension their schools and music programs–as broken. This depiction includes references to "reform" and implies that the schools are currently dysfunctional, disorderly, and require repair. In this

discursive thread, the desire to "fix" *urban schools* contributes to the urban-as-broken thread. While educators anywhere may desire better things for their schools and students, descriptions of *urban reform* and the need for *urban improvement* suggest that the current state of *urban schools* prohibits *urban students* from being successful. Across the corpus, statements contribute to the urban-as-broken discourse.

Comments that "30 to 50 percent of new teachers who work in urban areas leave the field in their first three years of service" (MENC, 2005 in Mixon, 2005, p. 16) imply high teacher turnover is an urban problem, not a problem of the profession regardless of the location. This particular item of propaganda, which rearticulates a notion previously stated by a prominent national organization (noted in the article), reinforces the perceptions of *urban classrooms* as less functional than non-urban spaces. Statements or articles that focus on "the state and future of music in our urban schools" (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 27), with little attention paid to rural schools or suburban schools, isolate *urban schools* and imply that *urban school music programs* have a more questionable future than schools elsewhere. In one instance, "urban" and "reform" appear in the same statement twice, including the phrase "rough passages of reform" (Kindall-Smith, 2004, p. 43), suggesting that *urban music programs* may be dysfunctional, in permanent disrepair, and difficult to "fix." Taken together, this discursive thread suggests that music programs in urban areas are more fractured than music programs elsewhere. Being perceived as broken is detrimental to all *urban music education* actors, and these ideas in the discursive plane inspire pity, as seen the next section.

Urban as pitiable. Throughout the discursive plane, *urban music programs*, *teachers*, and especially *students* are described in ways that ask the audience to forgive shortcomings that urban actors might have due to where they live and go to school. The invitation to pity *urban music education* actors, present in the discourse, impedes development of a positive and healthy discourse for a group within the music education structure.

Urban students are labeled as suffering in phrases such as "this also builds self-esteem, which is so often low with urban students" (Mixon, 2005, p. 18). While some *urban students* may indeed have low self-esteem, the implication is that most do. Further, students in other school

classifications (suburban, rural) may also have low self-esteem, though they are not mentioned. Labeling *urban students* begs pity for a certain population. A statement later in the article declares that "instrumental music programs should be made for the benefit of the deserving children in them – especially the often forgotten children in urban schools" (Mixon, 2005, p. 22), further luring the reading audience to pity *urban children* who are "forgotten" yet somehow "deserving." While such statements aim to draw attention to *urban music education*, to do so through inciting pity contributes to a discourse of urban-as-less-than.

Some descriptions of *urban children* that ask for pity through implication also suggest that the presence of a music teacher or a music program can improve their social conditions. For example, asking "what can music programs provide children in the urban school that will make a positive difference in their lives?" (Hinckley, 1995, p. 33) insinuates that all *urban music students* have pitiable lives and that they need to be saved by a school music program. Another thread of urban-as-pitiable suggests that *urban students* face "challenges" in their lives and music teachers should aim to create a welcoming classroom environment that feels like "home" (Bernard, 2010, p. 57). Such statements contribute to the discourse of urban-as-pitiable and to the "teacher as savior" threads, thus diminishing both *urban students* and the lives they have in urban locations.

Urban music teachers, seen as saviors in one discursive thread, are themselves pitied in other threads. The term "woefully unprepared," used as a descriptor for *beginning urban music teachers* (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 28), simultaneously asks the audience to feel sorry for the teachers and to excuse any difficulties that they face, shifting blame to the university teacher preparation programs that have (incompletely) educated them. Statements that "empathize" with new urban teachers (Allsup, 1997, p. 34) also contribute to the urban-as-pitiable thread in the discourse.

Urban schools are also depicted as vulnerable and pitiable in statements such as "it seems easier to cut programs in poor urban schools" (Clements, 2009, p. 54) and "all too often, our urban schools suffer the most" (Kindall-Smith, 2004, p. 41). In these statements and others, negative or deficit-laden terms become attached to *urban schools* and portray urban actors as less desirable, broken, something to be pitied, something "less" than the dominant normative

category. Across the discursive plane, such statements position the urban actors as more damaged than their non-urban peers, relegating them to an unwanted group status.

Urban as culturally disconnected. Foucault describes culture as "a hierarchical organization of values, accessible to everybody, but at the same time the occasion of a mechanism of selection and exclusion" (Foucault, 1981–1982/2001, p. 179). Culture, as a system of thoughts, ideas, and symbolic practices, is constructed out of numerous, competing discourses that guide actions and beliefs of a community. When members of the community enact actions and beliefs that are determined to be incorrect, those actors move into a position of "other." Actors whose practices are not in concordance with the accepted systems of the structure are viewed as "different" and disconnected. Perceived differences cause human beings to create systems of classification, and these categories of meaning, according to Foucault, are "imposed by culture as a basis of inequality and oppression" (Monaghan & Just, 2000, p. 58).

References throughout the corpus examined in this study connect "urban" to "culture" and position *urban music education* so that it is outside the perceived idealized norm or propagated in the music education structure. Threads in the discourse compare cultures of *urban music students* and to those of their teachers, describe the *urban culture* as "diverse" and different from non-urban culture, and position *urban music practices* as other. Within these threads about culture, some statements connect the concept of "urban" to race and race to poverty; race is further examined in Chapter 5. In this portion of the analysis, I describe two threads in the discursive plane related to "culturally disconnected." The first thread portrays *urban students* and *urban teachers* as at odds with or outsiders to each other, and the second portrays urban actors as not having culture.

The first thread portrays *urban students* and *urban teachers* as culturally dissimilar from one and other. For example, the statement "music teachers who are successful in the urban setting must share successful teaching strategies so that new teachers can benefit from their experience in spanning what is often a cultural void between teacher and learner" (Hinckley, 1995, p. 34) promotes the discursive thread of *urban students* and *urban teachers* as culturally disconnected through the explicit use of "cultural void." The statement occurs early in the

discursive plane, demonstrating the legacy of such strands in the *urban music education* discourse.

Another statement in the corpus concedes the student/teacher culture divide by acknowledging that teachers can be successful "even if you are an urban music teacher who considers yourself an inexperienced rap artist" (Allsup, 1997, p. 35). In the context of the article, composition in the form of rap is suggested as a teaching technique appropriate for *urban music classrooms*, connecting rap to *urban students,* but not *urban teachers*, through an implication of familiarity. The assumption is that *urban music students* will want to rap and that *urban music teachers* will not know how to do so. Rap music has a strong association with Black youth and an association with violence and offensive language (even if not true), furthering these connections with *urban music education.* In this instance, the cultural divide suggested in the discourse is not only musical and generational but also racial; this will be discussed in the next chapter.

Another indication of the divide between *urban students* and their teachers is inferred in a statement that suggests "that most often teachers who teach urban kids don't live in the same communities" (Bernard, 2010, p. 57). As seen in other parts of the analysis in this chapter and next, "urban" within *urban music education* means poor and minority. The statement above implies that *urban music students* are physically, economically, and racially removed from the White, middle class ideal, and therefore culturally disconnected. This statement, appearing at the end of the corpus, reiterates cultural differences between *urban student* and *urban teacher* presented fifteen years earlier in this discursive plane.

As will be described in Chapter 5, *urban population* and *urban culture* are depicted as "diverse" and unlike non-urban people and culture. Statements such as "multicultural education is uniquely suited to the urban environment" (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 29) connect urban to ethnic diversity and imply a non-urban norm of non-diverse. "Urban," used here as an adjective, draws connections within the discursive plane between "urban" and minority students in general. The pairing of "urban" and, more specifically, "African-American" occurs throughout the corpus, even when there is no need to use the word "urban." For example, in a 1995 *MEJ* article focused on the development of a MIDI lab in an Ohio neighborhood, the administrators of the program

requested that the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for the Performing and Cultural Arts music program focus on multiple aspects of music making and provide an African-American perspective, which "seemed reasonable since the students were predominately urban, African American students" (Beery, 1995, p. 35). The connection of the students' ethnicity to the term "urban" was unnecessary for the storyline. That single instance was the only use of the term "urban" in the article, and removing it would not alter the message of the article. The language, however, connects "urban" to "African-American" and implies that both are culturally disconnected from the idealized (White, middle class suburban) norms.

The partial history of the urban-as-culturally-disconnected thread is revealed in a 2002 *MEJ* article entitled "Music Education in a Time of Cultural Transformation" (Campbell, 2002), which summarizes changes in music education over time. A section about the 1960s recounts the changing demographics of schools in *urban areas* and the impact music teachers were able to make by "reshaping institutional practice" (p. 29) and by including various styles and genres of music. Direct connections between "urban" and "African-American" enforce the perceived association in the discourse: "the emergence of 'urban music,' which in reality was the music of African-Americans, was slow to come but was indeed a response by a few enlightened inner-city music teachers to the discontent they heard around them" (p. 29). Statements such as these expose the history of "urban" as code for minority, African-American, or an actor seen as culturally different from the idealized norms.

Other statements from this corpus also show the history of ideas in the *urban music education* discourse. For example, a 1991 quote about *urban schools* cited in a 2009 *MEJ* article directly positions urban as poor and minority: "poor urban schools, the places where most of our children go to school, are predominately minority" (Funes, 1991, p.32, in Clements, 2009, p. 54). While other links between urban and poor are examined in the "Urban as Substandard" section of this chapter, this statement demonstrates the legacy of these ideas in the *urban music education* discourse and solidifies the discursive threads that imply a disconnect between urban/poor/minority students and an idealized suburban culture.

Other statements in the corpus infer that *urban music students*, with their varied cultural backgrounds, are disadvantaged because they do not have the same cultural knowledge base as their non-urban peers. For example, statements in an *MEJ* article about play-party games explain that *urban children* (not rural or suburban students) would struggle with references to the terms "miller" and "hopper" in lyrics of the song "Happy Is the Miller," a song about farm life provided as an example (Howle, 1997, p. 27). Such statements epitomize a discourse of urban-as-culturally-disconnected without acknowledging that suburban students may not be familiar with farm business or that not all rural students live on farms. The blatant declaration of *urban students* as lacking basic knowledge impacts the discourse and labels the *urban culture* as deficient or disconnected from a perceived common culture.

A *JRME* study about urban middle school band students' decisions to participate and persist in band notes that "teachers in urban schools can find it challenging to recruit and retain students in instrumental music electives because typically these schools enroll greater proportions of minority students" (Kinney, 2010, p. 336) and that "the perceived cultural relevance of instrumental ensembles affected recruitment of minorities" (p. 336). *Urban students,* who are not White, are illustrated as disinterested in school band programs and as cultural outsiders from the position of a normative instrumental music education. Demographic data used in the study came from *urban middle schools* where the majority of school population was White. Readers are cautioned that results may be problematic to generalize to schools that are not predominately White and that "minority and nonminority students are equally likely to join and remain enrolled in urban band programs, at least in schools where the racial makeup is predominately White" (Kinney, 2010, p. 346). Such contributions to the corpus portray non-White urban students as cultural outsiders who are disconnected from or disinterested in a perceived norm. Such statements, located at the later end of the corpus, demonstrate the obstinacy of threads in the discourse.

Segments of the *urban music education* discourse position multiple elements of urban culture, including *urban music practices*, as culturally disconnected. Statements such as "if you compare the urban sounds of Arrested Development to those of country music's Garth Brooks,

you can hear how *different ways of life* develop different types of music" (Masterson, 1994, p. 27, emphasis added) enforce a prejudiced dichotomy. The statement connects *urban music students* with rap/hip-hop music and a group of mostly Black musicians, and non-urban students with country music and a White musician-star. While Arrested Development produces music that typically carries positive themes and little to no objectionable language, listeners not familiar with the genre might stereotype the Afrocentric hip-hop group. Connecting "urban" to a genre of music forces associations within the discursive plane that allows the structure to view *urban music education* actors as culturally different or disconnected from a norm. Such positioning within the discourse advances the idea that *urban music students* are cultural outsiders to their non-urban peers, and labels them as different, not ideal, substandard, and broken.

Urban as a demarcation. As demonstrated in the previous sections, "urban" serves to move groups of actors into or away from norms. This action of fixing boundary limits or situating a dividing line is an act of demarcation (Random House, 2014) and operates in this corpus in at least three ways. First, "urban" appears as a substitute for "city area," inferring specific demographics and populations. Second, "urban" also exists as a category, commonly juxtaposed with "suburban" and/or "rural." A third and final demarcation is urban used as a label, typically as an adjective with no defining context, therefore contributing to the complex meanings of "urban" within the discursive plane.

Urban as city. Within the corpus, the term "urban" suggests, at times, a city setting or large, densely populated area. Most such occurrences appear in articles exploring historical aspects of music education or population migration. In this strand, statements commonly refer to past events; urban was not similarly or frequently used as code for "city" when referring to then-current ideas.

In two 1995 *MEJ* articles, "urban" appears three different ways, each instance ethnographic or historical in nature. Twice "urban" describes the setting of the narrative: one refers to Los Angeles as an "urban" area of the United States (Campbell, 1995a, p. 45), and another characterizes a song as a tune sung in "urban" areas (p. 46). The third use of "urban" refers to the migration of Blacks "from the rural South into the urban areas of the North and

South" (Campbell, 1995b, p. 42). Similar statements appear in a 2000 *JRME* article describing a relocation pattern of Australian aborigines from their original habitat lands to urban, or city, areas (Campbell, 2000): "…Blacking protested the action on the basis that aborigines' resettlement in urban areas would make them susceptible to deadly European diseases" (p. 339). In these instances the author uses "urban" to define a populated area, which is a geographic connotation and different from other threads encountered during this portion of the analysis.

Other statements also utilize "urban" in order to convey a city or a city-like area, as in "every American child, rural as well as urban" (Lee, 1997,p. 307), "people living in urban and eventually even rural localities" (Lum, 2008, p. 101), and "urban areas of America" (Small, 2009, p. 48). Demographic contexts are described as urban in eight statements within a single article (Howe, 1992), and similar patterns evolve elsewhere in the discursive plane (Volk, 1994, 2001), including references to organizations with names that include "urban" such as "Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs"[19] (Volk, 2001, p. 36).

At times "urban" has been employed to infer a city or populous area. One statement connects urban to a specific city (Los Angeles in Campbell, 1995a, p. 45), but in other statements, no other defining information or specific reference is provided. In statements describing migration patterns, urban is juxtaposed with rural, providing a contextual reference as to the meaning of "urban."

Urban as category. "Urban" materializes as a generic population density category serving to separate one type of actor, usually a school or school group, from another, and appears 59 times in the corpus in this way. Although used in both publications and in both decades (1991–2010), "urban" occurs most frequently in the second decade of *JRME* (2001–2010): 37 times or 62.71% of the statements. The following analysis of urban-as-category highlights instances of "urban" in which the purpose of the term is to place actors into a group to separate them from other groups. In most articles, "urban" occurs only once in a single statement, with little or no definition of the term.

[19] The Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs is at the Walter P. Reuther Library at Wayne State University. Founded in 1960, the Archives holds collections related to the American Labor Movement and American unions. (http://www.reuther.wayne.edu/about)

Urban-as-category often occurs as a means of organization or what will be referred to as a “list” in this section of the study. Four different lists appear in the discursive plane: urban with suburban, rural, and smaller city; urban with rural; urban with suburban; and urban with suburban and rural (see Table 7). The four-way separation occurs only once (Bergee, 1992b, p. 107) in a *JRME* article regarding music education majors’ attitudes towards occupational status. “Urban” also appears later in the same article in a statement comparing the level of perceived respect for *urban teachers* versus rural teachers.

Table 7

How Urban As Category Is Used In Lists

Category Pairings With Urban	MEJ Early	MEJ Late	JRME Early	JRME Late	Total
With Suburban, Rural, & Smaller City	0	0	1	0	1
With Rural	2	0	3	3	8
With Suburban	0	1	0	9	10
With Suburban & Rural	1	6	8	25	40
Total	3	7	12	37	59

Eight articles include categorical lists that position urban and rural as two different groups, resulting in city-based schools in opposition to non-city-based schools with no definition or description of terms. The urban-rural list occurs across the timeline of the corpus of the study: twice in *MEJ* in the first decade (1991–2000), and three times in each decade of *JRME* considered in this study. One example from the first decade of *JRME* includes a description of participant students who were “drawn from a variety of socioeconomic class levels and rural/urban areas” (Hargreaves, Comber, and Colley, 1998, p. 245). The statement, which describes a sampling technique, may imply that multiple SES levels were present in the populations of both urban and rural locations, however, juxtaposing rural/urban and socioeconomic qualifiers emphasizes the perceived differences already present in the discourse.

Pairing urban with suburban occurs 10 times in the corpus. All 10 uses appear in the second decade of the corpus, and nine occur in *JRME*. The categories of suburban and urban,

when placed in opposition, are not clearly delineated, and what constitutes an *urban school* versus a suburban school is not articulated.

The most common use of "urban" as a category positions urban in opposition to both suburban and rural. Forty of the 59 statements in the urban-as-category strand use this type of list (67.80%). Of these 40 statements, 33 appear in *JRME*, and 25 of those occur in the second decade of the corpus. Similarly, most three-way comparisons in *MEJ* occur in the second decade (6 of 7) rather than the first decade. In other words, this three-way level of categorization and separation of school types is predominate in the second half of the data set. The second half of the corpus reflects discourse after the initiation of NCLB, and perhaps the focus on test scores or school improvement in urban areas is reflected in the writing of music education scholars.

One particular instance of this three-way categorization of schools occurs alongside a list of three ethnic divisions. The statement reads, "schools were selected to include students from urban, suburban, and rural environments as well as predominately white, predominately African-American, and mixed student populations" (Morrison, 1998, pp. 210–211). While it may tempting to think that the double list avoids matched stereotypes pairs, African-Americans are listed in a secondary position after White students, even if they are not aligned through ordering of the lists with *urban schools*.

Other school location lists in the corpus connect the category of urban with race more explicitly, as in the following statement from a 1997 *JRME* participant description: "boy singers were interviewed during a solo/ensemble contest that included boys from 15 different schools, ranging from large, urban, racially diverse schools to small, suburban, and rural schools" (Killian, 1997, p. 524). Racial or ethnic connections are only made with the *urban schools*, not suburban, rural, or small schools, suggesting that students in the other school categories are mono-cultural or match the Anglo-normative ideal. When used in this way, descriptors become integral threads in the *urban music education* discourse and connections between *urban schools* and minority students continue to be performed and reinforced by the propagators of the music education structure.

Within the *urban music education* discursive plane, “urban” is a categorical word, used to demarcate groups of students, schools, or music programs away from the idealized norm. In some instances, using “urban” as a category positions certain actors away from what has been accepted as the idealized White suburban normative. The use of “urban” as a category connects perceived differences to specific actors, strengthening the current situated discourse. “Urban” is employed as a category meant to separate schools from one and other, a category with an implied code that is supported with other content in the discourse of *urban music education*.

Urban as an undefined label. While “urban” is rarely defined across the discursive plane, the uses of “urban” still carry either implied or explicit meanings. Seventy-six statements appear in the data set in which “urban” is used as an undefined label for a school, area, or system. The word “urban” is merely dropped into the discursive plane, and readers, as receptors of propaganda, must infer or are expected to understand the intended use in each context. Within these 76 statements, other prose alludes to what “urban” might mean, but even within the same journal or same year, statements engage with the term “urban” inconsistently. In the corpus, different sizes of schools or communities are classified as “urban.” Statements include phrases such as “large urban” (Brophy, 2005), but also “midsized city” (Flowers & O’Neill, 2005) and even “small urban” (Scheib, 2003). “Urban” serves various purposes or may promote specific agendas when used as an undefined label with minimal context clues, and the variety of possible meanings and subsequent inconsistencies become apparent. Statements in the discursive plane force readers to admit that “urban” acts as more than a simple population term.

Some “undefined label” statements connect “urban” to socioeconomic status. When “urban” becomes a descriptor for research sites, for example, word choice implies connections to socioeconomic status of those students. Although most references do not connect SES to a specific level of wealth, two statements in the discursive plane do make direct ties: one between urban and lower-middle class (“children from two urban, lower middle class elementary schools;” Persellin, 1992, p. 309) and the other between urban and lower SES (school characteristics in a sample: “urban, low socioeconomic background, ethnic diversity, and school test scores;” Abril & Flowers, 2007, p. 216). While other statements infer an association between “urban” and level of

economic security, the association is directly articulated in these instances, which use “low” or “lower” as descriptors. This juxtaposition of terms positions entire urban populations at a deficit while confirming urban as code for lower SES.

Other statements in the thread of urban-as-label indirectly connect urban to various other concepts. For example, “African American and Hispanic music, urban and popular music, jazz, and contemporary music in all styles” (Leonhard, 1999, p. 42) links “urban” to multiple music genres, most of them affiliated with not-White populations. As will be seen in Chapter 5, these connections to minority populations are indirectly cultivated in descriptions of research sites as “urban” and in references to student diversity, ethnicity, and ethnic diversity.

Indirect connections between “urban” and other labels exist in the discursive plane, such as “the present investigation sought to predict initial enrollment and retention in urban middle school band programs using academic achievement, SES, family, structure, gender, ethnicity, and mobility as predictor variables” (Kinney, 2010, p. 344). Here, “urban” is used and not defined, and other terms pulled into the text infer connections that, once forged into the discourse of *urban music education*, become accepted and unchallenged. Readers do not question the implied definition of “urban” as “low SES, low achievement, high mobility, and ethnic diversity” when it materializes within the literature.

Across the corpus, few authors define “urban” when they choose to use the term. In this urban-as-category strand, only one statement attempts to explain urban, and describes a “school located in a large or midsize central city” (Hancock, 2008, p. 134), although no descriptions are provided to explain what “large,” “midsize,” or “central” mean in the context of the study.

“Urban” in *Urban Music Education*

Throughout the corpus, the term “urban” manifests in a multitude of ways. “Urban,” used as an adjective *sans* definition, has an assumed meaning that the readership and consumers of the music education discourse have come to understand and accept as valid. The implied understanding, so entrenched in the discourse, connotes an image from which the reading audience infers meaning. When used within a statement, “urban” conjures an image of a poor/low SES, minority-populated area. Even if “poor” and “minority” do not adequately define an “urban

area" in terms of *population*, these meanings have become associated with "urban" in *education* and in the *urban music education* discourse.

The abundant use of "urban" as an undefined label suggests that the structure accepts the implied definition of the term. Through an examination of the proliferation of "urban" in conjunction with specific ideas, the analysis in this chapter demonstrates that, through repeated use, "urban" has become a device for categorizing and a code for labeling specific types of actors or groups as abnormal, challenging, culturally disconnected, and located in a city. These uses of "urban" allow for an indeterminate yet understood meaning of "urban." Exploring how "urban" is used in statements within the discursive plane demonstrates that the music education community has positioned "urban" to portray actors as poor, minority, low achieving, challenging elements of the larger structure of music education. A deeper exploration of terms associated with "urban" may help further explain and define the current discourse of *urban music education*. In the next chapter, the terms "inner-city," "at-risk," "race," and "diversity" are examined to determine how threads within the discursive plane are connected, interrelated, and reinforce one and other.

Chapter 5

Other Threads in the Discourse: Inner-City, At-Risk, Race, and Diversity

In this chapter, I continue to examine the discourse of *urban music education* by analyzing statements that contain terms closely associated with "urban." As described in Chapter 3, I selected four keywords related to "urban" in order to locate additional discursive statements in the corpus. To determine appropriate keywords, I used the "Similar" tool in DEVONthink Pro Office software to develop an initial list of potential keywords. I then reviewed subject and keyword tags assigned to corpus-bound articles containing the term "urban." Using these steps, I selected four keywords: inner (for inner-city), risk (for at-risk), race, and diversity.

In the subsequent analysis sections, I examine statements using these four terms in order to interrogate the *urban music education* discourse. Each of the analyses is unique. The analysis of statements using the term "inner-city" resembles that of "urban," with critiques of discursive threads arranged by topics appearing in both journals (*MEJ* and *JRME*). The data in the "at-risk" analysis are presented chronologically so that gradual changes in the discourse become obvious. The term "race" functions in different ways across the two journals examined in this study, and I divide that data analysis into two sections, allowing for a comparison between uses. Finally, statements containing the term "diversity" are examined in two subsections: statements using "cultural diversity" and those using "ethnic diversity." I include the results of these analyses in the current chapter, and use this information as well as the Chapter 4 analysis to articulate the perceived truths of *urban music education* in Chapter 6.

Inner-City

Within the corpus examined in this study, different threads of discourse intertwine and shape an idea of *urban music education*. An examination of "urban" statements in Chapter 4 exposed a recurrent pairing of "urban" with "inner-city." To clarify this section of the discursive plane, I investigated occurrences of "inner-city" in the corpus. As with the analysis of "urban," I

isolated all statements that included the term "inner"[20] and examined each use of the term through a critical lens. The analysis of these statements exposes discursive threads in the *urban music education* discourse that include deficit positioning and pejorative assumptions about the *urban school* community, yet an examination of these statements reveals no definition or direct explanation of "inner-city." Statements using "inner-city" are present in both journals, and used in different ways. First, I examine statements in *JRME*, followed by an analysis of statements in *MEJ*.

During the twenty years of *JRME* articles examined in this study, "inner-city" appears nine times in the same number of articles. Of the nine statements in *JRME*, seven include "inner-city" as a school category, positioning urban actors away from the norm of the suburban population. While sometimes "inner-city" is juxtaposed with rural and/or suburban (and once with both suburban and exurban (Goolsby, 1999), "inner-city," like "urban," is never defined. The definition of "inner-city" is assumed; readers understand the meaning of the unexplained term. As with "urban," "inner-city" is positioned as different from suburban, but differences are typically implied, not articulated.

In some *JRME* statements, "inner-city" appears as a term of categorization. Two of the nine "inner-city" references describe a research setting as an "inner-city school" and do not articulate what "inner-city" means, again implying that the reading audience shares a common understanding of "inner-city" shaped by the discourse. In *JRME,* "inner-city" occurs two other times as a descriptor with no definition or comparison to other categories of settings or actors. "Inner-city" is used alongside words such as "stark" (Bergee & Platt, 2003, p. 350) and "modest means" (Byo & Cassidy, 2005, p. 344), and is connected to ethnicity and income level differences in phrases such as "the communities represented by the two schools were both suburban and inner-city, with a variety of ethnic groups and various income levels" (Burnsed, 1998, p. 398).

MEJ contains more numerous "inner-city" statements (31) that contribute to the discourse in similar and perhaps even more discouraging ways than in *JRME*, including statements in which

[20] DEVONthink Pro Office software does not recognize hyphens or spaces in concordances, making it most useful to search for "inner" versus "inner-city" or "inner city." Therefore, I removed non-relevant uses of "inner" (e.g., "inner ear," "inner voices," etc.).

"inner-city" appears as a category (e.g., urban/suburban) or as a label (undefined or without descriptors). Statements in *MEJ*, however, make more frequent connections between inner-city and at-risk students, low SES settings, challenges, deficits, differences, and ethnic diversity. In the analysis that follows, I first compare *MEJ* statements in which "inner-city" occurs in similar uses to *JRME*, and then I explore connections between "inner-city" and other language in the *MEJ* section of the corpus.

Similar to practices within *JRME*, "inner-city" appears as a category in *MEJ* statements. In three instances of categorization, "inner-city" is juxtaposed with "suburban" (McCusker, 1999; Monsour, 2000; & Soto, 2008), implying that the inner-city is different or abnormal when compared to perceived suburban norms. Also similar to *JRME*, a strand of "inner-city" discourse includes statements engaging the term as a label; in six separate instances, the term "inner-city" appears as an isolated descriptor that is not directly defined. While some statements include "inner-city" as a passing adjective ("ninth graders in an inner-city high school," DeLorenzo, 2003, p. 37; "to facilitate an inner-city program," Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995; p. 30; "methods course in an inner-city school," Monsour, 2000, p. 48), other statements include language that forges connections to ethnicity or specific races, as described below.

An article about musical play includes a statement noting that "research on children's musical play has been directed towards children in American and British urban schools and playgrounds, Jamaican children, Ghanian children, and Australian inner-city children" (Lew & Campbell, 2005, p. 59). Here, "inner-city" and "urban" are used to describe students from countries perceived to have predominately White populations, as though to qualify them in some way; neither "inner-city" nor "urban" are used to describe students from countries with predominately Black populations. While this statement may appear banal at the surface level, a CDA aims to uncover potential reasons for the positioning within the discourse. In this statement, "urban" and "inner-city" serve as adjectives that infer "not-White," thereby inferring a White suburban norm.

Additional uses of "inner-city" also connect the term to race. A description of a classroom project states that "mostly African-American" students (Jenkins, 2008, p. 42) studied 1940's

Harlem and completed themed projects and assignments focused on the Harlem Renaissance and African-American figures. The project occurred in a Chicago "K–8, inner-city, low income school" (p. 42), connecting inner-city to both SES and race. A description of how the unit topic was chosen, in part due the "rebirth of African American art forms" (p. 42), strengthens the race connection in the discourse; using "inner-city" and "African-American" in adjacent sentences connects inner-city schools to minority populations. While the article implies that this project may be "good" for African-American students who attend schools located in cities, no such assertion is made about the "goodness" of the project for African-American students who may attend schools in non-urban locations or for students who may not be African-American.

"Inner-city" appears in or near lists of musical practices associated with majority non-White populations, such as "famous musicians are experimenting with musical idioms from Africa, South America, Asia, and the inner cities of the United States" (Seeger, 1992, p. 28), and "gospel choirs, salsa bands, mariachi bands, and synthesizer ensembles capture and nurture the diverse interest of inner-city students" (Hinckley, 1995, p. 33). Other statements connect inner-city music to African-American churches (Hinckley, 1995) and African-American communities (Campbell, 2002), and strengthen ties between "inner-city" and "African-American." The discourse plane also includes descriptions of an inner-city school as a "melting pot" (Chamberlin, Smith, & Svengalis, 1993, p. 32) and as a place of non-native English speakers (Hinckley, 1995), even though immigrants and non-native English speakers may indeed be White. These statements appear across the timespan of the corpus and strengthen the connection between inner-city and not-White.

While descriptions of the inner-city as not-White dominate the discourse, two statements attempt to expand the conversation by acknowledging that ethnically diverse populations are not limited to the inner city (Robinson, 2004; Soto, 2008). In an article about at-risk students, the at-risk population is described as not limited to "those in urban or inner-city schools, of low socioeconomic status, or from minority or ethnic groups" (Robinson, 2004, p. 43). A second article acknowledges that teachers in both inner-city schools and suburban settings will potentially have diverse classrooms and may teach students "from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and

language groups" (Soto, 2008, pp. 54–55). While these statements may be attempts to alter, influence, or impact the current discourse, the efforts reflect an accepted version of reality—one in which propaganda reproduces a conception that *inner-city music programs* consist primarily of not-White students who listen to different idioms of music than their White middle-class peers and who may be at risk. Still, the desire to change perceptions signals that the current version of the discourse of *urban music education*, while accepted, is also contested.

Inner-city actors, similar to urban actors, become a target in the discursive plane through various culture-related labeling in *MEJ* articles. One strand targets inner-city immigrant parents "many of whom are not English proficient – [and who] may feel unqualified to speak to school leaders" (Hinckley, 1995, p. 34), making an assumption that these individuals feel inferior or unable to address their children's needs within the school system. The discourse isolates inner-city parents and connects immigrant parents and non-English speakers to ideas of "helplessness," which is further reinforced by statements noting that teachers "must sometimes provide the voice for the inner-city children" (p. 35). Such statements do not acknowledge that non-English speaking homes also exist in the suburbs and rural areas; immigrant parents and students become connected only to the inner city. By suggesting that non-native English speakers cannot communicate, participate, or be involved within the school system, inner-city parents are made to appear indifferent, further reinforcing negative threads in the discourse. Another statement in the same article, "parents in inner-cities typically care about the education of their children" (p. 34), infers that it is acceptable to have thought otherwise of these parents. While inappropriate to assume that "parents in inner-cities" do not care about their children's education, such statements demonstrate that those thoughts are present in the "inner-city" discourse.

Inner-city students, also targets in the discursive plane, are described as having cultural deficits. The children of the inner city are incomplete individuals who need "cultural enrichment" (Klotman, 2000, p. 44) or require supplementation by others outside their own cultural experiences. One article valorizes the film *Music of the Heart* for its storyline of a (White) teacher who works with a school orchestra located in Harlem and helps them to perform at Carnegie Hall.

In this film, a member of the dominant (White middle-class) culture frames success for the orchestra students (who are "different") in ways that reflect success in her culture. This "savior" ideal is referenced in another article which suggests that a preservice teacher "service-learning" project could be used to find or create "access to music education for inner city students" (Barnes, 2002, p. 46), suggesting that White college students who are outsiders to the community and school culture can improve the quality of life for inner-city students who are described as having "different ethnic background(s)" (p. 45). Other statements in this thread such as "they're inner-city people and they don't know 'Go Tell Aunt Rhody'" (Mixon, 2005, p. 18), specify that inner-city students lack knowledge that is assumed standard or canonic in the music education structure. Such threads in the corpus contribute to the deficit positioning of inner-city and *urban music students* compared to their normative non-urban peers.

Authors describe inner-city students as requiring different types of schools (i.e., vocational) (Hinckley, 1995) who have "little to no interest in 'traditional' music programs such as band or orchestra" (Williams, 2008, p. 54), separating inner-city students from the perceived "traditional" norm and declaring urban actors as deficient. Further, as with the "urban" discourse threads, the "inner-city" threads contain references to challenges or describe urban actors as being challenging. Claims are made that inner-city schools are more difficult to work in, inner-city students more difficult to manage good relations with (Chamberlin, Clark, & Svengalis, 1993; Hinckley, 1995), or according to one statement, "in the inner cities, these challenges are intensified" (Hinckley, 1995, p. 32). These discursive practices continue to label urban actors of the structure in negative and pejorative ways.

An *MEJ* article about keyboard labs describes two middle schools: one a "melting pot. . . composed of border-line inner-city, lower- and middle- income students whose needs require continual staff attention to maintain a harmonious learning environment" and the other able "to blend affluent students with inner-city students in an accepting, positive, and productive relationship" (Chamberlin, Clark, & Svengalis, 1993, p. 32). In the latter statement, the juxtaposition of "affluent," a word with a positive connotation (abundance), with "inner-city" infers that the latter term has a negative and undesirable meaning (dearth). Both statements portray

inner-city students as poor and misbehaved, or different due to their lack of funds and assumed propensity to act out.

Some statements connect “inner-city” with “low income” even when the content or subject of the article is not related to either concept. For example, a job placement description in an article about interdisciplinary teaching reads “teaching elementary general music in a K–8, inner-city, low-income school” (Jenkins, 2008, p. 42), and a statement in an article about steel bands refers to “inner-city students, the overwhelming majority of whom are on a free- or reduced lunch program” (Williams, 2008, p. 54). Both statements strengthen the connection between inner city and poverty. One of the most blatant connections between inner city and poverty occurs in a statement that reads “the cycle of poverty and purposelessness to which many of those in the inner cities have fallen victim” (Hinckley, 1995, p. 35). Combining all inner-city actors into a single category of people who are both poverty-stricken and without purpose is damaging. This gross generalization contributes to the discourse, influencing the music education profession.

A distinct strand of “inner-city” connects inner-city actors with “at-risk.” An article describing an opera company production designed for students who “were in grades 5–8, from an inner-city environment and were labeled as at risk, basic skill students” (Bland, 1993, p. 27) is summarized in a second article that describes the same learners as “inner-city, at-risk middle school students” (Smith, 1993, p. 21). Neither author defines “inner-city” or “at-risk,” but both statements suggest that students in these city schools are deficient youth who require alternate teaching strategies. As noted earlier, statements explaining that at-risk students come from a variety of backgrounds (e.g., “we must remember that at-risk students are not only those in urban or inner-city schools, of low socioeconomic status, or from minority or ethnic groups,” Robinson, 2004, p. 43) reinforce the very associations the author appears to wish to sever.

The term “inner-city” is positioned within the music education discourse in ways similar to “urban.” “Inner-city” has become a synonym for “urban,” and it carries the same connotations: at-risk, poor, deficient, challenged, different, and not White. In the statements examined in the twenty-year corpus, “urban” and “inner-city” imply ideas about race, hegemony, and social class. A critical examination of other terms including “at-risk,” “race,” and “diversity,” may clarify other

threads of this discourse and contribute to an understanding of how *urban music education* has been defined and reproduced over time in this corpus.

At-Risk

Within the twenty-year span of the music education publications examined in this study (1991–2010), the keyword "at-risk" occurs in close proximity to the term "urban." The critical examination of the use of "at-risk" that follows will contribute to and clarify the larger discussion of *urban music education* and illuminate threads present in the discourse. For this analysis, I searched the corpus for the word "risk." "Risk" occurs separately from "at-risk" in statements such as "the risk of injury in musicians has been well established" (Guptill & Zaza, 2010, p. 28) and in references to "A Nation at Risk." "Risk" also exists within other words, such as "asterisk." These types of occurrences were not considered in this analysis. I first catalogued relevant statements using "risk," then sorted the statements by publication, author, and year, and finally read, reviewed, and analyzed statements for common discursive threads.

A chronological analysis of statements using "at-risk" demonstrates how the context of the term has altered over the twenty years examined in the corpus. In early writings, "at-risk" is used to describe students with physical or mental disabilities. Over time, however, "at-risk" becomes synonymous with "urban" and infers poverty and/or a minority population. To best facilitate a comprehensive analysis of "at-risk," I employ strategies aligned with a chronological archaeology methodology and present the analysis in two sections: 1991–2000, and 2001–2010.

At-Risk: 1991–2000. In 1991, MENC (now NAfME) published an *MEJ* special focus issue about "at-risk" students. Although the majority of the statements in the first ten years of the corpus occur in this single issue, the term "at-risk" appears in seven of the first ten years of *MEJ* considered in this study, with no statements appearing in 1997, 1998, and 2000. The most prolific use of "at-risk" occurs in three 1991 articles, and an analysis of the content and context of those three articles serves as a foundation to explore statements that include other occurrences of this keyword.

In a featured article, Duerksen and Darrow (1991) describe the music therapist's perspective of music education for the "at-risk" student. Both authors have experience in the field

of music therapy, and these experiences position their views and use of the term “at-risk.” They note that the term “at-risk” traditionally included the handicapped student and has come to include those students who “deviate from the norm in some substantial way” (Duerksen & Darrow, 1991, p. 47). From a critical perspective, actors in positions of authority label students as “at-risk” when students “deviate” from a perceived norm. Perceived norms are references established by the dominant culture favoring their images, practices, and ideals, and departures from favored norms are seen as a failure worthy of the “at-risk” label.

Language in the article suggests that “music educators and music therapists use music to provide a motivating and attractive school environment” (p. 46), thereby providing at-risk students a place at school in which to feel more comfortable or less anxious. Yet the positivity in this statement is overshadowed by the continued use of negative words describing at-risk music students, including generalizations that at-risk students “come from families that have been imprisoned for generations in grinding poverty” (p. 49), “provide a challenge for professionals” (p. 46), are different, frequently absent from school, disinterested, and unmotivated (p. 48), and are a “special population” (p. 46), in some instances relegating social class or economic need to the same category as physical disability. While music therapists recognize that both social and educational factors work both for and against at-risk students, statements in the article position at-risk students in an undesirable space by highlighting negative stereotypes that contribute to and reinforce threads of the discourse.

A second article in the 1991 special focus issue provides numerous references to “at-risk” students in music education and suggests that at-risk students are unlikely to succeed (Shuler, 1991). “At-risk,” a label for “troubled” students, is reserved for those not learning the skills necessary to be “effective citizens” (p. 22), also not defined. This language along with phrases such as the “problem of at-risk students” (p. 22) positions a group in the music education structure into a deficit position and connects those “at-risk” to failure and negativity. In this article, at-risk students have an “inability to learn and lack the desire to learn” (p. 23), and most unfortunate, are labeled as “at-risk” at young ages (preschool children in this article). When the discourse labels preschool aged children as “unable to learn,” the students’ chances of

successfully overcoming stereotypes in order to obtain the perceived “effective citizen” status seem daunting. Missing from the conversation is any indication of what students *are* able to do. By acknowledging only the problems of at-risk students, including frustration, alienation, and self-doubt, the article neglects to provide any positive insights about the at-risk population. Instead, music is offered as an intervention for at-risk students without an acknowledgment of larger social and political issues that may shape the development of at-risk students.

According to a third article in the 1991 special focus issue, alternative music instruction benefits “at-risk” students. In the article, “alternative music instruction” includes electronic music and composition classes that are considered more appealing to specific groups of students (Modugno, 1991). These alternative frameworks may benefit not only students in the at-risk population, but also students who are not labeled in this way, yet the article focuses only on the connection between at-risk students and electronic composition classes. Further, at-risk students are described as including those with “disabilities” and “social problems” (p. 51) and as students who have trouble with focusing, a need for constant attention, insecurity due to frequent failure, and a demand for more of the teacher’s time (Modugno, 1991). Suggesting that a music classroom should “include a mixture of talented, less motivated, and at-risk students” (Modugno, 1991, p. 52) demarcates that at-risk students are unmotivated and without ability. Students with disabilities and social problems are not considered to possess capacity for developing “talent.” When statements in the most prevalent music education publications draw such conclusions for the music education structure, these strands become embedded into the discourse, and unless focused actors work to alter patterns in the discourse, the docile bodies continue to perpetuate these ideas, either actively or passively.

Other statements from this special focus issue that shape the at-risk discourse describe “conventional public education” as problematic for the at-risk population (Scripp & Meyaard, 1991, p.39). Descriptions of at-risk students as having a “limited understanding” (p. 38) of coursework, encountering “huge obstacles” (p. 38), and demonstrating a “syndrome of failure” (p. 38) categorize at-risk students as different and problematic, place them in a pejorative position in the

discourse. This language prohibits at-risk students from being perceived as capable or equal within the music education structure.

One of the recurring threads across the 1991 *MEJ* special focus issue is that at-risk students need to be taught differently: different strategies, different methods, interventions, and altered lesson plans. In this discourse, at-risk students are relegated to a different and inferior position within the music education structure. The discourse in this issue calls for alternative teaching approaches (Collett, 1991; Modugno, 1991), encourages teachers who work with "at-risk" students to approach lesson planning with different frameworks (Duerksen & Darrow, 1991), postulates that teaching "at-risk" students should allow "music educators to rethink their impact and interactions with the students that they teach" (Hanson, Silver, & Strong, 1991, p. 30), describes how traditional approaches fail at-risk students (Scripp & Meyaard, 1991), and explains that traditional school content does "not connect with at-risk students" (Shuler, 1991, p. 23). The prevalent discursive thread of this special focus issue is that at-risk students are "different" and should be approached with alternative methods, therefore positioning an entire population as "different," outside the norm, less desirable, or more difficult to teach. Inferences that at-risk students are not the type of students that music teachers should prefer to teach challenges actors and adds complicated negative threads to the discursive plane.

Although the word "urban" does not appear in the articles described above, the discourse of "at-risk" in this 1991 *MEJ* special focus issue has similar threads to the *urban music education* discourse present in the corpus; words used in tandem with "urban" in the corpus are also present and used in tandem with "at-risk." At-risk students, and by extension *urban music students*, are incapable of learning in the same ways as their peers, and portrayed as undesirable by the education community.

Examining the first ten years of the *MEJ* corpus outside of the special focus issue reveals substantially less use of the term "at-risk." When present, though, statements commonly connect "at-risk" to inner-city or urban populations, such as in "my students were in grades 5–8, from an inner-city environment, and were labeled as at-risk, basic-skill students" (Bland, 1993, p. 27), and "inner-city, at-risk middle school students" (Smith, 1993, p. 21). Such uses strengthen the "at-risk"

and “urban” pairing within the discursive plane. “At-risk” also emerges in the discourse in a hodgepodge of ways, for example in lists such as “gifted, musically and artistically talented, average, underachieving, at-risk, non-traditional, reading-disabled, special education, and dropout populations” (Gremli, 1996, p. 24), in relationship to students “with special needs” and “children with disabilities” (Scott-Kassner, 1999, p. 21), as a general descriptor that is not defined or explained (Bess & Fisher, 1991), or as an undefined word within lists of categories of students with disabilities, for example, “learning disabled, mentally disabled, behaviorally disabled, at-risk, physically handicapped, and ESL students” (Chamberlin, Clark, & Svengalis, 1993, p. 31). Students considered at risk for dropping out of school are labeled “difficult to motivate” (p. 34), but at no point do the statements define the “at-risk” student (with a hyphen) as a student who is “at risk” of not graduating (no hyphen). Instead, statements position the “at-risk” student as being similar to disabled, using language parallel to that in the urban discourse; at-risk and urban students are marginalized in similar ways within the corpus.

The first ten years of *JRME* (1991–2000) examined in this study include two statements that forge additional connections between “at-risk” and other language discursively associated with “urban.” One statement, “authors . . . have pointed out the role of music and music teachers for at-risk students, many of whom are minority students” (Hamann & Walker, 1993, p. 305), infers a connection between at-risk students and minority populations. The second statement submits that preservice teachers need “actual hands-on teaching of special learners as part of the training experience” for working with at-risk students (Wilson & McCrary, 1996), reinforcing “at-risk” as a special needs population. Such sentiments other a part of the music education structure, engineering deeper connections of “at-risk” to “minority” and “different.”

It is worth noting that statements in both publications in the first decade of the corpus label groups of young students as “at-risk.” As noted earlier, one statement labels preschool students as at-risk for failure (Shuler, 1991), and another describes a music program for at-risk kindergarteners (Scott-Kassner, 1999). Additional statements label students in grades 3 and 4 (Forest, 1995) and students in grades 5 through 8 (Bland, 1993) as “at-risk.” The fluidity of the definition of “at-risk” alongside the careless use of the term categorizes students into a group that

has become a catchall of convenience and that allows for the negative labeling of five-year-old students as failures. Given the discursive connections to urban, this is particularly troubling.

At-Risk: 2001–2010. The first ten years of the corpus (1991–2000) situated "at-risk" as synonymous with disability. The proximity of "at-risk" to other coded words strengthens connections to minority and/or poor students and equates "at-risk," and, indirectly, poor and minority statuses to disability. Those trends become more apparent in the second decade of the corpus, in which "at-risk" continues to be associated with negative prose and stereotypes in disjunctive ways that shape the discourse of "at-risk," and as seen in the later half of the corpus, over time "at-risk" becomes more frequently used to describe students who struggle behaviorally and socially in school, and also shares lingual connections to the urban discourse.

In the latter half of the data set, over one-half of the statements using the term "at-risk" originate in a single *MEJ* article (Robinson, 2004) and directly connect "at-risk" to "urban." The article, "Who Is At-Risk in the Urban Classroom," is based on interviews with seven music teachers. Although written to share strategies for teaching at-risk music students, the language perpetuates selected stereotypes and negative terms associated with "at-risk." For example, at-risk students are described as different, "complex" (p. 38), stressful, "negative" (p. 38), "difficult" (p. 38, 40), dissatisfied, a "struggle" (p. 40), and "those with behavior problems—such serious behavior problems that we're concerned for their safety" (p. 39). While teachers in the article agree that at-risk children can be of any ethnicity, race, or SES, they also note that "at-risk" has also been a term used to describe poor minority children. While refreshing, the admission confirms that previous patterns shape the discursive plane, patterns in which "at-risk" has come to be understood as students who are not part of the White, middle-class norm. While these threads are representative of the at-risk discourse of the time, this article also includes the singular attempt at defining "at-risk" in the discursive plane.

Early in the article, teachers share what they believe qualifies a student as "at-risk," and their contributions include, but are not limited to, learning or behavioral disabilities, "not hav[ing] an interest in school," "not completing high school in some way, shape, or form," "not having a satisfying life," "not living past the age of 18," "growing up in home environments that tend to

produce specific problems," being "disenfranchised—for whatever reason— from school," and external issues including economic disadvantages (p. 39). One urban teacher offers that many "factors" (p. 39) contribute to being "at-risk," and that sentiment is reinforced in subsequent sections of the article; students are described as having "risk factors" rather than being labeled as "at-risk." Interview participants offer opinions of what signifies that a student is at-risk, some noting that various external factors add to risk, factors that the student cannot address (i.e., parents going through a divorce, p. 40).

Language in the article suggests that the definition of "at-risk" is elusive, citing that "it is difficult to categorize at-risk students because there are various degrees of being at risk" (p. 39), some risks impact school success more so than others, and compounding risks can be more detrimental to a student's ability to succeed in the classroom. For example:

> a pregnant fourteen-year-old is at risk. But a pregnant fourteen-year-old who uses drugs is even more at risk. And a pregnant fourteen-year-old who uses drugs, has been retrained a grade, has missed thirty days of school, and has a low sense of self-esteem is still more seriously at risk. (Frymier & Gansneder, 1989, p. 53, in Robinson, 2004, p. 40)

Widening the definition and perception of who can be at-risk shifts the paradigm to include students with different backgrounds (not only poor, minority students), but doing so also impedes the establishment of a consistent definition, allowing those in positions of power to continuously resituate the norm to their own advantage. The acknowledgement of a risk hierarchy, first written in 1989 and restated in 2004, provides evidence of the existence of this discursive thread prior to the corpus examined in this study and the continued need to reassert positions within the structure.

Over half of the references to at-risk in the 2001-2010 *MEJ* issues of the corpus occur in the aforementioned article, and while attempts are made in that article to shift the discourse about at-risk actors, reconsideration of the "at-risk" student or label does not appear elsewhere. *MEJ* articles during this time period other students considered "at-risk" by connecting them to the "most persuasive problems and extraordinary negative publicity" (Kindall-Smith, 2004, p. 42), as well as "criminal activity, pregnancy, or other behaviors that can prevent a desirable future"

(Mixon, 2005, p. 17) and the inability to graduate from high school (Mixon, 2005). These threads of different, negative, and failure plague the discursive plane of “at-risk” and continue to shape thought about students so labeled, similar to threads in the urban discourse.

The notion that students who are considered “at-risk” will be unsuccessful is not always blatant. For example, language in an article about steel bands suggests that “since rote learning and music reading are considered equally valid educational methods for many steel band programs, the ensembles can draw both high-achieving music students and at-risk students with no musical background” (Williams, 2008, p. 54). The statement suggests not only that “at-risk” students lack “musical background” (p. 54) but also that rote learning, although described as equally valid, is more suitable for at-risk students than “high-achieving music students,” for whom “music reading” (clearly preferred) is possible. The statement fosters an assumption that students who are perceived to be “at-risk” are deficient and cannot achieve musically, something also found in urban discursive threads.

The discursive plane also includes various connections between “at-risk” and ethnicity. Statements such as, “the language barrier and its social ramifications may be factors that ultimately place Hispanic students at risk” (Abril, 2003, p. 39) connect “at-risk” to a specific ethnicity. A different article suggests that urban at-risk students “will be more motivated to join and remain in ensembles that represent their cultures” (Mixon, 2005, p. 18). Within these and other statements, the proximity of “at-risk” and words associated with ethnicity creates relationships that become woven into the discourse and reinforce stereotypes, similar to connections made between “urban” and those same words.

In this section of the corpus (*MEJ,* 2001–2010), pairings of “at-risk” and “urban” also reinforce the connection between city areas and at-risk students. Descriptions of school communities inform readers that “urban schools have the highest percentage of at-risk students” (Kindall-Smith, 2004, p. 42) and “urban schools typically have a higher number of students who are described as at-risk” (Mixon, 2005, p. 17). And, as in earlier examples, “at-risk” also appears as a categorical term equivalent with “special education” (Bernstof, 2001, p. 37) or “special needs” (Greher & Tobin, 2006, p. 52).

An increased use of “at-risk” can be found in *JRME* article content across the second decade of the corpus (2001–2010). The term appears in various ways, including “at-risk” as a special population category (Ebie, 2002; Hash, 2007), a label for a subset of the music education population (Yarborough, 2002), or as a “fragile” group of students (Hancock, 2009, p. 93). An article entitled “Music Education and Mentoring as Intervention for At-Risk Urban Adolescents: Their Self-Perceptions, Opinions, and Attitudes” (Shields, 2001) directly connects “at-risk” and “urban,” and in the content, “at-risk” is defined more than once and in various ways. For example:

> for this study, the definition of at-risk students was narrowed to those enmeshed in debilitating social, emotional, physical, academic, and economic difficulties, whose individual configurations of assets and deficits may have diminished their likelihood of success in school in society. (Shields, 2001, p. 275)

Words such as “debilitating,” “difficulties,” and “diminished” set up a deficit model for all at-risk students, not just those participating in the study. Participants in the study experience problems in two or more of five “at-risk” categories: home and family, academic, school setting, social skills adjustment and behavior, and physical & mental health (p. 276). The most frequent “at-risk” trait in the participant sample was the “academic” category (n = 139) and the least frequent was the “physical & mental health” category (n = 40), which was strongly associated with the term “at-risk” in the first half corpus. The demarcation of participant traits demonstrates the shift within the discursive plane regarding the definition of “at-risk”: instead of a health issue, “at-risk” has come to encapsulate multiple issues, most prominently academic progress and behavioral and social skills.

Mentoring “at-risk” students is a central theme in this study, and a reference to an external source suggesting that “individuals who would be successful in mentoring high-risk minority young people should possess bicultural competence, be proud of their own origins, and effective in various sociocultural contexts” (Blechman, 1992, in Shields, 2001, p. 275) connects at-risk students and minority status. A subsequent statement appears to challenge the assumed connections between at-risk and race, among other factors:

> the sociocultural diversity of the participants in this study was in agreement with the literature concerning at-risk children, which suggested that the at-risk students of American society were not limited to distinct populations that could be described by their race, sex, socioeconomic status, or their parents' marital status. (Shields, 2001, p. 282)

However, the frequency and prominence of counterarguments allows stereotypes to exist and remain dominant in the discursive plane.

In Shields' study, sixth-grade students identified as "at-risk" participated in one of the two previously existing music performance groups, either choir or creative percussion, resulting in a higher number of "at-risk" students in the ensembles than the music teachers had previously experienced. Although attempts were made to provide mentoring and guidance for at-risk students through teacher leadership and encouragement, the report of the study describes an increased amount of frustration and stress for the music teachers and students already in the ensembles. The not-at-risk students asked the music teacher to get rid of the at-risk students, made suggestions to "throw them out," get them "suspended," or do just "do something about the problem" (p. 284). Twenty-eight of the 57 choir students were participants in the "at-risk" study, and the report of the study explains changes to the learning environment:

> the presence of such large percentages of at-risk students in the performance groups of this study slowed the learning pace, limited the amount of repertoire learned, and created the necessity for increased patience and personal stamina from the teacher, requiring excessive time during rehearsal be spent on discipline. (p. 284)

In this and other similar statements, the pre-labeled "at-risk" students are characterized as slow, stressful, misbehaved, tiring, and troublesome, which "required that the teacher endure considerable additional stress as a result of [at-risk students] gaining access and participation" (p. 284). With the extraordinary amount of negativity aimed at the at-risk students, it is upsetting but not surprising when the report concludes that:

> music teachers may wish to consider the specific nature of the characteristics of at-risk students prior to granting access to large percentages of students who may be difficult to

> supervise in large performance situations. A study in which there was a smaller percentage of at-risk students might have rendered different results. (p. 284)

The summary section of the report offers that a reduction in the number of students labeled as "at-risk" in the performing ensembles would eliminate different stressors for music teachers and other students in the performing ensembles, since "the resulting chaos and sometimes negative energy generated often seemed to lead to more problems than the music teacher could effectively handle at one time" (p. 283). The report also suggests that "music teachers may wish to consider the specific characteristics of at-risk students prior to granting access" (p. 284), further assuring that actors in positions of power maintain norms.

As the most prolific "at-risk" statement producer in this section of the corpus, the aforementioned study contributes much to the discursive plane, including that each student has different risks at various levels, and a single teacher-student mentoring relationship may not be able to lessen or address those risks. Even within that framework, however, statements paint a negative portrait of what the inclusion of at-risk students into performance ensembles could be. Positioning of terms like "stress," "debilitating," "slow," and "problem" place the at-risk students into a deficit position as undesirable or different/abnormal. In the course of the article, the isolation of at-risk students and their exclusion from performing ensembles is presented an option for adequately handling students who are labeled "at-risk."

At-Risk: A changing thread. The discourse of "at-risk" has shifted over time within the corpus examined in this study. Once used to refer to students with medical conditions, by the second decade of the corpus, at-risk refers to failure or potential to fail due to minority status, low SES, and certain school locations. Being "at-risk," once associated with physical or mental conditions, is now more likely associated with behavioral, academic, social, or personal conditions that hinder a student's ability to be "successful," as defined by actors in the education community. In other words, "at-risk" has become a label used by persons in positions of power—principals, teachers, counselors, and administrators—to label students who may not reach established benchmarks of success and to separate them from the norm, so that their inability to succeed should not disrupt or impede the level of success obtained by other groups in the

population. Moving more students to the category of “at-risk” gives “normal” students more room to be successful. Categorizing students as “at-risk” and providing them alternative services once justified the segregation of mentally and physically handicapped students, and now justifies other forms of segregation. Curiously, after “No Child Left Behind” (2001) more groups of students who may struggle to meet normed benchmarks of success seemed to be moved to the ambiguous “at-risk” category.

The discourse of at-risk, as discovered in this analysis, labels students as young as *four years old* as having potential for failure, and these decisions are made based on school location, race, and SES. On the whole, an examination of the discursive plane uncovers connections between the term “at-risk” with “urban,” “inner-city,” and race or SES. A closer look at the term “race” within the corpus may provide additional insight.

Race

To reveal how the concept of “race” in music education publications contributes to the *urban music education* discourse, I examined the corpus for occurrences of the term “race.” The word “race” contains a consecutive arrangement of letters that appears within multiple other words (i.e., “embrace,” “braces,” trace,” and “grace”) and filtering out extraneous occurrences complicated the search. Further, “race” has multiple meanings that may be irrelevant to the current analysis, such as “arms race.” After sifting through all instances of “race,” the relevant uses were sorted and analyzed.

While the word “race” usually appears in statements separate from those that include the word “urban,” the two terms remain connected through shared language and parallel discursive threads, reinforcing a permanent relationship in the music education discourse and this corpus. The discourse of “race” has a longer history than “urban,” and language used and roles performed before the beginning of the corpus examined in this study situate both the discourse of “race” and later, the discourse of “urban.” As seen in the following analysis, “race” and “urban” share similar discursive threads in this corpus, suggesting that the coding of “urban” is tied to ideas of “race,” and particularly to discursive uses that segregate actors not part of the suburban, White, middle-class norm present in the *urban music education* discourse.

A cursory overview of statements that include “race” reveals that the term appears more frequently in *JRME* than in *MEJ* (176 statements versus 32 statements). In some articles, “race” occurs as a demographic variable used to describe a trait of a human being or group of people. At times “race” is the sole demographic variable discussed, whereas more often “race” is used in conjunction with other demographic variables including gender or sex and SES. In other articles in the discursive plane, “race” is used as a category or categorical division, an identifier, a synonym for group of people, or to infer a social construct that has developed through social practices. Ultimately, race exists as a tool to separate groups of people or explain potential similarities and differences among groups. Specific examples will be discussed in subsequent paragraphs, providing a framework for further discussion of the discourse. The analysis that follows is organized by journal. Similar to a genealogy, this investigation unearths power struggles and forms of oppression.

Race in *The Journal of Research in Music Education*. In *JRME,* “race” appears most frequently as a variable under consideration in quantitative studies. Both the results of these studies and comments made about race under the guise of research contribute to the discourse of *urban music education*. In the first half of the corpus (1991–2000), the term “race” appears in three articles that contain most of the “race” statements in this part of the corpus. Each has more than ten statements using the word “race” (Hamman & Walker, 1993; Karpf, 1999; McCrary, 1993), and “race” appears more than 50 times in one study (McCrary, 1993). The latter study (McCrary, 1993) is cited numerous times in the data set for this study and in both *JRME* and *MEJ* articles, giving it a distinctive place in the corpus. A review of those three *JRME* articles and other specific uses of the keyword “race” elsewhere in the *JRME* corpus for this study demonstrates how the term carries specific innuendos that are also connected to the *urban music education* discourse.

One prominent use of the term “race” occurs in a *JRME* article capturing the life and work of Emma Azalia Hackley, an African-American musician and activist (Karpf, 1999). Hackley promoted musical involvement within the Black community around the turn of the twentieth century, and therefore most of the uses of the term “race” are quotes from the time period, which

situates the discourse of “race” historically. A second study, this one regarding music preferences, examines both listener and performer race to determine whether correlations exist between the two (McCrary, 1993). Here, “race” is a demographic variable and is categorized as either “black” or “white.” The discourse in this study emphasizes differences between White actors and Black actors, using language similar to “urban” discursive threads. The third study focuses on African-American high school students’ viewpoints regarding their teachers as role models and whether these African-American students might pursue music in college (Hamann & Walker, 1993). In this study, race and gender are analyzed to determine whether students have access to teacher role models that match their own gender or race, and whether African-American students view their music teachers as role models. These three articles will be examined in detail below. Following that review, I examine other contributions to the discourse in this segment of the corpus (*JRME,* 1991–2010).

Multiple statements containing the term “race” occur in a historical account of Emma Azalia Hackley (Karpf, 1999), an African-American activist for musical involvement in the Black community of turn-of-the-century United States; the article focuses on her work from 1910 to 1922. Uses of “race” occur in direct quotes from Hackley or other prominent figures. Quotes include phrases such as the “fairer-skinned race” and “the colored race” (p. 320), thereby positioning “race” as a term that represents categories of people separated due to their physical appearance/skin color. Examples include the following phrases from quotes of author James Monroe Trotter and music teacher J. Hillary Taylor: “the art-capabilities of the colored race” (Trotter, in Karpf, 1999, p. 320), “the aesthetic taste and musical capacity of their race” (Trotter, in Karpf, 1999, p. 327), “how can we as a race improve ourselves musically” (Taylor, in Karpf, 1999, p. 321), and “we become thoroughly musical as a race” (Taylor, in Karpf, 1999, p. 321). These instances, and most others in the article, implement the term “race” as code to speak on behalf of an entire population of people identified by skin color; “race” never refers to the human race, but the White race or the Black race. Similar to “urban” in the discursive plane, “race” indicates that actors are *different* from one another. Black actors are a “race” in need of improvement and who possess “different” aesthetics. The cumulative impact of these quotes effectively captures the

racial separation present during this period of American history (1910–1922), and reveals, in part, a discourse of "race" that predates the corpus examined in this study. "Race" was understood, at this prior historical intersection, to mean either Black or White, and uses in these quotes demonstrate the notion that Black and White races were separate peoples with different thoughts, beliefs, and practices. This article not only addresses the narrative of Emma Azalia Hackley, but also demonstrates a set of expectations, roles, or norms for groups of actors not perceived as "normal" through the use of "race" that will appear, decades later, connected to "urban" (Chapter 4).

A music preference article that occurs early in the corpus (McCrary, 1993) includes more than 50 "race" statements, and the article is cited throughout the corpus in both *JRME* and *MEJ*. Thus, statements within this article shape further discussion about both race and music preference in the corpus. Race appears as a variable in the article and is used as a category with the divisions of "black" or "white." No consideration is given to other races, which is addressed in the discussion section of the article. The article acknowledges "race" and "ethnicity" are used interchangeably by other scholars in order "to describe physical qualities that distinguish groups of people" (p. 201). These patterns of categorization are similar to those of "urban": actors are relegated to Black or White, urban or suburban, normal or not normal.

In this investigation, participants were asked to listen to a musical selection and determine whether the performer was Black or White, in effect, asking listeners to identify race by vocal performance or by stereotyping the style of music heard. Listeners indicated their perception of race on a 7-point continuum in which they "selected a point closest to 1 if they believed the performers' race was black and a point closest to 7 if they believed the performers' race was white" (p. 205). Critically examining this continuum, the minority race, (Black), is at the lower end of the scale of the scale and in a deficit position, and forces the listeners to identify performers they thought were Black with lower numbers than performers they thought were White. Next, participants were to select a rating for each piece of music on the music preference scale, with a "1" signifying strong dislike and "7" signifying a strong preference. A critical comparison of these two rating scales reveals that the lowest score, "1," signifies both dislike and

Black performers. This same type of deficit positioning occurs in the "urban" discourse, which consistently places the *less desirable* "urban" or non-White "race" in pejorative positions.

> Findings in the music preference study include the following statements:
>
> (a) the white listeners demonstrated greater listening flexibility for the black performers [than black listeners for white performers]; (b) when the black listeners identified the performers' race as white, they frequently provided lower preference ratings, but when these listeners identified the performers' race as black, they provided higher preference ratings; and (c) the black listeners' preference for black performers was very strong, and this preference was greater among black listeners. (p. 209)

In the article, a comparison of these findings to the results of other studies leads to statements suggesting "greater 'flexibility of ethnic attitudes' among whites" [than flexibility among blacks] (p. 209) and a message that educators must "accommodate the cultural differences of racially diverse students" (p. 209–210). Conclusion statements suggesting that "white students will be flexible, thereby enhancing their own classroom music experience" while "preferences by the black participants . . . requires immediate attention [from music education]" (McCrary, 1993, p. 210) contribute to a discourse that positions White as correct and Black in need of repair. Similar to strands in the "urban" discourse, Black (read: urban) actors' preferences and practices are determined to be narrower and not as correct as those of their White (read: suburban) peers. The urban-Black connection occurs directly in the article in a statement that reads, "In January 1970, the *Music Educators Journal* devoted an entire issue to teaching black performed music in urban schools" (p. 210). With discursive connections already existing between Black students and *urban music education*, statements throughout this article further brand urban actors as different or broken.

Another research question addressed in the same study examines participants' preferences for same-race social encounters. Middle school students in the study selected social encounters based more on age than race, while college students preferred same-race social encounters. The social encounters research question is connected to music preference through an exploration of cultural symbols and students' loyalty to those symbols and to music styles that

are representative of cultures. Cultural connections and cultural differences may affect music preference more than race, yet the White or majority culture preference is still considered normative in this article, which also includes statements describing the goals of music education as “modifying music preference” (p. 210) or to “broaden students’ preferences” (p. 200). Such statements imply that some preferences are wrong or need correction, and those preferences belong to the Black/urban/other participants. The linking of the “other” population to cultural symbols determined to be *different* occurs in this “race” discourse, as well as the “urban” discourse.

Race also occurs as a demographic variable in a study examining African-American students’ teachers as role models (Hamann & Walker, 1993). The study seeks to explore whether African-American high school students:

> (a) prefer teacher role models of their own race and sex, (b) tend to select more music teachers as role models than nonmusic teachers, (c) believe that there are significantly fewer teachers of their own race and/or sex in their music classrooms as compared to nonmusic classrooms, or (d) tend to think positively about participating in music programs, classes, or groups at the college/university level due to music teacher influence. (p. 312)

The data collected in the study suggest that African-American students are more likely to identify role models that match their own race and sex, yet are also able identify teachers of other races or genders as role models. Role models, according to the article, play “a more significant role in the lives of nonwhite students than in the lives of white students” (Hamann & Walker, 1993, p. 304), and “role models of the same sex and race tend to have a positive influence on minority student achievement and development” (p. 305). As suggested in the study, the music education community would benefit from recruiting more minority teachers into the field, allowing more teachers to be identified as role models by minority students, as the “ratio of minority teachers to minority students is not favorable” (p. 305). African-American students are likely to select a teacher role model who is of their same race, and those same students reported that “music classrooms do not contain as many students or teachers of their own race or sex as compared to

other classrooms" (p. 308). The observed lack of not-White teachers, present in both the "urban" and "race" discourses, disadvantages students who seek teacher role models of the same race, and identifying these students as disadvantaged moves them into a deficit position.

These three articles provide a context for how race occurs in the remainder of the *JRME* data set in the corpus. "Race" occurs in the second half of the *JRME* discursive plane (2001–2010) in similar ways to the first half, furthering ideas established earlier in the corpus. Race functions as a "background variable" along with gender, cultural heritage, and SES in a study about musical expressiveness (Broomhead, 2001, p. 81), a variable along with sex, SES, and parent marital status in a study of at-risk (read: urban) students (Shields, 2001), a variable considered in performance evaluation in conjunction with gender, attractiveness, stage presence, and dress (Bergee & Platt, 2003), and a visual cue that can affect behavior towards a music director/conductor (VanWheelden, 2002). Across the discursive plane, academic success, music preference, performance rating, music participation, and conductor expressivity represent some of the dependent variables under investigation in studies that employed race as a factor or independent variable. "Race," connected to these variables in statements in multiple articles, provides reinforcement for similar connections to "urban" within the *urban music education* discourse.

A pair of articles examining the effects of race and gender on instrument assignment in band settings (Johnson & Stewart, 2004 & 2005) contains the most frequent uses of "race" within the second decade of the *JRME* data set (2001–2010). In both articles, "assignment" refers to the practice of pairing a beginning band student with an appropriate musical instrument. In the first article, the investigators determine that not concealing student race may have affected the assignment of instruments to African-American students, so in their second study, the authors attempted to conceal race as thoroughly as possible by showing dental only photos in order to determine if there was a difference in instrument assignment by race when full-face photos or dental-only photos were shown. Data in the second study suggest that "clearly knowing the race of the student had no significant impact on what instrument was recommended by music educators" (p. 356). Even with the finding that band directors tend to ignore the construct of race

when assigning musical instruments, the need to conduct studies examining actions of band directors when the directors can and cannot see the race of a student suggests that the "race" discourse in music education contains stereotypical (even if silent) threads regarding the treatment of not-White students. A significant finding in the second study was in the case of an African-American male. Photos of his mouth and photos of his entire face yielded different results in instrument assignment. Dental photos favored strong assignments to clarinet and saxophone, where facial photos favored assignment to trumpet. The researchers discuss possible "stereotypical assignments" with this individual case (p. 355), but not across the entire participant pool.

In the *JRME* articles examined here, the discourse of race is constructed through categorization, differentiation, and pejorative threads containing language similar to that which surrounds uses of the word "urban." An investigation of articles from *MEJ* may provide additional insight regarding the underlying connections between the race and urban discourses in the corpus.

Race in *Music Educators Journal*. The term "race" is used infrequently in the first half of the *MEJ* data set (1991–2000). In some instances, the word "race" appears in lists of human characteristics and in ways that imply that race is an obstacle or that belonging to certain races is detrimental. For example, the statement "certain composers have transcended the barriers of gender, race, class, and physical disability in order to create music" (Palmquist & Payne, 1992, p. 54) labels "race" as a "barrier." Even in statements arguing to the contrary (e.g. "some typical predictors, such as income level, educational background, living arrangements, race, marital status, or occupation, are surprisingly not powerful indicators of later interest in music," Darrough, 1992, p. 27), "race" is used to group people into categories for comparison.

Other statements in *MEJ*, such as "conflicts based upon race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, or nationality" (Campbell & Yung, 1995, p. 40), position "race" as both a category and an instigator of conflict. The same statement continues, "the problem is one of ignorance and alienation and fear of the unknown 'other' who is different from us" (p. 40), specifically positioning race in the discourse as something that is problematic and that others certain actors. Still other

statements suggest that “race” is one of many “student differences” (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 28), which connects “race” with negative insinuations about “difference” in the discourse of *urban music education*.

Additional uses of “race” in the early *MEJ* segment of the corpus include “race” as a category. For example, the suggestions that “race” may contribute to “a sense of belonging in the smaller community—based on race, language, or clothing” (Sinor, 1992, p. 23) also equates “race” with clothing and language as a way to note differences among or categorize groups within a population. A later article about multicultural music education includes race as one of many ways to categorize students, offering that “a multicultural teacher addressing the diverse nature of a class would consider ethnicity, race, culture, language, gender, social class, religion, and exceptionality” (Gonzo, 1993, p. 50). Throughout the discourse, “race” remains a tool to separate “different” people within a population, at times under the guise of “multiculturalism.”

“Race” continues to be utilized in similar ways in the later segment of this *MEJ* corpus (2001-2010), but occurrences of statements that include the word “race” increase and other, different connections are forged in the discursive plane. As in the first decade, some statements in the second half of the *MEJ* corpus employ “race” as a category and multiculturalism continues as a thematic thread, however, new connections to immigrants and at-risk students in the second half of the *MEJ* corpus also include language similar to that used in the *urban music education* discourse.

One statement in an article about multicultural and multimusical strategies positions “race” as a “cultural barrier” alongside “gender, age, musical abilities, socioeconomic levels, religion, race, and ethnicity” that must be “transcended” when planning curriculum (Kelly & VanWheelden, 2004, p. 37). Another statement in the same article connects “race” to minority and low SES students by noting that “the majority of the school aged population will be from cultural minority populations, with significant increases in students with limited English proficiency, from low socioeconomic backgrounds, and from ethnic populations” (pp. 36–7). Similar statements occur throughout this decade of the discursive plane, surfacing in multiple articles (Campbell & Beegle, 2003; Lychner, 2008; Mixon, 2009; Soto, 2008; Thompson, 2007;

and Walker, 2003) and contributing to the threads of race and urban discourses that align “race” with being othered and categorized.

An article about using video in the music classroom states that students will “identify best with performers of their own race and gender and look up to them as role models” (Smith, 2003, p. 39) and that such “perceived identification of race” affects listener preferences (p. 39). Statements in this article refer to the study by McCrary discussed earlier in this chapter, and reinforce discursive threads regarding “race” and the position of those who are non-White (read: urban) in music education.

An article about gospel music suggests that “race and race bias” (Walker, 2003, p. 24) affect authenticity of performance. The focus on cultural differences and incongruent musical values, combined with concerns of authenticity throughout that article, position gospel music as different. Such positioning is reminiscent of the urban discourse. Gospel music becomes othered due to the perceived differences about race. Instead of providing guidance about gospel music education, statements connect “race” to “other,” parallel to and sharing language with the discourse of *urban music education*.

An additional connection forged in this section of the discursive plane is between “race” and “at-risk.” “Race” becomes associated with “risk” in statements such as “an at-risk student may be defined as any student, regardless of age, race, or socioeconomic status, who has the potential to succeed but whose success is inhibited by academic or social risk factors” (Robinson, 2004, p. 40). While race is not necessarily a factor in determining whether a student is at-risk, the proximal location of “race” to “at-risk” strengthens a connection already present in the discursive plane. “Race” and “unsafe” appear in close proximity within other statements in this decade of the *MEJ* corpus for this study, further forging unfortunate connections. For example, “students feel unsafe because of personal characteristics, such as sexual orientation or race/ethnicity…” (Bergonzi, 2009, p. 22), positions race as something to be uncomfortable about. Race is declared an “issue” (Krueger, 2006, p. 59) to approach directly with students, again positioning “race” in an othered space within the discursive plane.

The discourse within *MEJ* constructs "race" as a way to group and separate people. "Race" is used in proximity of other words with negative connotations, including "at-risk," "unsafe," and "issue." Even when used in reference to multicultural music practices, the consistent othering through race or races places those actors in a vulnerable position within the discursive plane.

In both *JRME* and *MEJ*, race is a variable used across the discursive plane in order to demarcate or categorize groups of people. This examination demonstrates that "race" binds visually or culturally similar groups of people, while also simultaneously serves as a variable that forces individuals into "different" groups; "different," present in the "race" discourse as something pejorative, is reminiscent of the "urban" analysis in Chapter 4. Most frequently, statements employ race as a variable for study while, in articles that are not studies, "race" categorizes groups of people or echoes other threads present in the urban discourse. "Race" appears as a common thread across the discursive plane and connects concepts of "urban," "inner city," and "at-risk." This singular term has an impressive capability to both unite and divide groups of people, the effects of which resonate within the *urban music education* discourse.

Diversity

The terms "urban," "inner-city," "at-risk," and "race," have discursive connections to "diversity." An examination of "diversity," therefore, provides more insight about the network these terms share within this discursive plane. The dictionary definition (Random House, 2014) of "diversity" is "the state of being diverse; variety" and "a range of different things." Singling out the term "diversity" provides an assorted collection of uses across the corpus. For example, across the corpus "diversity" appears in place of "variety" when describing multiple topics, including audio equipment, skills, outcomes, and geography. In general, these statements about "variety" or "diverse" are beyond the scope of this study. Yet this is not the only way "diversity" is used within the discursive plane. In most instances, "diversity" or "variety," when referring to people, programs, music, or schools, signifies "difference," and "different" is a major thread of the urban discourse examined in Chapter 4. Statements in the corpus suggesting that music educators have "an obligation to teach music in a variety of ways, in a variety of settings, to a variety of students" (Carolin, 2006, p. 38) connect "variety," "diversity," and "different."

In this analysis, I compare and contrast how statements that include "diversity" articulate ideas also present in the *urban music education* discursive plane and examine how threads in the discourse of "diversity" connect to threads previously examined in the discourses of "urban," "inner-city," "at-risk," and "race." First, I examine how "diversity" has been used in the corpus to describe the United States and school actors. Next, I examine "diversity" as code for population descriptions and conclude with a section connecting multiple threads throughout the *urban music education* discourse.

"Diversity": Culture, School, Curriculum. In this section, I examine "diversity" statements that reference either "culture" (or similar word, such as "cultural") and "ethnic" (or similar word, such as "ethnicity").[21] First, I group together statements in the corpus that refer to diversity in the United States, then, I look at statements that refer to schooling in the United States, followed by diversity in school music education programs and K–12 music curriculum.

Phrases referring to the "culturally diverse" population of the United States (Teicher, 1997; Hamann & Walker, 1993) occur in both publications across the time span of the corpus examined in this study. Language in the articles makes claims that cultural and therefore musical differences are salient in the United States (McCarthy & Goble, 2002). Statements claim that "diversity rather than homogeneity characterizes our culture" (Morin, 2003, p. 27), and "the United States, a nation of immigrants, has a broad cultural diversity" (Kelly & VanWheelden, 2004, p. 35). In some statements, "diversity" is code for "includes immigrant populations," or echoes language about the immigrant presence and cultural diversity in the United States that occurs elsewhere in the discursive plane (Bobetsky, 2005; Teicher, 1997). Other statements declare "diversity" a "fact of life in American society" (Fung, 1994, p. 45), a fact that acknowledges the presence of not-White (*different*) people, similar to the descriptions of "urban" populations.

Across the corpus, the population of the United States, and by extension the music and traditions of the United States, is described as diverse in phrases such as the "multi-musical diversity of America's pluralistic culture" (Kindall-Smith, 2004, p. 44). At times such descriptions

[21] I consider these two terms to be separate and have distinct definitions. "Culture" refers to shared values, beliefs, and practices while "ethnicity" relies on origin or race. In this document I use this distinction, but incorporate statements that may not follow the same demarcations.

are valorizations of “diversity” or observations masquerading as implements of othering. For example, noting that “diversity is valued because it enriches the lives of others” (Allsup, 2007, p. 52), or that “ethnic diversity” contributes to the “rich culture of the United States” (Fung, 1995, p. 37) also insinuates that the presence of not-White citizens with other or different cultural practices under the guise of “rich.” Such language promotes a sense of exotic and hints at Orientalism, intensifying the focus on being “different.”

As the United States is described as “diverse,” by extension the education system and classrooms are expected to be “diverse,” a label that directly or implicitly suggests populations that include not-White students. For example, noting a “cultural diversity found in the public schools of today” (Svengalis, 1992, p. 32), which is echoed in other statements (Gonzo, 1993; Campbell & Lum, 2008; Williams, 2008; Allsup, 2007; Yudkin, 1993; Werner, 1994; Campbell, 2000), acts as a means to state implicitly that not-White students are present in a school system. Other instances more directly articulate differences among students, in concordance with ideas in the corpus that “no educator could ignore the cultural diversity in the classrooms of the United States” (Volk, 1993, p. 144). Across the discursive plane, the ways in which the term “diversity” is used contributes to the idea that schoolrooms in the United States include a “diverse” collection of people, a collection that includes not-White people.

Another thread in the discourse warns that ignoring diversity results in “color blind” teaching, that “color-blind administrators and teachers and the instructional strategies they create will force ethnic diversity into an oblivion” (Gonzo, 1993, p. 50). Such teaching strategies endanger the potential to recognize differences that make each ethnicity unique, and instead of “melting away ethnic diversity in society, differences should be preserved” (p. 50). This heralding of differences continues to acknowledge racial hegemony: White culture in the classroom must “preserve” the “differences” present, allowing one group to determine what is worth preserving for others. Throughout the discursive plane, most references to differences are meant to categorize or separate, not to preserve. This strand of preservation is more present in *MEJ* than in *JRME*, and usually employed to discuss multicultural music.

In addition to preservation, diversity threads also include ideas about sensitivity and inclusion, such as “music instruction should be sensitive to the music traditions that are reflected in the racial/ethnic diversity in the school” (Corenblum & Marshall, 1998, p. 137). That “music teachers should be able to acknowledge the existence of ethnic diversity in their classrooms” (Gonzo, 1993, p. 49) forces a recognition (labeling) of student differences. Music teachers are asked to simultaneously shape classroom curriculum around the “diverse” students in their schools and be sensitive to the traditions of students’ cultures, further empowering the (usually White) teacher to determine whose/what (othered) practices to include.

In another strand in the corpus, “diversity” statements range from supporting the inclusion of multiple cultures through music to questioning the ability to accurately represent multiple musics in the classroom. Some of these statements encourage music teachers to “celebrate our diversity” by “locat[ing] the exotic” (Conlon, 1992, p. 48), again demonstrating hints of Orientalism circulating in the discursive plane and positioning not-White cultures as “exotic,” which is both hegemonic and pejorative. Other descriptions label the “diversity” of immigrant populations as “a challenge” (Hinckley, 2000), coloring the discourse in ways that promote “diversity” as alien or curious, and is reminiscent of labels and threads present in the “urban” analysis in Chapter 4.

Threads of the “diversity” discourse suggest that teacher preparation programs, in the face of a continuously diversifying student population, remain stagnant, and that “music educator training programs will need to emphasize dealing with diversity in the music classroom” (DeNardo & O’Hearn, 1992, p. 37). The suggestion of “diverse” classrooms as something to be “dealt” with furthers “diverse” (read: urban) classrooms as spaces of difficulties and negativity, identifying “diverse” (read: not-White) students as challenging and different, and further securing the White, suburban norm as the ideal.

Multiculturalism in the Music Curriculum. The corpus contains statements of support for diversity in music education, usually framed as multiculturalism, as a necessary component of a complete education (Goodson & Duling, 1996; Campbell & Beegle, 2003; Kelly & VanWheelden, 2004), while also noting that some efforts at multicultural music education and diversity have been “selective or superficial” (Campbell & Beegle, 2003, p. 23), and that diversity

is “no fad whose time has come and gone” (p. 28). The discourse examined in this study propagates the idea that multicultural music is essential to a “complete” curriculum, and that cultural awareness beyond music plays an important role in the classroom, in statements such as “music educators must be aware of broader cultural diversity in order to be effective in the classroom” (Kelly & VanWheelden, 2004, p. 36).

This discursive strand also suggests that cultural diversity integration in the form of multicultural education “has the potential to help bridge the widening gaps between people of different backgrounds” (Teicher, 1997, pp. 415–416), with different (read: not-White) sharing connotations with threads in “urban” and “at-risk.” Some statements claim that a multicultural approach may not have been successful if “a call for unity, not diversity, was raised” (Campbell & Beegle, 2003, p. 22), asking teachers to label students as “different,” a notion found problematic in Chapter 4. Throughout this corpus suggestions that a multicultural approach in the music classroom is inclusive would benefit the “diverse” students who are part of the education landscape, but the “diverse” students continue to be the not-White students, particularly in school systems labeled “urban.” Multimusical practices, deemed appropriate and beneficial for “diverse” classrooms, are less frequent in conversations about homogeneous (read: White, middle class, suburban) classrooms, further strengthening threads that “different” practices belong to “different” students in “urban” or “inner-city” areas.

The ideal of “diversity,” read as “multiculturalism in the music curriculum,” endorses the inclusion of various types of music because of the presence of multiple types of not-White students. The implementation becomes problematic when the focus of the “diversity” means something “other” than Western-European art music or American folk tunes, with “other” music labeled as a single large unit of “world music,” as if all other populations are of another “world” separate from the White “West.” As the profession struggles to be “inclusive,” statements in the discursive plane show the limitations; “there are many ways of using cultural diversity to enhance the understanding of Western literature” (Schmid, 1992, p. 42) limits “diverse” music as a way to understand the norm. Even through practices of “inclusivity,” some actors (usually not-White) are not included and othered, and the un-included are forced to adapt to the norm by assuming a

different label or to reject the label. Such practices fail all students who may be part of the *urban music education* population.

Diversity in Population Samples. In *JRME,* "cultural diversity" is most commonly utilized to describe a population sample in a study. For example, "several efforts were made to include in the study schools that represented a wider cultural and socioeconomic diversity within their student populations" (Linklater, 1997, p. 404), or sample selection "based on an attempt to balance school districts included in the study in the areas of size of schools, socioeconomic status of the students, cultural diversity, and proximity to a large city" (Goolsby, 1997, p. 25). Statements acknowledge a need to study schools that may not fall within established norms, yet such statements not only imply the presence of not-White students, but also that not-White students are *difficult* to include. Researchers must make an "effort" to incorporate them. In these examples, "diversity" becomes code for "students who are not White," and the juxtaposition of SES and diversity implies poverty, continuously reinforcing connections between "race," "poverty," and "not White" in the discourse of *urban music education.* Uncovering these connections in the discursive plane supports the notion that "diversity" continues to be connected with pejoratives, allowing for hegemonic practices and performances of power to remain intact. Using the word "diversity" permits actors to make (and hide behind) broad categorizing statements without identifying specific population groups.

Similar to "cultural diversity," "ethnic diversity" in *JRME* also describes a population sample or a school from which a population sample was drawn, and implies the inclusion of not-White students. Some statements connect the phrase to other topics in the discourse of "urban," particularly low SES students. For instance, one statement explains that "the thirteen middle schools from which the sample was drawn reflected considerable ethnic and socioeconomic diversity" (Fortney, Boyle, & DeCarbo, 1993, p. 30). Even descriptions of the selection processes—"two schools in the study were carefully selected because of their similar characteristics (urban, low socioeconomic backgrounds, ethnic diversity, and school test scores)" (Abril & Flowers, 2007, p. 16)—reinforce connections between not-White students, poverty, *urban schools*, and implied low performance. Similarly, statements that describe participants in a study

as representing “a broad diversity of ethnic populations, socioeconomic divisions, religious beliefs, and with approximately equally mixed gender” (Kelly, 1998, p. 376) connect diverse populations with threads in the *urban music education* discourse.

Other statements address “diversity” in study samples or participants sometimes for different research purposes. One discusses refining a data collection tool “in an effort . . . to better represent ethnic diversity” (Abeles, 2004, p. 253), while another simply states “the ensemble had ethnic and gender diversity” (Goodrich, 2007, p. 97). In dissimilar ways, these statements contribute to the discursive plane that actors are conscious about the “diversity” present in school music programs. Statements in this thread acknowledge that “there may be important issues in instrumental music teaching that were not addressed in these cases (e.g., ethnic diversity and lack of resources)” (Conway, 1999, p. 353). While such statements reflect the consciousness of the presence of not-White actors, the statement also connects that discursive thread to lack of resources and to “issues,” again placing the diverse population in a deficit position.

At times, statements in *JRME* articles that include the term “diversity” infer a non-White population, even when “cultural” or “ethnic” are not paired with “diversity.” For example, “students did not audition and were fairly representative of the diversity of the population in the area in which the university is situated” (Hewitt, 2005, p. 151) communicates the inclusion of not-White participants without using specific terms. Similarly, statements explaining that “the English-language stations were the ones that drew a diversity of listeners” (Lum, 2008, p. 107), assume “diversity” will be read as “including not-White students,” therefore strengthening the connections in the discourse that speak of race.

Discursive Connections to Diversity. Statements in the discursive plane make claims that “for the past several decades, music educators have committed themselves to cultural diversity and the impact of their commitment is notable in American schools” (Campbell & Beegle, 2003, p. 21). An article explaining undergraduate coursework states that “the college of education requires three courses in educational psychology, literacy, and diversity education” (Conway, et al., 2010, p. 263). Yet other statements in the same discursive plane allude to the “increasing diversity of the urban student population,” connecting “diverse” to “urban,” and add that

"multicultural education is uniquely suited to this environment" (Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995, p. 29), connecting "multicultural" to the "urban" setting, and ignoring that potential of multicultural education, however it is defined, for all students. Adding to this part of the discursive plane are ideas that

> whether in rural, urban, or suburban schools, the increasing diversity in our cultural life and the tendency of public schools to be places mainly for poor and disadvantaged students who do not have the means or opportunities to attend select, private, charter, parochial, or home schools only exacerbate a disturbing flight of the most privileged students away from public schools. (Jorgensen, 2010, p. 22)

Here, the connection of "diversity" to "poor," "disadvantaged," "without means or opportunity," not "privileged," and located only in "public schools" strengthens the pejorative overtones present in the *urban music education* discourse not only for students, but for the entire institution of public schooling. While the intent behind such statements may be otherwise, and Foucault suggests that intent cannot be considered, the statements also continue to connect "diversity" to populations labeled as less desirable, reinforcing stereotypes.

Threads in the discursive plane also connect "diversity" to "at-risk." In one instance, "cultural diversity" is outlined as one of the three most important topics in music education, alongside "children at-risk" (Bess & Fisher, 1993), suggesting the importance of "cultural diversity" and reinforcing connections within the corpus. While some statements claim that at-risk children come from a variety of backgrounds (Robinson, 2004), other statements tie "cultural diversity" to "at-risk," as in the statement: "the sociocultural diversity of participants in this study was in agreement with the literature concerning at-risk children" (Shields, 2001, p. 282).

While "differences" in culture are celebrated in specific threads present in *MEJ*, similar to those found in the critical analysis of "urban" in Chapter 4, "differences" are more usually considered negative and infer lesser rather than desirable. "Differences," when referring to culture and part of "diversity," are sometimes elevated and celebrated; however, these same "differences," when connected to "race," and especially in areas perceived to be "urban," are seen

as burdens and limitations. “Race,” often more visible than “culture,” is less likely to have positive connotations in the discursive plane.

At the earlier end of the corpus, one statement suggests that “research on diversity issues began only recently in music education” (Koza, 1993, p. 228), providing an idea of where the discourse was situated at the beginning of the data set. At that point research on “diversity issues in music education” was scarce and remained a lacuna in the research agendas of most publications (p. 228). Descriptions noting a “broad agenda” into which *JRME* articles fit (Radocy, 1998) and the presence of a separate “diversity agenda” (p. 346) lump together all questions that examine issues within not-White populations. Among the various agendas present within the music education discourse, “many educational sound bytes, some accompanied by personal emotions, others meaningless, misleading, or counterproductive” exist (Colwell, 2000, p. 45), and “diversity” appears in this list of such topics. These statements frame diversity in various ways, as part of an agenda, a missing portion of a larger agenda, or perhaps an irrelevant sound byte. Statements across the discursive plane frame “diversity” in music education as all of these things.

In the corpus, “ethnicity” and “culture” are at times used interchangeably to delineate differences within a population. Large populations (in the United States) and small populations (a music class) are labeled as diverse in both ethnicity and culture, contributing to the varied interpretations of these terms in the discourse. After removing similar uses of both terms, the investigation reveals that “cultural diversity” endorses differences while “ethnic diversity” enforces that differences are present. In other words, “cultural diversity” implies different sets of practices, beliefs, and musics across different groups of people. “Ethnic diversity” implies a presence of minorities (usually an emphasis on not-White or at least indicating more than White students are present) and occurs in statements relegating a larger population into smaller subsections. The latter term, associated more frequently with race, is more likely to be close in proximity to other words examined in this study, namely “urban” and “at-risk,” and connected to low SES students or minorities. *MEJ* statements regarding diversity tend to observe differences while *JRME* statements enforce differences.

Chapter Summary

In this Chapter 5 analysis of “inner-city,” “at-risk,” “race,” and “diversity,” discursive threads surface that suggest hegemony within the *urban music education* discourse. As noted in the Chapter 4 analysis, “urban” is code for “different,” “broken,” or “challenging” and these discursive threads are perpetuated through the reproduction as demonstrated in this analysis of “inner-city,” “at-risk,” “race,” and “diversity.” Considered together, “urban,” “inner-city,” “at-risk,” “race,” and “diversity” in the *urban music education* discourse imply failure and marginalize “different” actors in the music education structure. Once some groups are marginalized, other groups become normalized, advancing specific “truths” in the structure, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

The establishment of norms creates practices that continue to be reproduced as part of the discourse. Chapter 4 explored the systematic reproduction of “urban” as a pejorative label, and in Chapter 5, closely related terms were examined to determine shared connections within the discursive plane. While each individual discourse includes unique elements, significant overlap signifies discursive connections. In the next chapter, I examine connections among and between discursive threads in order to articulate the concept of *urban music education* and expose accepted truths in the music education discourse.

Chapter 6

The Exposed Truths of Urban Music Education

As described in Chapters 1 and 2, Foucault sees "truths" as a set of actions approved by actors in positions of power, and performed and reproduced by docile bodies. Discursive threads contribute to the "truths" of *urban music education*, and as entwined as they are, these threads establish the discourse accepted by the music education structure. In this study, I examine twenty years of two major publications of the music education structure—the *Music Educators Journal* and the *Journal of Research in Music Education*—that propagate discursive threads that contribute to an *urban music education* nexus of truths. A critical analysis of statements and threads in this corpus reveals a complex portrait of *urban music education*.

At the onset of this study, I began with these questions:

- What is the current discourse of *urban music education*?
- How do specific publications and actors of the structure shape how *urban music education* is perceived and addressed within the discourse?
- What do those discourses say about urban music educators and urban music students?
- What does the *urban music education* discourse transmit, reproduce, reinforce, and expose?

In this chapter I summarize threads present in this CDA, then I reflect on the questions of this study, based on the analysis provided in Chapters 4 and 5. My reflection on these questions is an essay in two parts: first, I articulate the truths of *urban music education* that have manifested in this analysis and summarize the main threads in the discourse, and in the second section I utilize aspects of Foucault's thoughts on power-knowledge-truth, docile bodies, and panopticonism to provide insight for an understanding of the establishment of such truths. I expose these truths and address the questions at the center of this study. In the final chapter I will address how the profession can challenge this accepted set of truths and initiate a shift in the discourse that has marginalized actors of the music education structure.

What Is Said About *Urban Music Education*

Urban music education effectively others people, practices, schools, and communities through negative labels propagated both explicitly and implicitly (and repeatedly) throughout the discursive plane, as demonstrated in this analysis of statements in two prominent journals of the profession over 20 years. One of the guiding questions of this study focuses on *what* is said about *urban music education*. Authors, researchers, practicing teachers, and other actors of the structure employ the term "urban" in their speech, writing, and research, and as discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, "urban" and related terms in the corpus examined in this study have multiple connotations that are typically implied rather than directly stated.

The critical analysis of statements in Chapters 4 and 5 reveals what has been said and what has been silenced, and demonstrates how complicated and pervasive the *urban music education* discourse is. The complexities of the discourse provide an assortment of truths that are reproduced with varying frequencies, obscuring what could be considered valid. As Foucault articulates in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969/2010), statements are considered valid because they exist in the structure and are delivered through a recognized method of propaganda (usually, power). Validity does not infer truth, but the existence and production of statements in a structure demonstrates influence as a truth statement. An interrogation of the collection of statements within the corpus allows for an investigation of the truths. In the next section, I summarize the discourse of *urban music education* and expose truths in the discourse.

Summary of the discourse. This study focuses on a corpus of *MEJ* and *JRME* articles in the twenty-year time span from 1991 through 2010. I examined statements in the corpus that include the word "urban," locating the term 403 times in 148 articles. After removing unrelated uses (including u-r-b-a-n occurring in words like "disturbance" or "Urbana"), a critical evaluation of statements and articles employing the term "urban" yielded a subsequent list of terms similar to "urban" that were also suitable for investigation: "inner" (for inner-city), "risk" (for at-risk), "race," and "diversity." The following discussion summarizes how the music education structure performs "urban" within the discursive plane and examines the reproduction of the *urban music education* truths.

As summarized in Chapter 4, within the corpus of *MEJ* and *JRME* articles from 1991 through 2010, "urban" implies various concepts and is code for the following ideas: not ideal, challenging, substandard, pitiable, culturally removed, not White, less desirable, and broken. Further muddying the discourse, "urban" also exists as a label or category; "urban" as a category separates actors into groups (e.g., urban, suburban, rural), and "urban" as a label infers a negative descriptions of actors. These multiple uses of the word "urban" contribute to a complicated and multi-faceted discourse of *urban music education,* ultimately portraying *urban music education* pejoratively. Through these discursive moves, *urban music students*, *teachers*, and *programs* become othered and positioned as lesser parts of the structure. Within the structure, those who are permitted to speak—in this study, the authors of articles in the two journals examined—are perceived as experts; their voices carry messages deemed important because the statements they produce have been approved by actors who wield power (e.g., reviewers, editors, publishers, a national association). Their statements portray *urban music education* actors in unfortunate ways.

"Urban," as this analysis demonstrates, is used to position actors in certain ways, and that positioning dominates the *urban music education* discourse. *Urban music education* actors are moved to a space relegated for those who are *different* and *difficult*, and *urban music classrooms* are determined in the discourse to be *challenging* places in which to teach. *Urban music teachers* are characterized as *not possessing* the tools necessary to navigate the *issues* facing urban music programs. *Urban music students*, seen as *different*, *transient*, *less capable*, and a *burden*, *struggle* to meet the "traditional" models of "success" projected within the structure, allowing a thread of *low expectations* to pollute the discourse. Descriptions of *fewer resources*, families in *lower SES brackets*, and *older school facilities* contribute to the portrait of urban-as-*lesser*, allowing *urban music education* programs and those who participate in them to be seen as *incapable of achieving* an elusive, ill-defined, and idealized "success." Because of these perceived shortcomings, urban actors become relegated to *special needs* status and are seen as others or outsiders in the music education structure.

The term “urban” is used to separate and stigmatize actors of the music education structure, and within the corpus examined here, “urban” is code for neighborhoods, schools, and students that deviate from an idealized suburban White middle-class norm. “Suburban” is not used in the same fashion; neither articles about issues in “suburban music education” nor statements containing prose that connect “suburban” to words such as “bleak” and “forbidding” or phrases such as “incubators of indifference” appear in the publications. “Suburban” music education, silently revered as the ideal music education program archetype, exists as the model to which *urban music education* programs are compared. Differences between the silent ideal and the articulated “urban” occur throughout the discursive plane examined in this study and are reinforced and performed through the propagation of permitted or authorized statements and the acceptance of docile bodies, which will be discussed later in the chapter.

In order to further examine the discursive threads that surfaced in the analysis of the uses of “urban,” I critically analyzed additional terms that occurred in and around the “urban” statements. Using DEVONthink Pro Office software, I determined that the terms “inner-city,” “at-risk,” “race,” and “diversity” have similar patterns of use to “urban” within the corpus examined in this study. As described in Chapter 5, I also analyzed the statements containing these terms, and the analyses revealed both similar threads and new threads in the *urban music education* discursive plane.

“Inner-city” statements, similar to “urban” statements, portray *urban music education* actors as different or foreign. Salient threads in this analysis convey that urban actors are *poor*, *minority*, *challenging*, and *inferior* to non-urban actors. Both publications examined in this study contain statements that label “inner-city” actors in pejorative ways; most noticeably “inner-city” serves as a code for “not suburban” and “not White.” Several threads in the “inner-city” discourse, similar to threads in the “urban” discourse, connect “inner-city” to “at-risk” and “race,” and particularly to “African American.”

The analysis of “at-risk” reveals interesting patterns over the time span of the corpus. “At-risk,” frequently used in conjunction with “inner-city” and/or “urban,” once existed in the discursive plane as a term to describe students with physical or mental “handicaps.” “At-risk” students

received services for a “handicap” in order to assist them in completing their compulsory education. Over time, however, “at-risk” changed from a word describing the potentially disabling physical and mental conditions of students to code used for a variety of *perceived social conditions and/or behaviors* of any student perceived as *not succeeding* in an idealized conception of school, or as a term used to describe students *in danger* of not graduating. The term “at-risk” appears in the corpus with greater frequency in the second decade (2001–2010, after the passage of NCLB) and more often with either “inner-city” or “urban,” thus creating a stronger connection with “city” than with “handicap,” and perhaps turning “city” into a “handicap.” In the second decade of the corpus examined in this study, students as young as preschool are labeled “at-risk.”

“Urban,” “inner-city,” and “at-risk” at times refer to *minority students* or “race.” “Race” connects all components of the analyses, occurring as a silent theme across multiple threads. Both publications examined in this study contain statements using the term “race,” and while some similarities exist among “race” statements, important differences also occur. In *MEJ*, where the intended audience is practicing music teachers and music education students, the focus on pedagogy and curriculum positions “race” as something considered in connection with “world music” or “music diversity,” alongside the “race” of students. In these instances, “race” means “not White.” In *JRME*, “race” is used as a variable or separator, typically in quantitative articles involving human subjects. In this publication, “race” separates actors into groups, either towards or away from norms, and permits prediction based on physical appearance. “Race” also connects to *minority* throughout the corpus, which reinforces ties between “race” and “urban.”

Associated closely to “race,” “diversity” appears as a thread across statements in all analyses. “Diversity” implies *difference*, and as determined in Chapter 4, difference was determined to be a problematic thread in the urban discourse, positioning “diversity” as pejorative from the start. “Urban” and “inner-city” environments are described as having “diversity,” and *urban music education* programs as having “diverse” students. In some statements, “diversity,” occurs with either “ethnic” or “cultural,” but in both cases, “diverse” or “diversity” remained code for *not-White*, or *at-risk*, or *poor*. The “diversity” present in the United States, classrooms, and

music classes is described in multiple statements, signifying when actors *do not conform* to the idealized norm and require some type of attention. The deviations from the norm, the *differences*, are seen to be problematic in some way and then labeled as "diverse." Similar to the patterns found in the analysis of "race," some *MEJ* statements using "diversity" refer to "world music" or related topics while statements in *JRME* refer to population samples. As described in Chapter 5, however, *MEJ* statements regarding diversity tend to observe differences while *JRME* statements enforce differences.

As presented in chapters 4 and 5, statements through the discursive plane position *urban music education* as code for music instruction for *poor students who are not White with low levels of achievement who attend undesirable schools with few resources and under-prepared teachers*. Statements about *urban music students, teachers,* and *programs* appear both in articles that are specifically about *urban music education* and, more frequently, in articles in which urban actors are mentioned in passing. In both types of articles, statements position urban actors in lower regard than their non-urban counterparts and portray aspects of schools in urban areas in pejorative terms. Statements that describe music students, music teachers, and music programs in the "urban" environment contain prose that is at times derogatory, unsettling, and belittling, contributing to negative threads in the *urban music education* discourse. Even in articles in which the aim is to champion *urban music education*, the discursive threads position the urban sector of the music education structure in demeaning ways. Negative terms and pejorative language in close proximity to urban and the related terms inner-city, at-risk, race, and diversity contribute to a discourse of harmful assumptions and connections.

In some instances, a double-edged sword exists in the *urban music education* discourse. Calling attention to what makes *urban music education* distinctive may support urban actors, but the label "urban" also positions the actors as *lesser* and *unable to achieve success* under current practices and assumptions within the music education structure. The analysis in Chapters 4 and 5 shows that the discourse of *urban music education* is so thick with pejoratives and negative connotations that writing and speaking using the label "urban" becomes problematic, regardless

of intention. Labels, as Foucault offers, denote a system of power and oppression (Foucault, 1976/1990), which is described in a subsequent section.

"Positive" Words. Using the computer software, I was able to configure a list of four terms in addition to "urban" that were useful in a search for statements about *urban music education*. The DEVONthink Pro Office software's algorithms produced a list of words in the corpus "similar to" the term "urban." In other words, "similar to" terms appear with, alongside, or in conjunction with the same words as the term "urban" in the discourse plane. After reviewing that initial list, I selected terms that would most likely help me locate statements regarding *urban music education* within this discourse plane: inner-city, at-risk, race, and diversity. Even with aim of locating statements that epitomize the discourse of *urban music education*, I did not select "negative" words or choose not to select "positive" words; I selected terms that were present across the corpus and that appeared in statements regarding the phenomenon of *urban music education*. I did not assume that any selected terms (i.e., "urban" or "at-risk") were negative.

To check whether I had selected the most appropriate terms for locating and examining statements in the corpus, I examined other words that that the "Similar" tool showed were concurrent with "urban." For example, the terms "black" and "white," as well as "African," surfaced as similar terms alongside "race," and I selected "race" as search term instead of the words that could locate statements about colors or a continent. While many statements containing search terms also had words that could be considered "negative," I did not purposefully exclude statements containing positive words; I included statements that best represented the discourse in the corpus selected for this study. In an attempt to find statements that might provide a different position on *urban music education*, I did search the corpus for the term "resilient" and found the term in six statements, none related to *urban music education*. With that outcome, I decided to keep following my previously established procedures and analyze the statements yielded by the initial search using the original five search terms: urban, inner (for inner-city), risk (for at-risk), race, and diversity.

The preponderance of statements yielded in the search had negative connotations. The abundance of negative associations to *urban music education* was difficult for me at times, and I

acknowledge that the negativity affected my own reading and my analysis of the statements. My personal experiences also impacted my reading of the statements. This analysis is my analysis; an analysis of the same material conducted by another person may or may not be similar. While my read of statements resulted in a critical and largely negative analysis, I believe that most of the statements *do* have negative and pejorative undertones that have impacted the discourse of *urban music education*. Placed back in context of their original articles, the intention of the authors may be different, but Foucault argues that intent is not important, rather, what is said is important. These statements, even those that are not intentionally pejorative, when read as a set of data, portray *urban music education* negatively. A CDA provides voice for a population who is marginalized, and the CDA is shared with that population in hopes of empowerment. While I know that others may read the statements in this corpus differently than I have, I believe that other actors of the *urban music education* structure would share my reading and arrive at a similar analysis and discussion.

Decontextualization and Creating My Own Discourse. My analysis of this collection of statements within a bounded corpus contributes to the discourse of *urban music education*. I participate in the discourse through my selection of software, my design of the process, my presentation of my reading of statements, and my subsequent analysis. Early in my research procedures, I located statements and read them in isolation, separate from a context or historical situatedness. This initial reading, disconnected from any context, provided a negative and pejorative account of *urban music education* and all associated actors. When I re-read the statements in context of the original articles, the message of some statements changed due to author intent, but by holding to Foucault's idea that author intent must be ignored, I believe that I focused on what the author *said* rather than what the author *meant*. Examining statements out of context frequently provided a negative reading; contextualizing certain statements provided an alternate reading. Reading statements in lists and out of context early in the analysis process allowed me to code and group statements in categories that may have changed had I read all statements contextually before coding them. While I believe that my initial reading and coding of

isolated statements stays more true to Foucauldian tenets, a different reading and analysis may have been produced if my procedural steps were inverted.

An initial reading and analysis, separate from context and intention, provided me with the ability to be as objective as possible with the statements. While I tried to analyze statements separate from author intent, I recognize that I *do* have intent. My review of statements highlights the negative stereotypes and pejorative thoughts connected to *urban music education*. I have intent to be a voice for the marginalized students, teachers, and music programs located in these places and I seek to shift the discourse in their favor. My intention complicates my own Foucauldian framework and causes me discomfort. Yet in regards to his Ethics of Discomfort, Foucault reminds us to "never consent to being completely comfortable with your own certainties" (Foucault, 1997, p. 144).

Demographic Data

The corpus in this study includes research reports, and research reports force scholars to identify participants involved in their studies. The descriptions used by scholars frequently become labels for segments of the populations studied. The difference between providing demographic data and labeling participants is a problematic fine line. Because demographic labels carry connotations, researchers need to think about word choice and what each descriptor or label means or possibly suggests. Within research articles, word choice in regards to demographic data should be selected with care. The assumption that demographic data is relevant and important to a study can be debated. Is it important to note the demographics of participants in a study? Does the racial make up of a population sample affect the data collected? Or are demographic data labels used as innuendos for other factors such as class? In some research studies, factors such as race or school location might be an important component to highlight or analyze, but what role does labeling play in data collection, analysis, and reporting? Would these factors matter in a post-racial United States? Until these questions can be answered, scholars need to exhibit care in word choice regarding demographic data.

The Power of Labels

Labeling groups of people, while an efficient means of communicating ideas, imposes boundaries (Moncrieffe, 2007, p. 1), and attaching the label of "urban" to members of the music education structure can be detrimental to those actors. Labels construct the "social world . . . to define norms in relation to others who bear similar or different labels" (p. 1), and "labeling processes are linked to the distribution of social, political, and economic power, they are critical for securing hegemonic meanings and values" (p. 2). Applying labels to groups of people influences how actors "fit" into the social organization of a structure and shapes how others in the structure interact with the labeled. Labels cause actors to reproduce (or adopt or overact) behaviors so as to conform to the expectations of the label. Labels are socially constructed and not naturally derived (p. 8), and labels exclude (Gupte & Mehta, 2007, p. 69).

Labels, although socially constructed, simultaneously construct the social world; labels differentiate between accepted and unapproved practices within in a group. At times, the accepted practice is labeled, and at other times labels exist in order to identify unaccepted behaviors or something contrary to the unlabeled norm (Moncrieffe, 2007, p. 1). Within the structure, the creators of the labels define the legitimacy of the labels and how labels are applied (Klouda, 2007, p. 102). As explained by Gupte and Mehta (2007), labeling is an ideological practice that obscures, inscribes, and enables the social construction of reality (p. 66), allowing the powerful members of the structure to encourage specific behaviors, social patterns, and practices within the structure or social group. Labeling, a form of political manipulation and the product of power relationships (Wood, 2007), occurs "without contemplation of the politics involved and potential diverse outcomes" (Moncrieffe, 2007, p. 1) and influences discourse in society (Foucault, 1975/1995).

In this investigation, I examined two journals from the National Association for Music Education (NAfME), a professional association for music educators. Their website contains the following statement: "The mission of the National Association for Music Education is to advance music education by encouraging the study and making of music by all" (www.nafme.org/about/mission-and-goals, 2014). The phrases "every student" and "by all"

promote an ideal of equality or that music study and music making are for everyone. Yet the truths in the discourse suggest that this declaration is simply lip service. The divide between the stated ideals (*every* student) and the articulated discourse of the structure (pejorative references to urban actors) suggest that the concept of "high-quality instruction for *all* students" is actually a certain kind of music instruction for students who deserve it because they live in middle-class monocultural suburbs.

This CDA demonstrates that words such as urban, inner-city, at-risk, race, and diversity appear to be interchangeable in some instances and strongly connected in others, at times only separated by a comma. The ways in which these words are used as labels strengthen the pejorative discourse of *urban music education*. Language use and word positioning create a hierarchy in which schools located in urban areas are considered to be *bad*. The fact that this discrimination exists is relevant to this study. Through these labels, statements connect location of school neighborhood to *failure* and *risk*, cementing negative threads into the *urban music education* discourse. As demonstrated in this study, the words "inner-city," "at-risk," "race," and "diversity" label groups of people and move certain populations away from an established norm. An examination of these labels exposes the political in the seemingly apolitical (Moncrieffe, 2007, p. 1). As Moncrieff (2007) notes:

> labels that have the power to stigmatize are propped up by discourses . . . that dehumanize and discriminate, and that explain the labeled group's inferiority in terms such as inherent/essential or biological differences, status/breeding or just reward for prior action. (p. 90)

Articulating differences subjugates groups of people while simultaneously fostering support for marginalized groups. Categorizing people into generalized groups inadvertently increases the stigmatization the population will experience (Gupte & Mehta, 2007, p. 65) and such labeling "inherently creates exclusive divisions given that once labeled, there are clear ideological constructions" (p. 68). "Urban" music education, with a label, signifies abnormality, while the absence of label – music education – represents normalcy and the ideal. The lack of label

reinforces both the hierarchy in the structure and the subjugated position reserved for actors with the label.

In the corpus, statements with specific labels imply characteristics about music students, teachers, and programs in certain schools. The terms and ideas connected to *urban music education*, either directly or implied, are usually pejorative and serve to regulate non-urban peers into superior positions. Through these discursive acts, agendas and/or a specific set of ideals become the norm within the music education profession. The subjugation of actors within the *urban music education* population is widespread within the discursive plane and continues to be propagated to consumers of two major publications in the professional field. Until actors in the music education structure are able to alter their beliefs surrounding *urban music education*, the paradigm will remain static and position an entire population group as less able. Due to the proliferation of the existing discourse, change seems a challenging task. A return to the philosophical tenets of Foucault may provide perspectives that will help articulate how to shift the *urban music education* discourse, if the task is possible.

Why and How What Is Said Came To Be

I have incorporated a Foucauldian framework into this study in order to explain the relationship of power and the discourse that is gathered, disseminated, and propagated. An examination of the nexus of power-knowledge-truth, how it is absorbed by docile bodies, and the role of surveillance and panopticonism may contribute to a better understanding of how this discourse was able to come into existence and dominate the corpus, and, perhaps, how to begin to change it.

Power-Knowledge-Truth. Foucault's complicated nexus of power, knowledge, and truth thrives in the *urban music education* discourse. To best understand the Foucauldian framework employed in this investigation, a review of these three concepts may provide some insight and situate the pieces of this puzzle. Foucault uses the concepts of power, knowledge, and truth to articulate the workings of structures within society, realizing their connection can expose struggles within the discourse.

Foucault's ideas about power have roots within his study of Nietzsche. While Foucault leans on Nietzsche in parts of his *oeuvre*, his own thoughts on power have obvious differences. Most notably, Foucault reads that Nietzsche interprets all power as negative (Gutting, 2005), but Foucault argues that power can be other than "negative." Power, according to Foucault, "traverses and produces things . . . induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse . . . [it is] a productive network which runs through the whole social body" (Foucault, p. 119, 1980). Power exists, but is not held by individuals; power is an activity in which actors participate. As noted by Best and Kellner (1991), Foucault asserts that power is "productive, not repressive in nature" (1991, p. 49), producing, as noted, the accepted discourse.

Foucault describes the "interweaving effects of power and knowledge" (1980, p. 109), asserting that knowledge is "indisassociable from regimes of power" (Best & Kellner, 1991, p. 50). Power cannot exist without knowledge, and knowledge cannot exist without power; the presence of one signifies the existence of the other. Power, Gutting (2005) explains, transforms frameworks that underlie knowledge. Foucault utilizes genealogy to examine this concept and writes that genealogy is "a form of history which can account for the constitutions of knowledges, discourses, domains of objects, etc." (1980, p. 117). Genealogy examines the power at play within a discourse that allows knowledge to be constructed and reproduced.

As knowledge, alongside power, is produced within the structure, regimes of truth become established and accepted, as "each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true" (Foucault, p. 131, 1980). This "truth" appears as an accepted network of ideas that dictate what statements can be made, distributed, or produced. The systems of power within the structure produce and sustain the conditions necessary for the truth to be constructed, creating a circular relationship between power and knowledge/truth. There are effects of connecting power to truth in this fashion, and critical investigations aim to expose the relationship between power and repression and to uncover the "fundamental, immutable gulf between those who exercise power and those who undergo it" (Foucault, p.121, 1980).

According to Foucault, power circulates through a field of networks intended to create systems of control. Techniques of power act as "factors of segregation and social hierarchization . . . guaranteeing relations of domination and effects of hegemony" (Foucault, 1976/1990, p. 141). Hegemony contributes to a "social cohesion" not through force or coercion, but through "practices which cultivate behaviours and beliefs, tastes, desires, and needs as seemingly natural occurring qualities" (Smart, 1986, p. 160). Power techniques and their effectiveness are evident in this study: in the music education structure, power (large professional organizations) perpetrates knowledge (publications, statements in the articles), thereby creating regimes of truth, in this case, a network of ideas that constitute *urban music education.* Analyzing how marginalized groups (urban music actors) are described uncovers the systems of domination and repression present in the corpus, and how those systems of domination and repression are reproduced in the power-knowledge-truth nexus of the profession.

For example, in education, and even in music education, assessments and examinations aim to collect data about programs, students, and teachers. The data-driven community that is the education field, particularly since the enactment of NCLB (which is historically at the midpoint of the corpus), continuously collects information regarding students' achievements, demographics, and lives. These data are "recorded in documents that provide detailed information about the individuals examined and allow power systems to control them" (Gutting, 2005, p. 86). The irony is that this invisible collection process results in a very visible outcome, as categories, labels, and hierarchies are placed onto groups of actors who have been "scrutinized by armies of anonymous and invisible functionaries" (Gutting, 2005, p. 86). Collecting this knowledge is usually invisible, as the actors are not aware of the information being collected about them.

A critical analysis of these labels, categories, and descriptors in the *urban music education* structure exposes not only domination and repression, but also biases of race, class, and culture. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1975/1995) warns that judges of normality are everywhere, reaffirming that norms exist. In this study, the "judges of normality" reaffirm a perceived idea of a good, successful, ideal music education program by reproducing a discourse

that claims those ideals do not and cannot exist in programs, in schools, or among teachers and students labeled as *urban*. As Best and Kellner (1991) explain, “power operates not through physical force or representation by law, but through the hegemony of norms, political technologies, and the shaping of body and soul” (p. 49). The power-knowledge-truth nexus is exercised within a discourse, and in the case of *urban music education*, works to shape statements that create a regime of truth that is accepted and believable. Truth, as a part of this power-knowledge-truth nexus, becomes a tool to control the hegemonic discourse othering “urban.”

Foucault’s ideas about power-knowledge and truth form a framework suitable for examining the hegemony, repression, and subjugation present in the *urban music education* discourse. Examining the negative connotations expressed by actors in the discourse suggests that *urban music education* may continue to be situated as a “deficient” portion of the structure until the “truth” statements about those topics, inside and outside of music education, can be shifted. At present, the categories constructed within the *urban music education* discourse remove subjects from the mainstream and infer an accepted “truth” about what a successful, ideal music program is *not urban*. As long as these categories and labels continue to other groups of actors, they also continue to define what is “normal” within the discursive plane.

Docile bodies. Foucault uses the term “docile bodies” to explain the effects of institutional control over actors in a structure. His work *Discipline and Punish* (1975/1995) focuses on changes in the use of power near the close of the seventeenth century, changes reflecting the rejection of physical torture and an acceptance of taming and self-regulation. As explained by Corbett (2010), “institutions and practices of social control undertook practices aimed at observing, documenting, and cultivating reflective, pertinent, and, most important, self-regulating subjects” (p. 315). This self-regulation results in both compliance and discipline, creating subjects who are active participants in the desired outcomes of the structure, with participation ensuring a sense of normalcy that then causes the non-compliant to be labeled as abnormal.

When actors cannot be regulated, they are either labeled as abnormal or rehabilitated to become functional by learning how to act, behave, and believe properly, meaning that they are able to reproduce the powers present in the structure. As Corbett describes:

> The docile body is one that is under the control of its possessor in alignment with norms and more or less subtle forms of regulation that are learned and developed through training rather than through the application of external force. (p. 315)

The structure dictates how subjects should appear and act, ensuring a commitment to the prescribed discourses that are dominant and accepted. The reproduction of social practices is part of the semiotic element of discourse establishment (Fairclough, 2001a).

This power of regulation advances specific goals and thoughts within a structure; the accepted discourses advertise what is "normal" and how actors are expected to function. The desire to be "normal" drives actors in the structure to follow guidelines about how to act, be, and think. Within the music education structure, these guidelines are most readily accessible in discourse produced by large organized groups, including NAfME. NAfME publications, in this case *MEJ* and *JRME*, exist to inform the masses and perpetuate ideas on how to act, be, and think in acceptable ways within the structure. Such "peer-reviewed" publications allow selected sets of statements into the discursive plane, structuring the discourse. Review of content, managed by those in positions of power, allows certain truths and restrains others. As Dobbs (2012) proffers, the music education discourse is heavily influenced by *JRME*; the peer-reviewed journal uses a blind review process that still "allows certain voices to be heard whereas others are not" (p. 13), controlling the discourse.

These publications situate the discourse and allow power to be reproduced and performed by docile bodies within the structure. The consumption of the literature and the discourse espoused within those pages is in turn internalized by the consuming actors, music teachers, which results in self-regulation in order to be perceived as "normal" by peers. The concept of docile bodies demonstrates the "mundane production of power by ordinary social actors" (Corbett, 2010, p. 316), the ability of social institutions to be inherently oppressive towards their subjects. In the case of music education, the professional organizations have assumed the

power to disburse content that informs and shapes the discourse in ways certain actors deem appropriate. Music educators, in the role of actors/subjects, consume the information in hopes of learning how to be normal/accepted, aiming to self-regulate their role as “music educator” as defined by others in higher positions within the hierarchy of the structure. Without interrogation of discursive practices, teachers and other actors in the structure perpetuate norms and reinforce curriculum practices and specific models of success to which they had been previously exposed.

Panopticonism. The docile body requires monitoring, and Bentham’s panopticon serves as the physical representation of the theoretical model for how such a social structure could exist. Conceived as a way to monitor inmates, Bentham created this type of architectural structure as part of the prison system. The panopticon does not keep each inmate in an isolated, dark room, but instead, each inmate is placed in a well-lit cell that allows for direct surveillance. All cells face inward towards a central point within the building, facing the guard’s room. From this location, the guard can monitor the actions of each subject, and although the subjects are able to see the guards’ room, they are not able to see inside it. Prisoners know that they could be observed at any moment, but are unable to discern at what moments they are actually under surveillance (Foucault, 1975/1995, p. 201).

Constant surveillance provides opportunities for constant assessment and monitoring. Knowing they are under constant watch, prisoners are more likely to act appropriately and follow rules, therefore avoiding scrutiny and punishment from the guard. The consistent performance of accepted behaviors trains the prisoners, now docile bodies, to act or reproduce the standards that the structure determines to be acceptable. Whether or not the prisoners reformed or performed has been questioned (Simon, 2005), but Foucault (1975/1995) touts the efficiency of Bentham’s model. Establishing the panopticon structure ensures the desired behavior changes, using self-regulation instead of physical violence. Prisoners or actors use self-regulation to learn how to act and be, and repeated acts theoretically lead to a type of normative understanding, a discourse.

Guards observed the panopticon prisoners in order to enforce adherence to rules and regulations, and with this architecture guards were also able to constantly document abnormalities and deviations. Through studying such deviations, guards established additional

rules and procedures in order to “normalize” behaviors and control the actions of the prisoners. Foucault refers to this system as the “laboratory of power” (1975/1995, p. 204) in which the production of regulations controlled social behavior and the reproduction of desired behaviors. In this prison structure, a report of deviant behavior resulted in additional rules for the prisoners, and prisoners, aware of the system, reproduced accepted behaviors in order to not be positioned as abnormal. Systems of resistance are present in multiple structures, and in the panopticon this may occur as prisoners disobeying directives, causing disobedient actors to be accordingly labeled as abnormal and punished or shunned.

In music education a panopticon cannot exist as a physical structure that oversees each music educator at all times, rather, the publications and other media and actions that broadcast the discourse act as a system of regulation. Guards are not available to reprimand or reward, but journal article content, as described in this study, informs actors whether or not they are performing in ways accepted by the structure. NAfME disseminates information in order to inform, control, and shape the discourse of music education. As music educators and music teacher educators read the articles in these publications, they determine, subconsciously or consciously, whether their own teaching practices are in alignment with national expectations and then make any adjustments they view necessary. The need to be accepted as “normal” drives individuals to adjust their behavior patterns, and those who promote the vision or perception of what is “normal” control the discourse.

Foucauldian critical discourse analysis. CDA scholars seek to uncover perceived truths within a discourse, the historical and societal conditions that create these “truths,” and what “power” and “knowledge” exist in order for truths to be present. As Arvast (2008) explains, “one of the advantages of the Foucauldian perspective on power and discourse is that it avoids pointing fingers and blaming individuals for certain commentary, and seeks instead to identify the structures that cause the othering” (p. 173). Dobbs (2012) suggests that the decision to use CDA is

> guided by the premise that social power is enacted, reproduced, and resisted through talk and texts – those of us who choose to employ types of critical discourse analysis typically

have a clear understanding of our roles as scholars and researchers and work to expose and resist social inequity. (p. 12)

Foucault finds it important to explore truth as a product of systems of power (Prado, 2006). It is not important to determine what the truth "is," but more critical to determine how that truth has become part of the discourse. In music education, statements ("truths") made in the leading publications by respected members of the community are more readily accepted than other statements, in opposition or not, in other publications. Statements appearing in *JRME* and *MEJ* are valid or "true" "insofar as they appear under the guise of authority" (Mantie, 2009, p. 74). Not only *what* is accepted as a "truth" should be examined, but also, and more importantly, *why*. Regimes of truth come about as truth claims made by authority figures (or from power) are reproduced within the structure. These "regimes of truth" then "delimit who we are and what we can become" and "must be opened up for interrogation" (Mantie, 2009, p. 67); this is the essence of critical discourse analysis.

The connection Foucault makes between power-knowledge and truth is complex. As Morris (2011) details, Foucault submits that power is productive, something operating within the relationships between people and institutions and *not* always constraining, repressive, or negative. The presence of power is evident in the relationships between people and institutions in the music education structure. Power is an entity that is both exercised and employed (Morris, 2011). Power exists, but is not owned by people, but rather, people *participate* in power. In the current study, power in the music education discourse is not held by individuals within the structure, but rather by anyone and everyone participating in the power through their contributions within, adherence to, and reproductions of the discourse. As Ducar (2006) explains, in "the Foucauldian tradition, discourses are seen as institutionalized instantiations of power. Furthermore, the production of 'truth' is seen as controlled by power regimes and both meaning and social identities are believed to be derived from discursive interactions" (p. 42). The "truth" about *urban music education* is produced and shared by the power holders in the structure, which is then shared and accepted and reproduced by the docile bodies.

A critical discourse analysis is an effective tool to be used in examining the product of power relations within the music education structure. As Khalema (2011) explains, “the CDA approach provides a framework both to critique and analyze knowledge that is informed by a multiplicity of traditions as a way to make sense of discourses produced” (pp. 8–9). In this study, a CDA reveals that the power relationships in the music education structure promote truths that pejoratively label “urban” actors. This labeling results in the marginalization of specific students, teachers, music programs, and schools, allowing for the idealized norm to remain the conscious (or unconscious) model of music education in the United States. Actors in positions of power perpetuate the discourse, resulting in unfair labeling and discrimination towards segments of the music education structure.

In the field of music education, there are innumerable accepted “truths” that flourish in the discourse, truths which marginalize and normalize various actors. These statements are not questioned because they originate in or are perpetuated by leading figures and publications in the field (Dobbs, 2012, p. 7) and these deliverers of knowledge have the power to spew words and thoughts into the corpus that become a perceived reality within the profession. In a discursive environment, knowledge and power are governed, producing truths, and this complex three-way relationship figures into every discourse, which must be critically examined in order for “truths” to be accurately revealed. As Mantie argues, “there is, in other words, no innocent knowledge” (2009, p. 95).

Moving Forward

In this chapter, I have articulated a summary of the discourse of *urban music education* and examined aspects of labeling theory and Foucauldian elements that allow this discourse to function. The discourse positions *urban music education* actors at a low status within the structure, and most references made about *urban music education* are pejorative and harmful. The discourse describes these actors as poor, not-White, abnormal, and less-successful people who require a label in order to separate them from the idealized status quo of their suburban counterparts.

The performance of this discourse results from the propaganda disseminated and reproduced within the structure, which reproduces power and the subsequent reproduction of power. Words used in isolation or in proximity to other words in the discursive plane contribute to power struggles evident in the discourse of *urban music education*. To change or alter the nexus of understood and accepted truths in the *urban music education* discourse would be a daunting and difficult task, and the path to that type of shift in discourse is rocky and cannot be navigated by one single scholar working in isolation.

In the subsequent and final chapter, I propose a plan to shift the discourse. In order to change the discourse, the structure will have to become different. Different is abnormal, as encountered throughout this document and the discourse, but it is at these points of tension and difference where change can indeed occur. Change will come about when actors challenge the accepted discourse and through those challenges, work to be different. The ability to write, think, and act differently can shift perceptions of *urban music education*, with the ultimate shift being that the phrase *urban music education* no longer exists.

Chapter 7

Challenging an Unchallenged Discourse

"Effing the inevitable." ~ Susan McClary, 2011

In 2001 the Housewright Symposium, an assembled collection of music education leaders, admitted the continuing disparity in music education quality and access between the majority and minority cultures in the United States. Part of their Declaration statement reads "all persons, regardless of age, cultural heritage, ability, venue, or financial circumstance deserve to participate fully in the best music experiences possible" (Madsen, p.19, 2000). Strands in the discourses of music education acknowledge the continued struggle to provide quality music education to all students, with few suggestions for how to address the inequality and little conversation about what "best" or "music education experience" means, allowing the established discourse to reproduce in the structure without questioning it.

This study is limited to discourse analysis of terms related to *urban music education,* and the analysis in this document demonstrates that the stereotypes, assumptions, and pejorative images associated with *urban music education* are prominent within the discourse and literature of the field. Statements construct *urban music education* as poor, non-White music students who are unable to succeed. Texts produced in this structure may be influenced by additional discourses in society, including general education and politics, but the statements tend to remain unchallenged and accepted by docile bodies in the music education structure. Actors' thoughts regarding *urban music education* will not change until challenged within the structure, and therefore music education needs to critically examine the discourse, calling attention to the implied privilege of non-urban students and forcing the structure to begin to change.

In this chapter, I confront this unchallenged discourse by encouraging strategies for being "different" through writing/speaking, thinking, and action. Furthermore, I champion a discursive shift, a movement that requires a change in the perceptions of success, and how this discursive shift can impact current practices, including teacher education. Finally, to close, I restate my own personal story from Chapter 1, this time with new knowledge and a commitment to shifting the discourse and becoming different.

Being Different

An examination of the discourse shows that *urban music education* has been labeled as "different" and "abnormal," leaving urban actors marked as "less" than non-urban actors. When the structure defines an entire population as "different," the labeling places actors in hierarchal positions, moving some actors above others while creating a divide within the structure. This type divide becomes self-perpetuating and a method of surveillance (Gupte & Mehta, 2007), relegating actors into pejorative spaces. I posit that instead of labeling an entire *population* as "different," members of the structure should instead consider how they themselves could write/speak, think, and act differently, in turn shifting the discourse of *urban music education*.

Writing/speaking differently. The simple act of using the term "urban" carries significant weight, and when the term is used within the discourse, it signifies varied and pejorative ideas to the reader or listener/hearer. Seeing "urban" in text or hearing "urban" in conversation is similar to noticing a warning beacon. Actors in the discourse have learned to react to "urban" in specific ways and to expect specific contexts or make certain associations at the mention of the term. Critically aware actors should wonder whether a better, "different," approach to writing about *urban music education* can shift the discourse.

The problem, as demonstrated in this study, is that "urban" is an adjective that has become code for other things when used to describe students, teachers, schools, music programs, and education in general, and as long as "urban" continues to be used as an adjective in this way, writers and speakers reproduce the discourse. Reconsidering word order may be a first step in shifting the discourse, and changing word patterns could be one step toward altering the perception of *urban music education*. For example, "music education in city schools" or "music students in urban areas" may carry a different connotation than "urban music education." Yet even so, the word "urban" is still present, carrying discursive meaning. In the next section, I examine the phenomena of People First Language in order provide some insight as to the potential power shift that language patterns hold within society. I recognize that additional work will be needed in order to shift the discourse, and later in this chapter suggest other methods of altering discursive behaviors, including examining music teacher education.

People First Language. Language use positions groups of people or ideas into hierarchies. The ways in which we use language affect how people, objects, and concepts are perceived. Language is "an unstable social practice whose meaning shifts, depending on the content in which it is used" (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 769). Words used to label can define entire groups of people and objects; those meanings are not static. Labels carry weight, connotations, and judgment, and "labels used by some sets of actors are more easily imposed than those labels created and offered by others" (Wood, 2007, p. 20). As revealed in this study of *urban music education*, the addition of the singular descriptor "urban" alters the perceptions of the object and how it is received and perceived by the structure. The word "urban" as a label in the music education discursive plane has been systematically coded to infer specific and pejorative meanings. Labeling and categorization occur not only related to the word "urban" and not only in *urban music education*, but also with other words and in other discourses. For example, scholars have examined labeling, categorization, word placement, and language positioning in the area of disability studies. An overview of this phenomenon is relevant to this study.

In the area of disability studies, some writers advocate for the use of People First Language (PFL) when describing individuals with physical or mental disabilities. Initiated by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), this "deliberate reconceptualization of disability as a secondary rather than a definitive trait" (p. 8) aimed to deemphasize an individual's disability or limitation by shifting language. Through establishing PFL, the ADA restructured how people with disabilities are perceived in literature and documents; positioning the impairment as a secondary trait of the individual rather than the defining trait prevents a person from becoming labeled by something that makes them "different." In other words, in PFL, individuals are described primarily as a people, rather than as their disability (Halmari, 2011, p. 829), by placing of the label highlighting their disability following the acknowledgment of their being human. This practice produces a *postmodified noun*. The use of postmodified nouns instead of premodified nouns symbolically recognizes the person first and the disability second (see Table 8). For example, the phrase "autistic student" is modified in PFL to "student with autism." More than just a nod to

political correctness, the shift in language use and language positioning focuses on portraying an individual as a person first.

Table 8

Examples of "People First Language"

Use This Language:	Instead Of:
People with disabilities	The handicapped or the disabled
She is a student with autism	She is an autistic student
He has a learning disability	He is learning disabled
Person we provide services to	Client
Accessible parking	Handicapped parking
Brain injury	Brain damaged
Person to whom we provide services	He's in special ed

Even if PFL stems from an ethical place and fosters support for a marginalized group of people, all discourse is political. Positive and negative implications and ramifications of PFL have been examined within the literature of disability studies. As Muredda (2012) writes, "people-first language is not merely a rose by another name but rather a purposive attempt to fix language in both senses of the term: attaching a particular meaning to disability while correcting its antecedents" (p. 8). Whether language modification can change perceptions of society towards a group of people is complicated to measure, however, and whether a deliberate attempt to change language use can alter the way society and the discourse defines groups of people would be challenging to demonstrate.

In addition, identifying as "disabled" (or not) can create a conundrum for individuals with limitations. While PFL places the person prior to the condition, for a person with a handicap to receive assistance they must first be labeled as deficient in some way. This reflects Foucault's ideas about power and labeling. As explained by Muredda (2012):

> To be recognized as a person with a disability is at once economically beneficial, insofar as it renders one eligible for financial support, and restrictive, in the sense that one's experience of disability one must be aligned with the existing category, regardless of whether one personally identifies with it, in order to be recognized as such. (p. 4)

Individuals must accept labels in order to receive assistance from the government or other points of power and control, as the label “affirms positions, lends moral purpose” and portrays a group of people “who are owed something better” (Cornwall & Fujita, 2007, p. 48). In other words, actors of the structure, whether in public health, education, or music education, must admit inadequacies and deviation from the norm if they are to receive “goods” or “services” that allow others to identify them as more normal or less different. Need is present in some schools located in cities and elsewhere, however, to use “urban” as a totalizing adjective is problematic. Not all “urban” schools claim the same problems for which services are needed, and not all schools with need are in urban locations.

The motivating center of PFL is that change can occur through collective shifts in the ways words are used in the discourse. Linguists and sociologists comment on the ability of language to be powerful in perceptions and discourses (Krippendorff, 2006; Meyer, 2001), but debate the ability of a simple change of words to alter how society perceives an othered group, noting that such modifications can become euphemisms for old values while attitudes remain unchanged. Halmari (2011) suggests that the belief that perceptions about people with disabilities can be changed through rearranging the syntax and changing language use is outdated. Similarly, Muredda (2012), speaking of Halmari’s work, explains that, “euphemisms, after all, tend to become associated with the very term they once elided if they are only repeated enough times” (p. 5). Moncrieffe (2007) submits that “reform attempts are futile” (p. 12), noting that labeling is “inevitable” (p.13). Dobbs (2012) acknowledges the hegemonic effects of labeling, “in the matter of discourse, texts, including the spoken or printed word, have enormous power to create both positive and negative perceptions and/or constructions that – often unintentionally – reduce individuals to stereotypes” (p. 16). Changing language may be polite, but Halmari argues that a “fix the language, fix the world” mentality is naïve (p. 830).

In a study of language in the *Houston Chronicle* from January 2002 through June 2007, Halmari found that the premodified noun (negative) usage “seems to be common in reference to target group members when they have committed a crime, when they are victims, or when they are fictional characters” (p. 833), while postmodification (positive) use occurs in instances dealing

with children, non-criminal adults, and within names of organizations that serve the target population. Her findings suggest that we selectively use PFL when it best suits the context or our own purposes; we determine which people "deserve" PFL and which people do not. Halmari suggests that, in the case of the *Houston Chronicle,* using non-PFL language is both more concise and dramatic, allowing for more intriguing headlines. Disregard for PFL is symbolic of values: it is more important to sell newspapers than to be respectful of people (p. 838).

Can we instigate change by altering the way we write or speak? The case of PFL is inconclusive. The use of PFL aims to position people with disabilities so that they are recognized for being a person first, rather than a disability first; however, this can be perceived as a different form of labeling or euphemisms, with mixed effectiveness. As demonstrated in this analysis of *urban music education*, how the word "urban" is used, and how other language in the discursive plane is used, can rally for change while simultaneously labeling actors as being different. The effects of shifting the discourse by writing and speaking differently may be inconclusive, but is it naïve to try?

Thinking differently. Reflecting on PFL invites reflection on the discourse of *urban music education* perspective and the possibilities of speaking, writing, and thinking differently. I wish to clarify here that I am not equating being in an urban music program to having any sort of disability. Rather, the language used, stereotypes presented, and discursive threads evident in both discourses are similar and provide a relevant comparison and opportunity for discussion. For example, Muredda (2012) explains that Congress finds that:

> Individuals with disabilities are a discrete and insular minority who have been faced with restrictions and limitations, subjected to a history of purposeful unequal treatment, and relegated to a position of political powerlessness in our society, based on characteristics that are beyond the control of such individuals and resulting from stereotypic assumptions not truly indicative of the individual ability of such individuals to participate in, and contribute to, society. (p. 3)

Replacing the first three words in that quote with the text "urban music students and teachers" makes the point. *Urban music education* actors are groups of people subject to unfair scrutiny

and judgment, often based on aspects of their life over which they may have very little to no control, and who are relegated to positions of powerlessness in a totalizing discourse.

Being aware of how we speak and write means being aware of how we think, which is essential to shifting the discourse. In order to *be* different, we must critically analyze how we think, speak, and write in the discursive plane and then make changes in our thoughts and behaviors. As Halmari (2011) notes in her examination of PFL, premodified nouns are most commonly used in association with criminals, victims, and fictional characters (p. 833). When "urban" is an adjective positioned before the noun "music education," our own form of premodified vernacular, what are we saying? Does this premodified noun relegate *urban music education* actors to the status of criminals, victims, and fictionalized characters?

Postmodified nouns are part of the PFL vernacular. What would it take to make postmodified nouns part of the music education vernacular? Could we reconstruct our thoughts and language to be about music education in urban areas or music education in cities? Can this transition create more equal positioning within the music education structure? Perhaps, as Halmari suggests, this simple modification in hope of change is naïve; but until we try, how are we to know the effects of thinking differently?

Acting differently. Until our actions change, nothing changes. We remain docile bodies. As noted above, one essential adjustment should be change in the behaviors that allow the *urban music education* labeling system to continue. Labels are totalizing. As Titchkosky (2001) explains in the disability literature, grouping all people with disabilities into one singular group via labels diminishes their individuality. Similarly in *urban music education*, placing millions of actors into one group robs them of individuality. The label "urban" diminishes the differences that occur across thousands of music classrooms, students, and teachers. Insinuating that all of these students, teachers, and music programs are the same or can be addressed in the same way is faulty. Until we are able to shed the label that defines and entraps a major portion of the music education structure, we are unable to act differently; as long as the label exists, the continuous cycle of oppressive relationship remains.

Labels can concurrently show support for and isolate marginalized groups. Labels, "deeply political," influence policy, but also enforce "control, regulation, and management" (Moncrieffe, 2007, p. 7). As noted in the analysis section of this study, several authors who choose to be advocates for urban music programs, students, and teachers use vocabulary that may enforce the negative connotations that surround *urban music education.* In order to disassociate some of these negative concepts from *urban music education*, practices will need to change so that the reproduction of accepted truths may be changed or halted. These changes in behavior, in how we act, need to be significant in order for the discourse to shift.

As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, discourse is more than language; discourse is a system of ideas, actions, texts, and statements that construct a perceived reality. These ideas, actions, texts, and statements that enter the discourse do so at the permission of power (Foucault, 1969/2010), and contribute to the establishment of "truths." Because of the power component in discourse, discourse is "politically . . . loaded" (Rogers, 2004, p. 6). To shift the discourse, action is necessary. In the next section I turn to other kinds of actions that are necessary to alter perception and shift the *urban music education* discourse.

Shifting Our Perceptions

Within the music education structure, the discourse positions *urban music education* in a low regard. In order for *urban music education* to be better received, perceived, and respected, major shifts in the music education discourse will have to occur. I believe that many threads in the discourse can relegate urban actors into a lower status, and through addressing some of those threads the discourse can be altered. The two most prominent topics that affect the discourse of *urban music education* are how the structure perceives "success" and how the concept of "urban" is acted upon in teacher education.

Redefining success in music education. As a high school music student, I knew my school's band was "good" because we had lots of trophies on the wall and we received "Superior" ratings at festivals. Getting an occasional "Excellent" rating was sad and caused us to blame weaker sections or players for our "failures." But at the end of the day, we knew we were "good" because we had pieces of laminated wood and metallic-colored plastic that symbolized our

"success." Early in my teaching career, I reached for those same aspirations: I "knew" I would be a "good" teacher when *I* had those same trophies and plaques littering the walls and shelves of *my* band room.

At some point in my teacher education, I am sure a professor told me that there were other indicators of "good teaching" or "success," ones that were not presented by a judge at a district festival. But humans like being told we are exceptional, and for the music teacher, trophies and plaques may be one of the few ways to receive such validation. Scores are measures and result in pieces of plastic to hang on the wall. We want those sparkly pieces of validation because we are trained to believe (the "truth" of the discourse is) that high festival scores prove our worth and value as teachers. We are guilty of perpetuating this discourse by judging our peers on their performances and scores. *"Did you hear that so-and-so got a 3 at festival? A 3? Why did he even show up?"* This type of conversation became familiar to me as I attended music festivals, where we "band directors" seemed intent on earning the top rating and then comparing our ratings with our peers, wanting them to do well, but also hoping to do better than them. This competitive culture permeates the performance-based ensemble structure and causes many directors to put significant weight and focus on such events.

For part of my career, I was one of those directors. At my first teaching position, when I taught in a school that had the resources to perpetuate the competitive band culture, I bought into it and validated myself through the festival ratings, trophies, and plaques. In my second teaching position, when I couldn't compete for the top scores, I became confused: How could I validate myself as a teacher if I was not going to receive laminated plywood and gold-painted plastic? That point during my career was the beginning of a careful, and painful, re-evaluation of my own philosophy of teaching and music making; I began to reconsider what "success" looked like.

In this study, the discourse analysis reveals that "urban" is code for multiple meanings, but not "success." The idealized version of "success" present in the discourse of the music education structure positions a White, suburban, middle class model as the pinnacle in music education, while the discourse of "urban," fraught with terms like "broken," "difficult," and "challenging," is not compatible with those markers of "success." While the structure of music

education promotes a specific vision of “success,” multiple versions or visions of “success” exist in music education, and power wielders of the structure do not always validate those “other” manifestations. “Success” may manifest in some music classrooms as the idealized norm, while in other classrooms “success” may be renegotiated among the actors in the classroom to be something else. “Success” in music education, especially as a derivation from the discursive norm of “success,” allows and empowers more actors to be accepted as contributing members of the structure. The acceptance of multiple versions of “success” validates actors whose practices may have previously been marginalized or determined to be inferior by those members of the structure who subscribe to the propagated “truths” (docile bodies). In the discourse, an absence of such acceptance hinders these multiple versions of “success” to be seen as valid/true, which relegates the “other” experiences as “lesser.” The discourse discounts multiple versions of “success,” fostering the discursive “truths” about “success.” The idealized representations of “success” receive the label of “traditional,” which results in additional practices of othering.

My own visions of “success” have altered over time, representative of a changing philosophy and realization of limitations of the discursively idealized “success.” Reading my own story, in regards to my first teaching position in a more privileged school, I see the words “I” and “my” with greater frequency, and a focus on physical markers of success (trophies). Over time, and with a more critical mindset, I became more aware of the limitations of this version of idealized “success,” and caught myself rejecting the “truths” in the discourse, aware of the need to define “success” with students, in a shared space, on our own terms.

I urge that music educators reconsider how “success” manifests for our discourse. Especially in secondary performance-based ensemble, an honest analysis of teaching philosophies may be revealing, especially if we examine the truths inherent in common practices. In the current performance-based structure of music education, the pressure to perform at specific levels or to compete with peer schools can be oppressive. The large ensemble performance model, prominent in the discourse as a “successful” model, creates injustices in the music education structure and marginalizes some groups while ensuring “success” for others.

While there can be multiple versions of "success" outside the competition model, those "different" experiences are relegated as non-conformist and othered.

One marginalizing problem with the performance-based structure, funding, remains a discursive thread in music education research regarding competition (Meyer, 2011; O'Leary, 2013; Rickels, 2009) and, as seen in the analysis section of this document, not all schools, regardless of location or label, have the same access to money, donations, or resources of their peers. While the urge to compete at high levels motivates music programs to spend money, equitable access to resources does not guarantee a level playing field. Unequal spending, while an issue within the competitive ensemble model, is not the only problem present. If we use our time to find ways to spread out resources equally, we choose to use our time to validate and perpetuate the truths that define the performance-based competitive ensemble model as the only/accepted/correct method for "success" in music education, a method implemented and perpetuated in the idealized norm.

To discursively reconfigure the idealized norm, we need multiple definitions of "successful" school music programs, teachers, and students, therefore allowing multiple versions of success: versions that are not about competition, versions that are not only about large ensembles, versions that are not only about Western art music, versions that are not only about secondary schools, versions that are not only about star-quality solo performances, versions that occur anywhere a school is located, versions that are not only about the idealized White, suburban, middle-class, large ensemble, secondary school norm. Until that happens, segregation and labels will continue to categorize and separate/segregate school music programs. Shifting this discourse of success will be a challenging task. The perception of only one kind of "success" is prominent in the discourse, and, as demonstrated in this analysis of *urban music education,* any deviation from the "truth" of success in the discourse is incongruent and "abnormal." Since the majority of music teachers are products of idealized programs, hegemonic perceptions of success based on their personal experiences as students will continue until they are challenged to consider multiple views. As a profession, actors have a responsibility to help support multiple views of "success," as providing these opportunities only strengthens our profession as we

disrupt structure. In order to disrupt the structure and shift the discourse, action must be taken, as described in the next section.

Taking action within the profession. Some articles in the corpus examined in this study suggest that preservice music educators do not want to teach in "urban" schools, which is not surprising given the misconceptions in the discourse. Some of the actions needed to shift perceptions and change the discourse must occur with music teacher education. Doing so requires that we must first admit that misconceptions and negative connotations in the *urban music education* discourse affect how music programs in cities are portrayed, shaping perceptions of preservice teachers. In this section, I suggest that within music teacher education, we need to identify and challenge the discursive truths in the structure, provide preservice and practicing teachers opportunities to experience multiple versions of success, and engage with schools in a variety of locations. In confluence, such strategies can shift the discourse.

Identifying and challenging truths in the discourse. Multiple authors outside of the corpus have identified discursive patterns present in *urban music education.* A study by Bruenger (2009) published within the time frame of the corpus of this study but in a different journal examines possible reasons that preservice music teachers are not interested in applying to work in urban schools. Bruenger interviewed students regarding their attitudes on applying to work in urban schools, and participants reported that concerns emerged regarding their perceived ability to cultivate a competitive music program, a problem described in the section on "success" above, and major detractors included financial and racial prejudices. As corroborated in the analysis in my study, the discourse maintains that urban schools do not have financial resources that allow the music programs to be considered successful and competitive, and that "race" and "urban" are discursively entwined in negative ways. The preservice teachers interviewed in Bruenger's study expressed a desire to teach in a school similar to where they had grown up, usually classified as suburban or mid-urban. Bruenger argues that in urban schools the arts become a dumping ground for students and states that "horror stories" (p. 33) about urban music programs drive away interested, capable students from applying for jobs in city schools. Bruenger claims that the lack of preservice teacher experiences in urban schools may contribute to these attitudes and

opinions of the students. Preservice teacher field experiences will be discussed later in this chapter.

Prominent discourses within a structure shape the behaviors of those within the community, including preservice music educators. Discursive threads imply what patterns of behavior the actors should accept, and those seeking to conform will develop behaviors so as to be a part of the discourse rather than separate from it. Preservice teachers enter their teacher preparations programs already instilled with values, ideas, and ideologies regarding *urban music education* and ideas about race, poverty, culture, and difference, as well as "music education," that stem from their own system of personal beliefs, constructed before entering the classroom, and difficult to alter once there. Some researchers suggest that preservice teachers make assumptions about minority and low-income students before they enter underserved schools (Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Olmedo, 1997), and they may hold low expectations for some students due to deficit thinking.[22] A teacher's system of beliefs affects behavior and actions in the classroom (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001), and it may be difficult to change the minds of every individual even when approached in the curriculum in a constructive manner (Garmon, 2005). Yet, teacher educators have an obligation to understand, recognize, and challenge preservice teachers' believed truths about subordinated students (Bartolome, 2004).

A critical examination of discursive truths engages preservice teachers with ideals surrounding social justice and informs preservice teachers about their own perceptions. The discourse of music education and teacher education contains claims that including social justice topics in teacher education curriculum might contribute to more culturally sensitive teachers (McDonald, 2005), to effective "multicultural" teachers (Garmon, 2005), and can advance the

[22] Deficit thinking surfaces in urban classrooms, most frequently because we believe that a student's lack of achievement can be traced to the family or community. Deficit thinking refers to the notion that students, particularly low-income minority students, fail in school because they and their families experience deficiencies that obstruct the learning process (e.g., limited intelligence, inadequate home socialization). More plausible reasons why students and schools fail exist, but it becomes easier to blame a student's race for failure than to help a student reach his or her potential (Benedict, 2006). Deficit thinking allows teachers to blame the student instead of the system, regardless of the individual situation the student may be experiencing. Deficit thinking can also include a failure to recognize strengths a student may bring to the classroom, e.g., failing to recognize the strengths of having bilingual skills as opposed to requiring fluency in English as an indicator of being a "successful" or "good" student.

importance and relevance of diversity and cultural sensitivity in the classroom (Nieto, 2000, p. 180).

Among preservice teachers and music teacher educators, conversations about social justice may expose power structures and initiate discussions about power hierarchies present in the music education structure. As Bartolome advances (2004), if the concept of power is not addressed with preservice teachers, harmful ideologies can be reproduced; power should be shared instead of struggled with in the classroom. Students see covert power structures in schools on a daily basis and the issues are rarely, if ever, addressed. For instance, in urban schools, students see White teachers and White principals, and they also see minority custodians and cafeteria workers (Canning, 1995), reinforcing discursive threads. If such patterns are accepted as part of the discourse of *urban music education* and remain unchallenged or ignored, these patterns become truths accepted by the docile bodies, unquestioned and accepted by actors in the structure. Engaging in critical conversations with preservice teachers fosters awareness for social justice, power struggles, and social issues that often ignored in teacher education.

Teacher education programs committed to producing culturally sensitive teachers should include some sort of indicator that addresses these concerns in their application process or coursework. By the time college students decide to major in education, their belief systems are already established and potentially immutable, impacting every decision made in the classroom (Bryan & Atwater, 2002). While they are difficult to change, Milner (2003a) suggests that if addressed over time, attitudes concerning diversity in the classroom may improve, therefore creating a more relevant music education experience for students.

With the understanding that discourse affects preservice teacher belief systems, a discursive shift is essential to changing how aspects within the structure—especially, but not limited to, schools and students in urban locations, race, and poverty—are viewed. Discourse influences thought patterns of preservice and inservice teachers and shifting how we write/speak, think, and act about these matters can improve education for all students. Teacher dispositions, if mutable, may be adequately shaped in teacher education programs, regardless of the prominent

negativity towards *urban music education* in the discourse. Damaging discursive patterns should be identified and challenged in order to shift the discourse.

Providing opportunities for multiple versions of success. With the majority of music education students coming from suburban or non-urban backgrounds (Baker, Kloss, Foy, McWhirter, Siebert, & Spadley, 2010), considerable potential exists for social and cultural differences between music teachers and music students. In the literature, this collection of differences is referred to as the "culture gap." The idea of a "culture gap" is reflected in the corpus, which includes statements such as "the differences in backgrounds between students and teachers and the misconceptions that students and teachers may have of one another can make the urban setting a unique place to teach" (Bernard, 2010, p. 57). Multiple statements similar to this one in the discursive plane suggest that teachers are uncomfortable with negotiating "success" outside of the idealized norm. Teachers comfortable with the norms of middle-class suburban music programs may not feel prepared to or understand how to realize and implement other modes of "success" in a music classroom, especially in classrooms that do not match their personal background experiences and culture.

Sources outside the corpus examined in this study also reproduce this discourse. For example, language in *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom*, reviewed briefly in Chapter 1, states that music teachers are not prepared to work with diverse populations (Bell & Robinson, 2006) and calls for change within music teacher education (Kindall-Smith, 2006). These ideas also occur in publications outside of music education, which posit that preservice teachers in general education are not adequately prepared to enter a diverse classroom setting (Olmedo, 1997) and are not taught how to teach diverse student populations or how to address varying cultural and ethnic belief systems in a classroom (Piot, Kelchtermans, & Ballet, 2010). To neglect the perceived gap between students and teacher is a disservice to the students as well as to the educator, since the "racial and cultural mismatches between teachers and students" can stifle learning if not addressed and discussed (Milner, 2003b, p. 173) or if ignored entirely.

Ignoring the culture gap between teachers and students in the discourse of education preparation programs leaves teachers directionless and may lead some teachers to adopt a

"color-blind" philosophy of teaching (Head, 2008). The idea of a color-blind philosophy, the premise that teachers should ignore the cultural and ethnic differences among students, is damaging and decreases the credibility of the teacher (Kindall-Smith, 2006). As Olmedo (1997) explains, the concept of color-blind teaching allows for the perpetuation of stereotypes and ignoring our differences can cause more attention to be focused on them. Furthermore, this "erasing" of differences results in a "white washing," forcing students into the one culture in which the teacher is most comfortable.

Statements in the discursive plane condone the use of different/world music to bridge cultural divides in urban classrooms, and that students who attend urban schools would be more involved if the musical practices in schools were similar to their backgrounds or heritages. But these ideas situate urban music students as different, minority, at-risk, in need, and not like their peers elsewhere. Culturally relevant teaching practices would benefit *all* students regardless of location; "urban" schools are not the only structures where such practices are appropriate.

Present in the classroom, "the differences in backgrounds between students and teachers and the misconceptions that students and teachers may have of one another can make the urban setting a unique place to teach" (Bernard, 2010, p. 57), necessitating both teacher and student to invest in developing a relationship so that misconceptions on either side are negated. Appropriate uses of multiple musics, "world" or otherwise, may provide teachers with various avenues towards "success," and coursework or continuing education can engage music teachers and their students in ways that challenge discursive boundaries of "success" in a music classroom.

Some advocates of cultural music in the urban music program curriculum situate urban music students as different, minority, at-risk, and in need of different learning materials. Not-White students would be more involved with school music if it were familiar to their background or heritage, noting that "as an urban teacher, you probably work with students representing different minorities, you must strive to keep experiences culturally relevant" (Mixon, 2005, p. 18). While culturally relevant music learning benefits students, "urban" schools are not the only structures that have not-White students who would benefit from such teaching. Specialized ensembles, like

mariachi, bridge one version of a culture gap, while other types of music or ensembles may address other gaps. Myriad statements in the discursive plane label urban music students as minority, non-White, or culturally removed, suggesting that more urban students will stay enrolled in musical ensembles if the ensembles are culturally relevant and if music teachers find music that highlights styles other than Western European genres, since “different geographic locations in Europe [are] hardly an accurate representation of students in most large urban districts” (Mixon, 2010, p. 20). Such statements advance the discursive thread that urban students are minority, culturally different, and have special needs that most teachers struggle to meet through current cultural practices. But unless those issues are brought to light in an educational context, music education students may remain unaware of their racial and cultural incompetence (Milner, 2003a).

The culture gap between White, middle-class teachers and their minority, poor students is usually ignored in the discourse of education preparation programs (Head, 2008) and the lack of discussion about the culture gap leaves teachers directionless when navigating issues of race and culture, which prohibits both the students and the teacher from reaching their maximum achievements or feeling successful (Marxen & Rudney, 1999). Students from different ethnic backgrounds may learn in *different* ways, value education *differently*, and react to teachers and authority figures with actions *others* may find disrespectful or confusing (Milner, 2003a) and the constant juxtaposition of multiple cultural practices can be difficult for any teacher to navigate, but it would be most harmful to incorrectly address the issues of race and culture in the classroom (Nieto, 2000). Differences in culture and background, if not addressed during teacher preparation, can set up the beginning teacher for a continued reproduction of discursive “truths.” People need to enact changes within teacher preparation in order to deconstruct and reimagine success. Recognizing that students might engage with multiple versions of success, the structure needs to provide models of success to demonstrate such engagements are valid. If such experiences are limited to a single course within a music teacher preparation program, the discourse may not shift, as a discourse is constructed over time through repeated actions. Prolonged, positive exposure to varied models of success can challenge “truths” and shift discourse.

Engaging with learning in multiple locations. With effort, the current *urban music education* discourse can change when adequately addressed within the coursework and in the profession's publications, and if teacher educators are willing to put forth the effort to foster conversations that explore topics of social justice, as noted earlier in this chapter, and facilitate relevant field experience that resist the current discourse of *urban music education*.

One way to better prepare preservice music teachers for working in an urban setting is to afford them the experience of being part of a classroom or teaching environment that is outside of the suburban norm. The discursive plane in both music education and general education includes numerous calls for placing preservice teachers in urban settings (Bartolome, 2004; Garmon, 2005; Groulx, 2001; Hunt, 2009; McDonald, 2005; Nieto, 2000; Olmedo, 1997). To help resituate the discourse, teacher education programs can prioritize diversity and consider where preservice teachers in field experiences are placed (Nieto, 2000). Groulx (2001) suggests that the only way to change the perception of "urban" and schools composed of not-White students (affecting the discourse) is to have preservice teachers actively involved with programs in "urban" areas. As a participant in this setting, a preservice teacher may gain more favorable opinions regarding teaching possibilities in "urban" schools, challenging discursive threads regarding the lack of financial resources and disruptive/violent students.

As Benedict (2006) explains, "for teachers, urban settings are often looked upon as placements of desperation" (p. 3) and as the analysis in this document demonstrates, the profession does not consider "urban" schools as a desirable location/space/place for field experience placements or employment opportunities, as the "geographical settings of actions" (Cresswell, 1996) play a determining role in if actions are perceived as positive or negative. In other words, the physical location of learning (the setting) contributes to how "success" (the action) is perceived; schools in "good" areas are more likely to be perceived as "good" placements, whereas "urban" schools (labeled in the discourse as abnormal, etc.) will be perceived as lesser placements. Such discursive threads and associated stereotypes can be challenged through engagement within various school locations. Marxen and Rudney (1999), proponents of urban field experience placements paired with structured guidance, warn that

placing a preservice teacher in an urban area school may allow stereotypes to be perpetuated, but if this practice is coupled with structured discussion and guidance, it may solicit growth and acceptance of diversity, contributing to a discursive shift. Preservice teachers benefit from experiences in various school locations alongside teachers who are appropriate models so that stereotypes and preconceived notions can be challenged and perhaps attitudes changed.

Other opportunities for discursive impact may take place through partnerships. The following three examples are drawn from the *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom* text (Frierson-Campbell, Ed., 2006) critiqued in Chapter 1. Jones and Eyrich (2006) describe a successful relationship between a music teacher preparation department and a Professional Development School (PDS) where music education students worked with high school ensembles in an urban area. The preservice teachers participated as instructors in the school for five periods a day, two days a week, as students-as-teachers with teaching responsibilities. The music education professor, the classroom teacher, the preservice teachers' peers, and the high school students critiqued their rehearsals and provided organized feedback. This level of involvement with an urban music program reportedly increased comfort levels for preservice teachers and changed their attitudes about urban schools, as evidenced in part by several former program members seeking employment in urban settings.

Emmanuel (2006) describes a similar program in which university students taking an elementary general music methods course traveled to assist in the instruction at a school in an urban location. These preservice teachers worked with the general music teacher, serving a school of over 1,200 students, not all of whom were receiving music instruction prior to the project. Working together, both sides of the partnership benefitted; the university student help allowed the music teacher to reach more students in the school while the preservice teachers learned from a master teacher in action. Emmanuel notes that the positive experiences that occurred in this setting caused attitudes regarding "urban" schools to change among the preservice music teachers; the preservice teachers expected numerous challenges in working with "urban" schools and were instead impressed with the creativity and imagination they found in the music classroom.

Bell and Robinson (2006) brought preservice music teachers together with urban youth in an after-school program in which music education students taught private lessons to elementary and middle school students. This relationship positively affected preservice music teachers' attitudes towards working in urban environments, and several graduates of the program went on to teach in high-need (another code word) urban areas. In a different study, Ward-Steinman (2006) discusses a similar partnership between music education students and an after-school outreach program focused on providing music lessons to urban youth. Interviews with the music education students suggest that their perceptions of children in "urban" schools changed over the course of the program, demonstrating that when given the opportunity to explore what teaching in an "urban" school can be like, preservice teachers are able to form their own opinions, even if those opinions conflict with current discursive truths.

In the analysis of the corpus, I located statements about teachers leaving schools in urban areas. One recent study suggests that teachers leave urban settings for schools in more mono-ethnic and higher SES areas (Donaldson & Johnson, 2010), while urban and underserved areas, especially those served by Teach for America participants, experience higher turnover and tally a higher resignation rate. The inability to establish continuity in staff and instruction does not foster growth and achievement (Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005), and this turnover perpetuates the stigma of poor-performing schools in underserved areas, which are associated with "urban" in this study. Mentoring, teaching expertise, and long-term planning are all affected by high turnover rates, and while statements in the broader discourse encourage attracting high-quality teachers into "urban" schools (Donaldson & Johnson, 2010; Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005), other discursive threads (as found in Chapter 4) may discourage quality teachers from these positions by portraying "urban" schools in a negative way.

Strong support and resource systems are necessary to retain beginning teachers in any schools, especially when under-resourced schools are also in urban locations. The use of mentorship programs has been successful and helpful to those early-career teachers as they make the transition into becoming experienced teachers (Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005; Piot, Kelchtermans, & Ballet, 2010). An additional avenue for support is professional

development for new and veteran teachers (Garcia & Guerra, 2004), as entire school staffs may benefit from school-based workshops that address the needs of their community, including social justice, deficit thinking, and working in partnership with families and cultures present in that school. Recognition of and conversations about the inconvenient truths of the discourse opens spaces for discussion that can start to shift the discourse or at least challenge the docile bodies' acceptance of truths.

Impacting the Discourse and Shifting the Discourse

An archaeology explores conditions that allow for discursive practices to be reproduced or performed. Ways of thought and systems of practice established prior to the bounded corpus of this study shape the present negative and discombobulated discourse of *urban music education.* When a significant portion of the profession is prepared to work towards a discursive shift, the resistance to current practices can change the discourse. In order to accomplish changes within the structure, actors must be committed to taking deliberate steps that are incongruent with truths in the current discourse.[23] The actions must be repeated, frequent, visible challenges to the current system in order to effect change. Change is difficult, and non-conformity may be seen as a form of rebellion or non-compliance, but if there is to be change, there will need to be action.

Change, in order to occur, must emanate from multiple actors within the structure. Teacher educators, practicing teachers, and school administrators are best positioned to enact changes in the discourse on local levels. Over time, these grassroots adjustments in how people speak and act may gather momentum and influence others to alter their perceptions or to establish new patterns that develop new truths. In addition to these groups, significant change can be catalyzed by education policy makers, researchers, and centering institutions.[24] The latter

[23] In this examination, I did not encounter articles within the corpus that challenged or questioned the paradigm, but other scholars have challenged matters of race (Bradley, Hess) and hegemony (Benedict, Mantie).

[24] A centering institution, according to Mantie (2013), is a structure that controls access to information or resources, such as the state or universities. Centering institutions "help provide the gravitational center, or norms, on and around which meaning is oriented" (p. 341).

groups have access to larger audiences and carry significant weight at higher levels (more power). I will elaborate in the following paragraphs.

Music teacher educators can affect the discourse by leading the discussions that allow preservice teachers to examine their own preferences and priorities, and by providing opportunities for students to participate in the cultures of various schools to allow insights into multiple realities. Supplying reading assignments and facilitating conversations that allow preservice teachers the opportunity to examine their experiences and biases may lead to reflection and introspection. Asking preservice teachers to define or describe "success" in the music classroom may open multiple opportunities for discussion. Within such activities, preservice teachers may examine not only multiple versions of "success," but also how their biases may have connections to terms including "suburban," "urban," "rural," "inner-city," or "at-risk." In opportunities that are appropriately structured so that stereotypes are discussed rather than performed, music teacher educators, inservice music teachers, and preservice teachers, working together, may influence the truths in the discourse. Together they may challenge the perceptions in the discourse about what *urban music education* is and begin to shift perceptions within the structure.

Similarly, school administrators are in a position to effect change within the discourse. Administrators are in a position to model action, including language, for school and local communities. By acting and speaking in new ways, school leaders can enact new patterns within the *urban music education* discourse. Schoolteachers can benefit from such modeling, as long as it is repeated and genuine. In order to help each other develop speaking/thinking, acting, and being differently, administrators can work with teachers to promote practices such as culturally relevant pedagogy. Developing a model with teachers to achieve a more just educational environment, regardless of the type of school setting, can provide a foundation for conversations that may impact threads in the discourse, breaking down stereotypes to benefit all students and teachers, not "just" actors who are relegated to the "urban" part of the structure. In order for a significant shift to occur, various types of actors in the structure need to participate in the altering and acceptance of "truths."

Truths require dissemination in order be noticed and accepted and because of this, actors whose ideas are more likely to be acknowledged (education policy makers, researchers, and centering institutions) can influence the discourse in a structure. For music education, policy makers and actors who write for publications and speak in public forums can impact discourse. Research, policy, and legislation directly influence education, music education, teachers, and students; words, text, and statements used in documents code a system of values that shape the discourse of the structure. Those who wield that power advance the knowledge that creates truths. Those who wish to influence changes within the discourse can infiltrate the realms of publication and policy, and if they are aware of the current discourses, they can participate in actions and language that resist the current patterns of oppression. Through thoughtful and carefully selected strategies, advocates can positively impact the discourse.

Further exploration of the discourse can impact the social construction of *urban music education.* For example, an examination of a more extensive or different corpus may provide additional information for the profession. Since my analysis submits that the discourse of "urban" has been influenced by events preceding the bounded corpus, reviewing statements in *JRME* and *MEJ* before 1991 may provide more historical insight. Locating earlier statements in both or either journal, especially during time periods marked by political and social changes, will situate earlier discursive threads and provide a more detailed historical account. Also, the addition of other types of data could contribute to a description of the discourse or discursive actions. An analysis of advertisements, letters to the editor, photographs, and symposium announcements may provide additional insight.

Discourse is established through a network of texts and actions. Statements produced in additional publications may provide similar data or produce other discursive threads. NAfME publishes journals specific to various components of the music education structure (general, music teacher education) and hosts a variety of online publications and discussion boards. An analysis of the *urban music education* discourse in these outlets may reinforce exposed threads or uncover new threads that are part of the discourse. Music education publications produced by non-NAfME entities contain statements that should be examined. For example, *The Bulletin of the*

Council for Research in Music Education may provide statements for analysis, as would other music education journals based in the United States. International journals, including *British Journal of Music Education,* could provide interesting statements for comparison. Local/state journals in areas considered urban (and not) may also contain threads suitable for analysis. *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* and *Music Education Philosophy Review* statements may provide an alternate perspective to some discursive threads. Journals considered to be less conservative may better depict changes in the traditional music education discourse. Publications such as *May Day, Research Studies in Music Education,* and *Visions of Research in Music Education* include a wider field where discourse *has* shifted and scholars such as Randall Allsup, Patrick Schmidt, and Cathy Benedict have sought discursive models beyond music education, impacting the music education discourse.

Analyses of general education publications and urban education publications could also contribute to the description of the discourse. A comparison of threads in general education literature to threads in music education literature would provide insight as to what discursive threads or actions are shared or also what differences in discourse exist, depending on publication and profession. Do general education authors articulate the same ideas regarding urban schools, schooling, and school people? Further research could also employ other field-specific journals, i.e., math education. A critical discourse analysis of statements employed in urban education journals (*Urban Education* or *Education & Urban Society*) may provide the most rich comparison: are the threads present in urban education publications similar to or different from the threads exposed in music education publications? What is said in urban education publications and how are those sentiments expressed in current issues and over time? Do music teachers in city schools share similar or overlapping discursive planes with general education teachers in city schools?

An examination of other types of statements could assist in further situating the discourse. Teacher education texts, in both music and general education, reflect the current discourse and could be analyzed, as could papers and posters presented at music education or education conferences or symposia (i.e., AERA); discourse of conferences is often ahead of print

publications. Current educational policies or mandates reflect discursive threads, and those could be examined in isolation or in conjunction with legislature or decisions that have occurred over time. Myriad events generate statements that manifest as part of the *urban music education* discourse, some which are influenced by societal discourses, local and world events, and the economy, among other happenings. Additional critical discourse analysis studies could enlighten the profession as to different ways to think about *urban music education.*

Foucault asserts that the author of a statement does not matter, but rather the fact that the statement exists is important. Although authors may not be a determinate factor in the analysis of *urban music education* statements, an investigation into journal editing may be of interest. Individuals with the power to allow statements into circulation (or edit them) may retain more direction over the discourse than the original author. Actors allowed to vet statements promote specific ideas and agendas. A study of discourse-shaping review and editorial practices, including how reviewers and editors are appointed and understand their positions in the structure, may reveal how specific discursive strands have materialized over time.

In this study, “urban” sometimes occurred as a type of geographical categorization that included the word “rural.” An examination of “urban” may be compared and contrasted to an examination of “rural.” *Rural* also appears to occur in the discourse as a labeled/marginalized or othered group of the music education structure. An analysis of *rural music education* statements including “rural” may or may not produce similar threads as those that occur in *urban music education*, such as “different” or “substandard.” Do these two segregated populations, urban and rural, share the same stereotypes, labels, and threads, or does the music education structure other them both but not in the same ways? What commonalities appear when urban and rural music programs are discussed, and do labels become interchangeable between the two? Some statements about “rural” and “urban” in the same corpus and subsequent analyses may contribute to further clarification of discourses.

In order for a noticeable shift in the current discourse of *urban music education* to occur, a concentrated effort to alter the way the profession thinks/speaks, acts, and writes will have to be initiated and carried out by multiple actors across the structure. The historical, social, and

economic influences that shape the discourse cannot be erased or manipulated and will have to be studied and acted upon in order for any effective change to occur. Critically aware actors will need to find ways to address topics relevant to *urban music education* that deconstruct the hierarchy, reveal the opportunities present in all music programs, regardless of location, and promote multiple versions of success.

Aware that writing and speech aimed at supporting "urban" actors can still contribute to the negativity of the *urban music education* discourse, I return to my original story, told in Chapter 1. Reviewing this self-narrative, now through a critical lens, I see how easy it is to contribute to the discourse that I struggle to shift. In my Chapter 1 story, I painted a picture and positioned my "urban" experience as different, more difficult, challenging, and abnormal. To close this study, I rewrite my story. I am now more cognizant of the words I use, which words I place next to each other, and the assumptions others may draw through the discourse to which I contribute. This revisited tale was difficult to draft, but important to write, especially if I want to be a part of the discursive shift for which I advocate.

My Attempt to Shift: Revisiting My Story

In Chapter 1 of this document, I presented my personal story as a narrative to frame my motivations for undertaking this investigation. I composed my narrative early in the writing stages of this paper, and I returned to it for review after I had completed the CDA presented in Chapters 4 and 5. While rereading my story, I was uncomfortable with my own story because it included the same problematic uses of language that I had I pointed out throughout the 20 years of discourse examined in this document. I was reproducing the same patterns of which I had become critical. At that point, I added the paragraphs that now precede my story in the Prelude section, promising to re-tell my story and return to my narrative at the end of this document. Here, I revisit my story, now more cognizant of what I am saying or not saying, the words I use, and the message I send. I have articulated above that a shift in the discourse will occur when the profession can write, think, and act differently, and here I attempt to be different, hoping that others will do the same.

Denouement. Growing up, I lived in the suburbs of Phoenix, AZ where I benefitted from spending time with friends and neighbors who were both similar to and different from myself. My

fellow students and I were mostly Caucasian or Hispanic and from middle to lower-middle class families. We attended the local school system, and in this school system, I joined band in fourth grade. I wanted to be in band because my friend joined band, so my mother found an old clarinet in the closet and I signed up for instrumental music pullout classes. I loved playing the clarinet, and I remained in band through high school. During high school, one of the band directors offered me private lessons. Unable to afford that expenditure, I paid him with Tupperware containers of mom's lasagna. When I began my first job at the age of 16, he referred me to a clarinet teacher in town who gave me a good rate because, as he explained to my mother, "she works hard." I became one of about 20% of the high school band students taking private lessons.

Over the course of the nine years I was in band in that school district, I participated in activities and events I considered to be normal. I had not experienced band before, and neither had anyone else in my family, but the band experience I had paralleled portrayals of band in the media, and my friends who came from "band families" looked forward to doing the same things their siblings or parents had done in band. We were excited to go to contests, play at the State Fair, and entertain at football games. At the time, I assumed, without realizing it, that I was part of a traditional band culture, and since we placed highly at festivals and received superior contest scores, I "knew" we were in a pretty good music program. I neglected to notice who wasn't in band or what other band programs "looked" like.

I continued my band experience at the collegiate level, at first through marching band, as I had enrolled in school as an aerospace engineering major. During this time, I realized the impact that the band experience had had on my life. Wanting to replicate these same experiences for others in hopes of positively affecting their lives, I changed my major to music education and participated in more ensembles. These ensembles, in concert with my coursework, shaped my perceptions of how to teach music, why to teach music, and how to be a "good" music educator. My peers and I devoured these lessons; according to our shared stories and narratives in classes, we had had similar school band experiences, and we looked forward to giving those opportunities to our future students. We studied hard, practiced, and watched "master teachers"

at “great schools” with what we perceived to be “strong music programs.” Upon graduation, we believed we were ready to take on the world and foster successful band programs.

My first job was in southern California, in a city near Los Angeles. After interviews and offers, I elected to take a job in a district in which administrators communicated that they had high expectations of their music programs. I noticed that these expectations were very similar to my own band experiences, and I felt comfortable. Performance opportunities, contest expectations, and travel commitments were familiar to me or consistent with my own experiences, and I believed that I was suitably prepared to handle the job. The sixth-grade students I met during my interview were Caucasian, Middle Eastern, and Asian, and each one was well dressed, polite, and carried a newer model instrument. I looked forward to working in this environment, where I served as the elementary band teacher at five schools, the elementary honor ensembles director, and the assistant high school director.

Many expectations in my first job were connected to monetary resources. Students and their families were expected to pay for, and did pay for festival trips, band fees, buses, uniforms, commissioning works, repairs, new instruments, and field trips. At the onset, I struggled with how the expected level of performance could be maintained, knowing that there were significant amounts of money connected to these events (that my family could not have afforded), but as I settled into my job, I realized that there was a fair amount of wealth in the community. This presence of wealth implied to me that these financial expectations were not burdens, but rather accepted by members of the band, the families of band members, and the school. The students and families had at their disposal the monetary resources needed to perpetuate the experiences that were perceived to be part of “successful” or high-achieving band programs. The absence of financial concerns allowed me to provide students with multiple experiences that resulted in tangible proof of what we believed to be our success: trophies, plaques, a commissioned work, and high scores at festivals. I labeled my program as “outstanding” and myself as a “successful” teacher. According to my experiences and to the prevailing music education discourse propagated by my instructors and peers, I had met the benchmarks of success.

After four years in Job One, I wanted to learn more about music education, hoping to become an even better music teacher. I moved across the country to start a Master's degree in music education. After two more years of coursework focused on how to be a better teacher and a researcher, I was ready to try out the tools in my music educator toolbox. I eagerly accepted a position teaching middle school band, orchestra, and general music in a city near Washington, D.C. The school seemed like a perfect location to test my refined skill sets. I was excited to teach courses that were new to me (general music and orchestra) and an age group with which I had no previous experience (middle school). These new experiences, I thought, would help me become a better teacher educator later in my career. I told my peers about my new job opportunity, and instead of the support I expected, they warned me about my new school. They told me it would be "different" and that I would be "challenged." I thought that being "challenged" would be fascinating, and I headed into my second job with curiosity and excitement.

I approached Job Two the same way I had approached Job One. I figured that the methods I had used in Job One model had already proven successful, so it would be foolish to try others . . . not that I knew other models or methods. I made the conscious decision to replicate the expectations and structures that had worked for me as a teacher in Job One and also for me as a student. I planned to recreate the same experiences using the same content and strategies that I believed had proven to be failsafe. I was more than shocked when I was met with immediate opposition from the students at Job Two.

I knew that the students and I did not look the same, but I refused to believe that this meant anything in the context of a music classroom. I was White, and most them were Black or Hispanic, but regardless of what we looked like, where we lived, or the salaries of our parents, shouldn't the experience be the same? I was not prepared to consider how students' experiences and perceptions might affect the classroom or the curriculum. As students continued to point out the obvious differences between us, I slowly began to realize that these differences implied various things to the students—things that I did not at first understand. Differences that I thought were best ignored were the exact things which students focused on the most. Avoiding such differences created tension in the classroom that manifested in barely manageable chaos.

Yes, peers at my school and in my county had warned me that Job Two would be "challenging," but I was not prepared to think critically about the "differences" between my students and myself. I thought band and music would unite us all in the classroom, and I came to realize that I was wrong. I had to connect with the students, and the students needed to connect to *me* (not just the music), but I had not been prepared to think or act in any other ways than those similar to my own experience. When I sought advice from mentors, I was offered platitudes (in the tone of words of wisdom), ranging from the idea that "cultural differences" are a non-issue in a music classroom to "urban schools" are just "hard." I was unsatisfied with these answers and forced myself to examine the "truths" I held about music education. This line of thinking caused me, for the first time, to wonder whether "success" might be something different.

I loosened some of my tightly held views about music education. I started working *with* my students instead of *against* them. I became more open to their ideas about band, orchestra, and music curriculum. I learned how *they* defined "success" in the classroom and in music. I began to understand what the students saw as acceptable, respectable, and important. Working with students, we negotiated sets of expectations so that we could create a classroom environment that was musical and productive. This path was not easy, as the students and I did not always see things the same way, and I had to convince myself that the changes we were making were going to be okay. I experienced lots of cognitive dissonance, and I was not always convinced that I was doing what was "right." Sometimes I thought I was not doing "right" by my formal training as a band member, and other times I thought I was not doing "right" by the students. It was a time of significant personal growth coupled with struggles.

After two years, I left Job Two with unanswered questions to begin doctoral coursework in music education. I grappled with the fact that I had struggled in Job Two. When I had tried to reproduce, in Job Two, the band culture and experience that was so meaningful to me in my youth, in my college education, and in Job One, I was met with opposition that dissipated only when *I changed* what I had come to love about being in band. *Not* doing what I was knew as "truth" was suddenly *more* "right," and that caused me to wonder whether what I had been taught, or what I "knew," was false. I entered my studies asking such questions and wandered aimlessly

until a book chapter (Vaugeois, 2009) assigned as a reading in a class that challenged the way I thought. The reading forced me to question how I viewed the world and how I acted within it, and led me to Foucault. Immediately, I began to read more about and by Foucault, curious about what he had to say. A complicated French philosopher was somehow helping me understand the confusion I experienced in Job Two, and I wanted to know more. Foucault aided in my understanding that the struggles and feelings I experienced were valid.

Between reading Foucault and progressing through my coursework, I began to understand that I had been so focused on my own version of the world that I had neglected the worlds of others. My version had become the only version, excluding anyone else's ways of being musically successful or of just being. Making these realizations was frustrating and liberating all at the same time. I saw everything I knew as a "truth" changing, and I frequently wondered how my teaching might have been different if I had encountered these ideas sooner in my career. Wondering whether the preservice teachers at the institution where I was now a doctoral student would be responsive to similar ideas, I gently tried to steer a few conversations during undergraduate courses towards thinking about students, repertoire, schools and communities that were not like their own experiences, and toward thinking about why some of them wanted to avoid these people and places. The role of a teaching assistant is complicated, and not wanting to broach ideas that were not present in the syllabus, I did not press questions about what constituted "success" or why some undergraduate students preferred some teaching settings to others. I became motivated to think about such these matters further and to contemplate their role in music teacher education.

For a qualitative research class, I conducted case studies of two first-year educators in teaching positions that mirrored my experience in Job Two to see what they thought about their teaching environments. One of the teachers was Hispanic, the other was Caucasian; both worked in schools that had served primarily Hispanic, African-American, and Caucasian students and were labeled as "Title I." I carefully designed interview protocols to get "good data," however my questions about demographics, family participation, and perceived wealth did not yield expected answers. The first-year teachers were unable to comment on cultural or sociological dimensions

of their students' lives because, even several months into their jobs, they were still focused on finding the restrooms and learning how to fill out field trip paperwork. I was disheartened, ready to discard the entire study, when I realized that the data collection actually told me everything I needed. The participants did not know much, if anything, about their students, but they were well aware of what music in their school libraries qualified for the state festival list. What these beginning teachers focused on suggested something about *their* own experiences, *their* music teacher education, and *their* profession, but not much about the students. And thus began the discourse analysis that comprises the body of this dissertation.

But my story is not over. As a music teacher educator, I have worked in four different university teacher preparation programs in the past four years, making conscious decisions regarding curriculum. I strive to include discussion topics and readings that allow preservice teachers to think critically about their own experiences and biases regarding the actors labeled "urban." Taking advantage of as many teaching contexts that I can, I aim to engage preservice teachers in experiences working in multiple kinds of school settings, especially in schools that do not match their own experiences. I aim to work with them to navigate their encounters with labels, models of "success," and opportunities present in each location.

While thinking about perceptions of various actors of the music education structure, ideas of "success," and the labeling of students, schools, and programs, I have wondered about preservice or beginning teachers' experiences. Do they struggle with unfamiliar discourses in their new classrooms? Can actors in the structure work together in new ways to better negotiate such unfamiliar discourses? How do preservice teachers and beginning teachers envision being labeled as "successful" and what steps do they take to get there? And in taking those steps, are their actions focused on student musical development or other ideas abundant in the discourse? How are they shaped by the discourse, and how are they aware of it? Is there too much focus on a certain model of "success" in music education, a version that has become a "truth" in the discourse but that may not be "true" for all students? Does the structure then label students, teachers, schools, and locations in a race to meet the dominant model of "success?" Attaching a

label is far easier than adjusting an entire discourse to be more open to multiple versions of "success." Can they do this? Can I?

I have retold my story, attempting to position some things differently, including myself, trying to claim more of the struggles as my own and not those of the students who I struggled to engage. Numerous threads color the rich and complex discourse of music education. I am fortunate to be a part of the musical experiences of children, and those experiences will be the most meaning-full when I am most cognizant of the children whom I teach. Until I am able to celebrate each one, individually and collectively, instead of shaming them or excluding them, I continue to reproduce actions and notions that put students into pejorative positions. I am convinced that, for myself and within music education, the discourse must shift. To become better teachers for all students, to change the discourse, will take a concentrated, deliberate effort. To quote Foucault (1989),

> the work of an intellectual is not to mold the political will of others; it is, through the analyses that he does in his own field, to re-examine evidence and assumptions, to shake up the habitual ways of working and thinking, to dissipate conventional familiarities, to re-evaluate rules and institutions and to participate in the formation of a political will. (p. 305–6)

I urge others to join me in re-examining our contributions to the profession, shaking up the structure, and shifting the discourse.

References

Abeles, H. (2004). The effect of three orchestra/school partnerships on students' interest in instrumental music instruction. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 52*, 248–263.

Abril, C. R. (2003). No hablo Inglés: Breaking the language barrier in music instruction. *Music Educators Journal, 89*(5), 38–43.

Abril, C. R. & Flowers, P. J. (2007). Attention, preference, and identity in music listening by middle school students of different linguistic backgrounds. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 55*, 204–219.

Allsup, R. E. (1997). From Herscher to Harlem: A subjective account. *Music Educators Journal, 83*(5), 33–36.

Allsup, R. E. (2007). Democracy and One Hundred Years of Music Education. *Music Educators Journal, 93*(5), 33–36.

Arvast, A. (2008). *Critical theory and the spectacle of the CAAT program review: A Foucauldian discourse analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (NR 44825.)

Baker, V., Kloss, T., Foy, P., McWhirter, J., Siebert, J., & Spradley, M. (2010). *Profile of a career music educator.* Conference session presented at the Biennial MENC conference in Anaheim, CA, March 26.

Ball, S. J. (1990). Introducing Monsieur Foucault. In S. J. Ball (Ed.), *Foucault and education: Disciplines and knowledge,* (pp. 1–8). New York: Routledge.

Bartolome, L. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31*(1), 97–122.

Barnes, G. V. (2002). Opportunities in service learning. *Music Educators Journal, 88*(4), 42–46.

Beery, L. S. (1995). Teaching MIDI from an African American Angle. *Music Educators Journal, 82*(3), 35–38.

Bell, C.L., & Robinson, N.G. (2006). Music education students teach at-risk children private instrumental music lessons. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom: A guide to leadership, teacher education, and reform, Vol. 2,* (pp. 105–114). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Benedict, C. (2006). Defining ourselves as other: Envisioning transformative possibilities. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom, Vol. 1,* (pp. 3–13). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bergee, M. J. (1992). Certain attitudes towards occupational status held by music education majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 40*(2), 104–113.

Bergee, M. J. & Platt, M. C. (2003). Influence of selected variables on solo and small-ensemble festival ratings. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*(4), 342–353.

Bergonzi, L. (2009). Sexual orientation and music education: Continuing a tradition. *Music Educators Journal, 96*(2), 21–25.

Bernard, R. (2010). The rewards of teaching music in urban settings. *Music Educators Journal, 96*(3), 53–57.

Bernstof, E. D. (2001). Paraprofessionals in music settings. *Music Educators Journal, 87*(4), 36–40.

Bess, D. M. & Fisher, R. E. (1993). Arts advocacy in music education. *Music Educators Journal, 80*(1), 17–22.

Best, S. & Kellner, D. (1991). *Postmodern theory: Critical interrogations*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Bland, A. (1993). Original opera in middle school. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(6), 27–30.

Boardman, S. D. (1996). Breathing your way to a better chorus. *Music Educators Journal, 82*(6), 26–30.

Bobetsky, V. V. (2005). Exploring a community's heritage through a collaborative unit of study. *Music Educators Journal, 91*(5), 51–56.

Briggs, P. (1970). The arts can shatter urban isolation. *Music Educators Journal, 56*(5), 56–57

Bronner, S. (2011). *Critical theory: A very short introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Broomhead, P. (2001). Individual expressive performance: Its relationship to ensemble achievement, technical achievement, and musical background. *Journal Research in Music Education, 49*(1), 71–84.

Brophy, T. S. (2005). A longitudinal study of selected characteristics of children's melodic improvisations. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 53*(2), 120–133.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: University Press.

Brown II, M.C., Dancy, T. E., Norfles, N. (2006). A nation still at risk: No child left behind and the salvation of disadvantaged students. In F. Brown & R. C. Hunter (Eds.), *No child left behind and other federal programs for urban school districts* (pp. 341–364). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Bruenger, S. D. (2009). Why select new music teacher chose to, or chose not to, apply to teach in an urban school district. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 19*(2), 25–40.

Brunetti, G. (2006). Resilience under fire: Perspectives on the work of experienced, inner city high school teachers in the United States. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 22*(7), 812–825.

Bryan, L. & Atwater, M. (2002). Teacher beliefs and cultural models: A challenge for science teacher preparation programs. *Science Education, 86*(6), 821–839.

Bryan, L. A. & Atwater, M. M. (2002). Teacher beliefs and cultural models: A challenge for science teacher preparation programs. *Science Education, 86*(6), 821–839.

Burnsed, V. (1998). The effects of expressive variation in dynamics on the musical preferences of elementary school students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*(3), 396–404.

Byo, J. L. & Cassidy, J. W. (2005). The role of the String Project in teacher training and community music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 53*(4), 332–347.

Campbell, P. S. (1995a). Mellonee Burnim on African American music. *Music Educators Journal, 82*(1), 41–48.

Campbell, P. S. (1995b). Steven Loza on Latino music. *Music Educators Journal, 82*(2), 45–52.

Campbell, P. S. (2000). How musical we are: John Blacking on music, education, and cultural understanding. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 48*(4), 336–359.

Campbell, P. S. (2002). Music education in a time of cultural transformation. *Music Educators Journal, 89*(1), 27–32, 54.

Campbell, P. S. & Beegle, A. (2003). Middle eastern expansions on cultural diversity in music education. *Music Educators Journal, 90*(1), 21–30.

Campbell, P. S. & Lum, C. (2008). Musical America: United yet varied identities for classroom use. *Music Educators Journal, 95*(1), 26–32.

Campbell, P.S. & Yung, B. (1995). Bell Yung on music of China. *Music Educators Journal, 81*(5), 39–46.

Canning, C. (1995). Getting from the outside in: Teaching Mexican Americans when you are an "Anglo". *High School Journal, 78*, 195–205.

Carolin, M. (2006). An instrumental approach to culture study in general music. *Music Educators Journal, 92*(5), 38–41.

Cataldi, B. J. (2004). *Foucault's discourse theory and methodology: An application to art education policy discourse 1970–2000* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3144854.)

Challenge. (2014). *Random House Dictionary.* New York: Random House, Inc.

Chamberlin, L. L., Clark, R. W., & Svengalis, J. N. (1993). Success with keyboards in the classroom. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(9), 31–36.

Choate, R. A. (1968). *Documentary Report of the Tanglewood Symposium.* Washington, D.C.: MENC.

Chou, V., & Tozer, S. (2008). What's urban got to do with it? Meaning of "urban" in urban teacher preparation and development. In F. P. Peterman (Ed.), *Partnering to prepare urban teachers: A call to activism* (pp. 1–20). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Clements, A. (2009). Minority students and faculty in higher music education. *Music Educators Journal, 95*(3), 53–56.

Collett, M. J. (1991). Read between the lines: Music as a basis for learning. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(3), 42–45.

Colwell, R. (2000). Grand masters series: The best from the past. *Music Educators Journal, 86*(5), 43–49.

Conlon, J. C. (1992). Explore the world in song. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(9), 46–51.

Conway, C. M. (1999). The development of teaching cases for instrumental music methods courses. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*(4), 343–356.

Conway, C. M. (2003). An examination of district-sponsored beginning music teacher mentor practices. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*(1), 6–23.

Conway, C. M. (2006). Special mentoring series: Navigating through induction: How a mentor can help. *Music Educators Journal, 92*(5), 56–60.

Conway, C., Eros, J., Pellegrino, K., & West, C. (2010). Instrumental music education students' perceptions of tensions experienced during their undergraduate degree. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 58*(3), 260–275.

Conway, C. & Holcomb, A. (2008). Perceptions of experienced music teachers regarding their work as music mentors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 56*(1), 55–67.

Corbett, M. (2010). Docile bodies. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (pp. 316–319). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Corenblum, B. & Marshall, E. (1998). The band played on: Predicting students' intentions to continue studying music. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*(1), 128–140.

Cornwall, A. & Fujita, M. (2007). The politics of representing 'the poor.' In J. Moncreiffe & R. Eyben (Eds.), *The power of labeling: How people are categorized and why it matters* (pp. 48–63). London: Earthscan.

Cresswell, T. (1996). *In place/Out of place: Geography, ideology, and transgression.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Darrough, G. P. (1992). Making choral music with older adults. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(4), 27–29.

Davidson, A. (1986). Archaeology, genealogy, and ethics. In D. Hoy (Ed.) *Foucault: A critical reader* (pp. 221–234). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

DeLorenzo, L. C. (2003). Teaching music as democratic practice. *Music Educators Journal, 90*(2), 35–40.

Delzell, J. K. & Leppla, D. A. (1992). Gender association of musical instruments and preferences of fourth-grade students for selected instruments. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 40*(2), 93–103.

Demarcation. (2014). *Random House Dictionary.* New York: Random House, Inc.

DeNardo, G. & O'Hearn, R. N. (1992). Preparing every teacher to be a generalist. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(2), 37–40.

Diamond, J., Randolph, A., & Spillane, J. (2004). Teachers' expectations and sense of responsibility for student learning: The importance of race, class, and organizational habitus. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 35*, 75–98.

Different. (2014). *Random House Dictionary.* New York: Random House, Inc.

Diversity. (2014). *Random House Dictionary.* New York: Random House, Inc.

Dobbs, T. (2005). *Discourse in the Band Room: How Talk Shapes Teaching, Learning, and Community in a Middle School Instrumental Music Classroom* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3177710)

Dobbs, T. (2010). Talking to myself: Reframing music classroom discourse. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 183*, 7–24.

Dobbs, T. (2012). A critical analysis of disabilities discourse in the Journal of Research in Music Education, 1990–2011. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 194*, 7–30.

Donaldson, M. & Johnson, S. (2010). The price of misassignment: The role of teaching assignments in Teach for America teachers' exit from low-income schools and the teaching profession. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 32*, 299–323.

Downing, L. (2008). *The Cambridge introduction to Michel Foucault.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ducar, C. (2006). *(Re)presentations of United States Latinos: A critical discourse of Spanish heritage language textbooks* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (85661952)

Duerksen, G. L. & Darrow, A. (1991). Music class for the at-risk: A music therapist's perspective. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(3), 46–49.

Dukes, D. (2012). "*It's not cheating if you don't get caught:" Critical discourse analysis of academic integrity policies in public high schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3502617)

Ebie, B. (2002). Characteristics of 50 years of research samples found in the "Journal of Research in Music Education." *Journal of Research in Music Education, 50*(4), 280–291.

Emmanuel, D. T. (2006). Cultural clashes: The complexity of identifying urban culture. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom, vol. 1* (pp. 15–24). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis.* Boston: Addison Wesley.

Fairclough, N. (2001a). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (121–138). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Fairclough, N. (2001b). *Language and power.* Harlow, England: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction,* (pp. 258–284). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Fallin, J. & Royse, D. (2000). Student teaching: The keystone experience. *Music Educators Journal, 87*(3), 19–22.

Fiese, R. K. & DeCarbo, N. J. (1995). Urban music education the teachers' perspective. *Music Educators Journal, 81*(6), 27–31.

Flowers, P. J. & O'Neill, A. A. (2005). Self-reported distractions of middle school students in listening to music and prose. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 53*(4), 308–321.

Forest, J. (1995). Music technology helps students' success. *Music Educators Journal, 81*(5), 35–38+48.

Fortney, P. M., Boyle, J. D., & DeCarbo, N. J. (1993). A study of middle school band students' instrument choices. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 41*(1), 28–39.

Fowler, C. (1970). (Ed.) Urban culture: Awareness may save our skins. *Music Educators Journal, 56*(5), 37–38.

Foucault, M. (1977). 'What is an author?': The author function. In D. F. Bouchard & S. Simon (Trans.), *In language, counter-memory, practice* (124–127). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews & other writers, 1972–1977* (pp. 109–133). New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry, 8*(4), 777–785.

Foucault, M. (1988). *Birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception.* London: Routledge. (Original work published in 1963)

Foucault, M. (1988). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1964)

Foucault, M. (1989). Foucault live: Interviews, 1966–84. (S. Lovtringer, Ed.). New York: Semiotext(s).

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality, Vol. 1: An introduction.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1976)

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality, vol. 2: The use of pleasure.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1984)

Foucault, M. (1994). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1966)

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1975)

Foucault, M. (1997). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collége de France 1975–1976.* New York: Picador.

Foucault, M. (1998). *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth (Essential works of Foucault, 1954–1984, Vol. 1).* P. Rabinow (Ed.). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2004). Je suis un artificer. In Roger-Pol Droit (Ed.), *Michel Foucault, entretiens,* (p. 28) (C. O'Farrell, Trans.) Paris: Odile Jacob.

Foucault, M. (2010). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1969)

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Bloomsbury.

Frierson-Campbell, C. (2006). Introduction: Perspectives on music in urban schools. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom, Vol. 1* (pp. ix–xviii). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fuchs, C. & Hofkirchner W. (2009). Autopoiesis and critical social systems theory. In R. Magalhaes & R. Sanchez (Eds.), *Autopoiesis in organizational theory and practice,* (pp. 111–129). Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing Group.

Fung, C. V. (1994). Undergraduate nonmusic majors' world music preference and multicultural attitudes. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 42*(1), 45–57.

Fung, C. V. (1995). Rationales for teaching world musics. *Music Educators Journal, 82*(1), 36–40.

Garcia, S. & Guerra, P. (2004). Deconstructing deficit thinking: Working with educators to create more equitable learning environments. *Education and Urban Society, 36*, 150–168.

Garmon, M. (2005). Six key factors for changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity. *Educational Studies: Journal of the American Educational System, 38*, 275–286.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in in discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.

Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. London: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Gillespie, E. (1970). Music teachers should shake their conservatism. *Music Educators Journal, 56*(5), 60–62.

Goldberg, M. P. (2005). *Ideology, policy and the (re)production of labour market inequity: A critical discourse analysis of access to professions and trades* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (NR 07855.)

Gonzo, C. (1993). Multicultural issues in music education. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(6), 49–52.

Gooden, M. A. & Nowlin, T. Y. (2006). The achievement gap & the no child left behind act: Is there a connection? In F. Brown & R. C. Hunter (Eds.), *No child left behind and other federal programs for urban school districts* (pp. 231–247). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Goodkin, D. (1994). Diverse approaches to multicultural music. *Music Educators Journal, 81*(1), 39–43.

Goodrich, A. (2007). Peer mentoring in a high school jazz ensemble. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 55*(2), 94–114.

Goodson, C. A. & Duling, E. (1996). Integrating the four disciplines. *Music Educators Journal, 83*(2), 33–37.

Goolsby, T. W. (1997). Verbal instruction in instrumental rehearsals: A comparison of three career levels and preservice teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*(1), 21–40.

Goolsby, T. W. (1999). A comparison of expert and novice music teachers' preparing identical band compositions: An operational replication. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*(2), 174–187.

Grant, J. W. & Kohut, D. L. (1992). Performance teachers for the future. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(2), 35–36, 50, 64.

Greher, G. R. & Tobin, R. N. (2006). Taking the long view toward music teacher preparation: The rationale for a dual–degree program. *Music Educators Journal, 92*(5), 50–55.

Gremli, J. (1996). Tuned in to learning styles. *Music Educators Journal, 83*(3), 24–27.

Groulx, J.G. (2001). Changing preservice teacher perceptions of minority schools. *Urban Education, 36*(1), 60–92.

Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. (2000). Analyzing interpretive practice. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed). (pp. 487–508).

Gupte, J. & Mehta, L. (2007). Disjunctures in labelling refugees and oustees. In J. Moncreiffe & R. Eyben (Eds.), *The power of labeling: How people are categorized and why it matters,* (pp. 64–79). London: Earthscan.

Guptill, C. & Zaza, C. (2010). Injury prevention: What teachers can do. *Music Educators Journal, 96*(4), 28–34.

Gutting, G. (2005). *Foucault: A very short introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hacking, I. (1986). The archaeology of Foucault. In D. C. Hoy (Ed.), *Foucault: A critical reader* (pp. 27–40). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hahn, A. M. (2003). *The intersection of language, power and international education: A critical discourse analysis of the international baccalaureate organization* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI Number 3091253)

Halmari, H. (2011). Political correctness, euphemism, and language change: The case of 'people first.' *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*, 828–840.

Hamann, D.L. & Lucas, K.V. (1998). Establishing journal eminence in music education research. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*(3), 405–413.

Hamann, D. L. & Walker, L. M. (1993). Music teachers as role models for African-American students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 41*(4), 303–314.

Hancock, C. B. (2008). Music teachers at risk for attrition and migration: An analysis of the 1999–2000 schools and staffing survey. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 56*(2), 130–144.

Hancock, C. B. (2009). National estimates of retention, migration, and attrition: A multi-year comparison of music and non-music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 57*(2), 92–107.

Hanson, J. R., Silver, H. F., & Strong, R. W. (1991). Learning styles of at-risk students. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(3), 30–35.

Hargreaves, D. J., Comber, C., & Colley, A. (1995). Effects of age, gender, and training on musical preferences of British secondary school students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 43*(3), 242–250.

Hash, P. M. (2007). The Chicago reform school band: 1862–1972. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 55*(3), 252–267.

Head, A. (2008). *Ripples of hope" Rethinking how we prepare teachers to work for equity, diversity and social justice.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest (3315798)

Hess, J. (2012). Docile choristers and the 'choir machine:' A search for agency in choir. *Proteus: A Journal of Ideas, 28*(1), 37–48.

Hewitt, M. P. (2005). Self–evaluation accuracy among high school and middle school instrumentalists. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 53*(2), 148–161.

Hinckley, J. (1995). Urban music education: Providing for students. *Music Educators Journal, 82*(1), 32–35.

Hinckley, J. (2000). Why Vision 2020? *Music Educators Journal, 86*(5), 21–24+66.

Horrocks, C. (2009). *Foucault: A graphic guide.* UK: Icon Books, Ltd.

Howe, S. W. (1992). Music teaching in the Boston public schools, 1864–1879. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 40*(4), 316–328.

Howle, M. J. (1997). Play-party games in the modern classroom. *Music Educators Journals, 83*(5), 24–28.

Hunt, C. (2009). Perspectives on rural and urban music teaching: Developing contextual awareness in music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 18*(2), 34–47.

Jacobson, E. (2001). *The "colonialism of language": AA critical discourse analysis of Bambara texts produced during the pre-colonial and early colonial periods in the former French Sudan.* (Doctoral dissertation.) Retrieved from ProQuest (304702734)

Jäger, S. (2001). Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd edition), (pp. 32–62). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Jäger, S. & Maier, F. (2009). Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian Critical discourse analysis and dispositive analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis,* (pp. 34–61). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Jenkins, J. N. (2008). A kaleidoscopic view of the Harlem Renaissance. *Music Educators Journal, 94*(5), 42–49.

Jensen, C. (2011). *Foundations and racial inequality: A discourse analysis.* (Doctoral dissertation.) Retrieved from ProQuest. (3466351)

Johnson, C. M. & Stewart, E. E. (2004). Effect of sex identification on instrument assignment by band directors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 52*(2), 130–140.

Johnson, C. M. & Stewart, E. E. (2005). Effect of sex and race identification on instrument assignment by music educators. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 53*(4), 348–357.

Jones, P.M. & Eyrich, Jr., F.P. (2006). Real-world methods: Preparing future music teachers in today's classrooms. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom: A guide to leadership, teacher education, and reform, vol. 2* (pp. 81–94). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Jorgensen, E. R. (2010). School music education and change. *Music Educators Journal, 96*(4), 21–27.

Jorgensen, M. & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Kaplan, M. (1970). We have much to learn from the inner city. *Music Educators Journal, 56*(5), 39–42.

Karpf, J. (1999). The vocal teacher of ten thousand: E. Azalia Hackley as community music educator. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*(4), 319–330.

Kelly, S. N. (1998). Preschool classroom teachers' perceptions of useful music skills and understandings. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*(3), 374–383.

Kelly, S. N. & VanWheelden, K. (2004). Connecting meaningful music experiences in a multicultural, multimusical classroom. *Music Educators Journal, 90*(3), 35–39.

Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed). (pp. 567–605).

Kendall, G. (2007). What is critical discourse analysis? Ruth Wodak in conversation with Gavin Kendall. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research 8*(2), 29.

Kendall, G. & Wickham, W. (1999). *Using Foucault's methods.* London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Khalema, E. (2011). *"Race talk" in epidemiology & public health: A critical discourse analysis of Canadian and Brazilian texts.* (Doctoral dissertation.) Retrieved from ProQuest. (911425122)

Killian, J. N. (1997). Perceptions of the voice-change process: Male adult versus adolescent musicians and nonmusicians. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*(4), 521–535.

Kincheloe, J. & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 303–342). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Kindall-Smith, M. (2004). Teachers teaching teachers: Revitalization in an urban setting. *Music Educators Journal, 91*(2), 41–46.

Kindall-Smith, M. (2006). I plant my feet on higher ground: Music teacher education for urban schools. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom, vol. 2* (pp. 47–66). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kinney, D. W. (2008). Selected demographic variables, school music participation, and achievement test scores of urban middle school students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 56*(2), 145–161.

Kinney, D. W. (2010). Selected nonmusic predictors of urban students' decisions to enroll and persist in middle school band programs. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 57*(4), 334–350.

Klotman, R. (1970). The supervisor must know the city score. *Music Educators Journal, 56*(5), pp. 58–59, 125–127, 129–130.

Klotman, R. (2000). Grand masters series: Why strings? *Music Educators Journal, 87*(3), 44–45.

Klouda, T. (2007). Poverty as a spectator sport. In J. Moncreiffe & R. Eyben (Eds.), *The power of labeling: How people are categorized and why it matters,* (pp. 98–112). London: Earthscan.

Kopkas, J. (2011). *Soundings: Musical aesthetics in music education discourse from 1907 to 1958.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Georgia State University Digital Archives.

Kouper, I. (2011). *The meanings of (synthetic) life: A study of science information as discourse* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI Number 3466361)

Koza, J. E. (1993). The "missing males" and other gender issues in music education: Evidence from the "Music Supervisors' Journal." *Journal of Research in Music Education, 41*(3), 212–232.

Kress, G. (1985). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice.* Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Krippendorff, K. (2006). *The semantic turn: A new foundation for design.* Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Krueger, P. J. (2006). Empower music student teachers through inquiry: Cooperating teacher views. *Music Educators Journal, 92*(3), 56–61.

Laliberte Rudman, D. (2003). *Active, autonomous and responsible: A critical discourse analysis of contemporary newspaper construction of 'retirees.'* (Doctoral dissertation.) Retrieved from ProQuest. (305258819)

Lee, C. C. (2005). Urban school counseling: Context, Characteristics, and competencies. *Professional School Counseling,* 8(3), 184–188.

Lee, W. R. (1997). Music education and rural reform, 1900–1925. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*(2), 306–326.

Legette, R. M. (1998). Causal beliefs of public school students about success and failure in music. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*(1), 102–111.

Leonhard, C. (1999). Grand masters series: A challenge for change in music education. *Music Educators Journal, 86*(3), 40–43.

Lessa, I. (2006). Discursive struggles within social welfare: Restaging teen motherhood. *British Journal of Social Work, 36*(2), 283–298.

Lew, J. C. & Campbell, P. S. (2005). Children's natural and necessary musical play: Global contexts, local applications. *Music Educators Journal, 91*(5), 57–62.

Linklater, F. (1997). Effects of audio- and videotape models on performance achievement of beginning clarinetists. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*(3), 402–414.

Livingston, C. (1997). Women in music education in the United States: Names mentioned in history books. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*(1), 130–144.

Locke, T. (2004). *Critical discourse analysis.* New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Loeb, S., Darling-Hammond, L., & Luczak, J. (2005). How teaching conditions predict teacher turnover in California schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 80*(3), 44–70.

Lopez, G. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(1), 68–94.

Lum, C. (2008). Home musical environment of children in Singapore: On globalization, technology, and media. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 56*(2), 101–117.

Lychner, J. A. (2008). Instrumental music experiences from Mexico. *Music Educators Journal, 94*(4), 40–45.

Madsen, C. (2000). Preface. In C. Madsen (Ed.), *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the future of music education* (pp. ix–x). Reston, VA: MENC.

Madsen, C. K. & Hancock, C. B. (2002). Support for music education: A case study of issues concerning teacher retention and attrition. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 50*(1), 6–19.

Mangion, C. (2011). *Philosophical approaches to communication.* Chicago: Intellect.

Mantie, R. (2009). *Stylizing lives: Selected discourses in instrumental music education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest (NR 61025).

Mantie, R. (2012a). Music education and avocational music making: Examining the discourse using techniques from corpus linguistics. In L. K. Thompson & M. R. Campbell (Eds.), *Situating inquiry: Expanded venues for music education research,* (pp. 119–146).

Mantie, R. (2012b). Striking up the band: Music education through a Foucaultian lens. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 11(1): 99–123. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Mantie, R. (2013). A comparison of "popular music pedagogy" discourses. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 61*(3), 334–352. Doi:10.1177/0022429413497235

Markley, R. (1999). Foucault, modernity, and the cultural study of science. *Configurations 7*(2), 153–173.

Marshall, J. D. (1990). Foucault and educational research. In S. J. Ball (Ed.), *Foucault and education: Disciplines and knowledge,* (pp. 11–28). New York: Routledge.

Marxen, C. & Rudney, G. (1999). An urban field experience for rural preservice teachers: "I'm not afraid – should I be?". *Teacher Education Quarterly, 30*(1), 68–94.

Masterson, M. L. (1994). Moving beyond "It's got a good beat." *Music Educators Journal. 80*(6), 24–28.

Matsko, K. & Hammerness, K. (2014). Unpacking the “urban” in urban teacher education: Making a case for context-specific preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(2), 128–144. Doi:10.1177/0022487113511645

McAnally, E. A. (2006). Motivating urban music students. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom, vol. 1* (pp. 99–108). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

McCarthy, M. & Goble, J. S. (2002). Music education philosophy: Changing times. *Music Educators Journal, 89*(1), 19–26.

McCrary, J. (1993). Effects of listeners’ and performers’ race on music preferences. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 41*(3), 200–211.

McCusker, J. (1999). The Gibbs Street connection. *Music Educators Journal, 86*(3), 37–39+54.

McDonald, M. A. (2005). The integration of social justice in teacher education: Dimensions of prospective teachers’ opportunities to learn. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(5), 418–435.

Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis,* (pp. 14–21). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Milner, H. (2003a). Reflection, racial competence, and critical pedagogy: How do we prepare pre-service teachers to pose tough questions? *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 6*(2), 193–208.

Milner, H. (2003b). Teacher reflection and race in cultural contexts: History, meanings, and methods in teaching. *Theory Into Practice, 42*(3), 173–180.

Mixon, K. (2005). Building your instrumental music program in an urban school. *Music Educators Journal, 91*(3), 15–23.

Mixon, K. (2009). Engaging and educating students with culturally responsive performing ensembles. *Music Educators Journal, 95*(4), 66–71.

Mixon, K. (2010). Q&A with Kevin Mixon. *Teaching Music, 18*(3), 46.

Modugno, A. D. (1991). The lost student found. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(3), 50–54.

Monaghan, J. & Just, P. (2000). *Social & cultural anthropology.* New York: Sterling.

Moncrieffe, J. (2007). Introduction: Labelling, power and accountability: How and why 'our' categories matter. In J. Moncreiffe & R. Eyben (Eds.), *The power of labeling: How people are categorized and why it matters,* (pp. 1–32). London: Earthscan.

Monsour, S. (2000). General music tomorrow. *Music Educators Journal, 87*(2), 45–48.

Morin, F. (2003). Learning across disciplines: An approach to West African music. *Music Educators Journal 89*(4), 27–34.

Morris, J. (2010). *Exploring the discursive limits of "suicide" in the classroom: A Foucauldian-inspired discourse analysis of a school-based youth suicide prevention program.* (Masters Thesis.) Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (ProQuest ID 896483920)

Morrison, S. J. (1998). A comparison of preference responses of White and African-American students to musical versus musical/visual stimuli. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*(2), 208–222.

Muredda, A. (2012). Fixing language: 'People-First' language, taxonomical prescriptivism, and the linguistic location of disability. *The English Languages: History, Diaspora, Culture* 3, 1–10.

Myers, H. (2000). *Specialized public high schools of choice in a northeastern state: A descriptive study* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9991264)

Nerland, M. (2007). One-to-one teaching as cultural practice: Two case studies from an academy of music. *Music Education Research 9*(3), 399–416.

Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 180–187.

Oksala, J. (2007). *How to read Foucault.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Olmedo, I. (1997). Challenging old assumptions: Preparing teachers for inner city schools. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 13*(3), 245–258.

Olssen, M. (2010). Structuralism, post-structuralism, and neo-liberalism: Assessing Foucault's legacy. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(2), 189–202.

Palmquist, J. E. & Payne, B. (1992). The inclusive instrumental library: Works by women. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(7), 52–55.

Patterson, J., Collins, L., & Abbott, G. (2004). A study of teacher resilience in urban schools. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 31*(1), 3–11.

Persellin, D. C. (1992). Responses to rhythm patterns when presented to children through auditory, visual, and kinesthetic modalities. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 40*(4), 306–315.

Piot, G., Keltchermans, L., & Ballet, K. (2010). Beginning teachers' job experiences in multi-ethnic schools. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 16*(2), 259–276.

Pohan, C. & Aguilar, T. (2001). Measuring educators' beliefs about diversity in personal and professional contexts. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(1), 159–182.

Potter, J. (2008). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric, and social construction.* London: SAGE Publications.

Prado, C. (2000). *Starting with Foucault: An introduction to genealogy.* 2nd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Prado, C. (2006). *Searle and Foucault on truth.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Radocy, R. E. (1998). Personal perspectives on research: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*(3), 342–350.

Raulet, G. (1983). Structuralism and post-structuralism: An interview with Michel Foucault. *Telos 55,* 195–211.

Risolo, D. L. (2011). *Negotiating policy and literacy in the NCLB era: A study of the policy discourse practices of the National Council of Teachers of English* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3484292.)

Robinson, N. R. (2004). Who is "at risk" in the music classroom? *Music Educators Journal, 90*(4), 38–43.

Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education,* (pp.1–18). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rong, X. L. (2006). Immigration, urban schools, and accountability. In F. Brown & R. C. Hunter (Eds.), *No child left behind and other federal programs for urban school districts* (pp. 21–339). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Rowling, J. K. (1998). *Harry Potter and the chamber of secrets.* New York: Scholastic, Inc.

Russo, P. (2004). *What makes any school an urban school?* Retrieved from http://www.oswego.edu/~prusso1/what_makes_any_school_an_urban_s.htm.

Scheib, J. W. (2003). Role stress in the professional life of the school music teacher: A collective case study. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*(2), 124–136.

Schmid, W. (1992). World music in the instrumental program. *Music Educators Journal 78*(9), 41–45.

Schmidt, C. M. (1999). *Multiculturalism and the representation of culture in the 1995 elementary music series textbooks: A discourse analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (9927359.)

Schwartz, K. D. (2011). *Understanding conceptualizations of students with "significant intellectual disabilities": An analysis using discourse theory* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ISBN 978-0-494-78574-4)

Scott-Kassner, C. (1999). Developing teachers for early childhood programs. *Music Educators Journal, 86*(1), 19–25.

Scripp, L. & Meyaard, J. (1991). Encouraging musical risks for learning success. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(3), 36–41.

Seeger, A. (1992). Celebrating the American music mosaic. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(9), 26–29.

Shields, C. (2001). Music education and mentoring as intervention for at-risk urban adolescents: Their self-perceptions, opinions, and attitudes. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 49*(3), 273–286.

Shuler, S. C. (1991). Music, at-risk, students, and the missing piece. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(3), 21–23+25–29.

Simon, B. (2005). The return of panopticism: Supervision, subjection and the new surveillance. *Surveillance & Society 3*(1), 1–20.

Sinor, J. (1992). Meeting the challenge of future classrooms. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(2), 22–25.

Sleeter, C. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94–106.

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, R. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse.* London: Oxford University Press.

Small, K. (2009). Saving the spiritual for your students. *Music Educators Journal, 96*(2), 46–49.

Smart, B. (1986). The politics of truth and the problems of hegemony. In D. Hoy (Ed.) *Foucault: A critical reader* (pp. 221–234). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Smith, D. J. (2003). Can video save the radio star? Using music-plus-video in the classroom. *Music Educators Journal, 90*(1), 37–41.

Smith, J. (1993). Opera as interdisciplinary art. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(6), 21+61.

Smith, J. (2006). The challenges of urban teaching: Young urban music educators at work. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom, vol. 1* (pp. 57–74). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Solomon, R. C. (2005). Subjectivity. In T. Honderich (Ed.), *Oxford companion to philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soto, A. C. (2008). Conjunto in the classroom. *Music Educators Journal, 95*(1), 54–59.

Svengalis, J. N. (1992). Partnership: The key to student teaching. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(2), 31–34.

Talbot, B. (2010). *Finding a way: Discourse analysis of music transmission in Eka Sruti Illini and implications for music education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3445844.)

Teicher, J. M. (1997). Effect of multicultural music experience on preservice elementary teachers' attitudes. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*(3), 415–427.

Thompson, K. (2002). A critical discourse analysis of world music as the 'other' in music education. *Research Studies in Music Education 19*(14), 14–21.

Times Higher Education. (2009). *Most cited authors of books in the humanities, 2007.* Retrieved from http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/405956.article

Thompson, L. K. (2007). Considering beliefs in learning to teach music. *Music Educators Journal, 93*(3), 30–35.

Titchkosky, T. (2001). Disability: A rose by any other name? "People-First" language in Canadian society. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 38*(2), 125–140.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Method of text and discourse analysis: In search of meaning.* London: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Unwanted. (2014). *Random House Dictionary.* New York: Random House, Inc.

U.S. Census Bureau (2010). *2010 census urban and rural classification and urban area criteria.* Retrieved from U.S. Census website: http://www.census.gov/geo/reference/urban-rural-2010.html.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2013). *National school lunch program.* Retrieved from USDA website: http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Lunch/AboutLunch/NSLPFactSheet.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1996). *Urban schools: the challenge and location of poverty.* Retrieved from NCES website: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/web/96184.asp.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). Definitions. In *Urban education in America.* Retrieved from NCES website: http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/urbaned/page2.asp.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *Average freshman graduation rate for high school students, by locale: School year 2007–2008.* Retrieved from NCES website: http://nces.ed.gov/surveys /ruraled/tables/b.3.a.-1_0708.asp?refer= urbanTable%20B.3.a.1.%3C/a%3E%3C/td%3E%20%20%20%20%3Ctd%20valign=.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Numbers and types of public elementary and secondary schools from the common core of data: School year 2010–11.* Retrieved from NCES website: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/pesschools10/tables/table_03.asp.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as interaction in society. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction,* (pp. 1–37). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.) *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. (pp. 95–120). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

VanWheelden, K. (2002). Relationships between perceptions of conducting effectiveness and ensemble performance. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 50*(2), 165–176.

Vaugeois, L. C. (2009). Music education as a part of social justice. In E. Gould, J. Countryman, C. Morton, L.S. Rose (Eds.), *Exploring social justice: How music education might matter* (pp. 2–22). Waterloo, ON: CMEA/ACME.

Volk, T. M. (1993). The history of 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. (1994). Folk musics and increasing diversity in American music education: 1900–1916. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 42*(4), 285–305.

Volk, T. M. (2001). Little red songbooks: Songs for the labor force of America. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 49*(1), 33–48.

Walker, L. B. (2003). Developing a gospel choir. *Music Educators Journal, 89*(3), 23–28.

Ward-Steinman, P.M. (2006). Learning to teach in the city: Privileged music education majors read underprivileged children in an after-school music partnership. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom: A guide to leadership, teacher education, and reform, vol. 2* (pp. 115–122). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Warzer, J. (2006). Music education administration in an urban setting: The stone drops deeper here. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom, vol. 2* (pp. 3–12). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Weiner, L. (2006). *Urban teaching: The essentials.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Werner, R. J. (1994). The international scene in music education. *Music Educators Journal, 80*(4), 45–46.

Williams, K. (2008). Steel bands in American schools: What they are, what they do, and why they're growing. *Music Educators Journal, 94*(4), 52–57.

Wilson, B. & McCrary, J. (1996). The effect of instruction on music educators' attitudes towards students with disabilities. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 44*(1), 26–33.

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis,* (pp. 1–13). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Wodak, R. (2005). Discourse analysis (Foucault). In *Routledge encyclopedia of narrative theory.* (pp. 112–114). New York: Routledge.

Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory, and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd edition), (pp. 1–33). London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Wood, G. (2007). Labels, welfare regimes and intermediation: Contesting formal power. In J. Moncreiffe & R. Eyben (Eds.), *The power of labeling: How people are categorized and why it matters,* (pp. 17–32). London: Earthscan.

Woofitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction.* London: Sage.

Yarbrough, C. (2002). The first 50 years of the “Journal of Research in Music Education:” A content analysis. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 50*(4), 276–279.

Yudkin, J. (1993). Choosing pluralism or particularism. *Music Educators Journal, 79*(8), 46–48.

APPENDIX A

AUTHORS OF *JRME* ARTICLES, 1991–2010, IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER BY ISSUE NUMBER

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1991	39.1	Bennett
1991	39.1	Cassidy & Sims
1991	39.1	Duke, Geringer, & C. Madsen
1991	39.1	P.S. Campbell
1991	39.1	Rogers
1991	39.1	Schleuter
1991	39.1	Standley & C. Madsen
1991	39.2	Bess
1991	39.2	Booth & Cutietta
1991	39.2	Brittin
1991	39.2	Dickey
1991	39.2	Duke & Pierce
1991	39.2	Geringer
1991	39.2	Martin
1991	39.2	Wapnick & Rosenquist
1991	39.3	Bowles
1991	39.3	Fiese
1991	39.3	Killian
1991	39.3	Klinedinst
1991	39.3	LeBlanc & McCrary
1991	39.3	McCoy
1991	39.3	Saunders & Baker
1991	39.4	Duke & Blackman
1991	39.4	Fisher
1991	39.4	Gillespie
1991	39.4	Jellison & Flowers
1991	39.4	Lewis & C. Schmidt
1991	39.4	Sims
1992	40.1	Bartel
1992	40.1	Bergee
1992	40.1	Fonder
1992	40.1	Halpern
1992	40.1	Price
1992	40.1	Yarbrough, Bowers, & Benson
1992	40.2	Bergee
1992	40.2	Dalby

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1992	40.2	Delzell & Leppla
1992	40.2	Demorest
1992	40.2	Ely
1992	40.2	Sample
1992	40.2	Zdzinski
1992	40.3	Eastlund
1992	40.3	Jones
1992	40.3	Moskovitz
1992	40.3	Rentz
1992	40.3	Richmond
1992	40.3	Scott
1992	40.4	Ellis
1992	40.4	Howe
1992	40.4	LeBlanc, Sims, Malin, & Sherrill
1992	40.4	Persellin
1992	40.4	Pierce
1992	40.4	Sloboda & Howe
1993	41.1	Atterbury & Silcox
1993	41.1	Bergee
1993	41.1	C. Madsen, Brittin, & Capperella-Sheldon
1993	41.1	Fortney, Boyle, & DeCarbo
1993	41.1	Kvet & Watkins
1993	41.1	Maclin
1993	41.1	Schmidt & Zdzinski
1993	41.2	Darrow
1993	41.2	J. Byo
1993	41.2	Vispoel
1993	41.2	Volk
1993	41.3	Gumm
1993	41.3	Koza
1993	41.3	McCrary
1993	41.3	Mizener
1993	41.3	Yarbrough & Hendel
1993	41.4	Azzara
1993	41.4	Cassidy
1993	41.4	D. Hamann & Walker
1993	41.4	Humphreys
1993	41.4	Wapnick, Flowers, Alegant, & Jasinkas
1994	42.1	Costa-Giomi
1994	42.1	Duke

(*table continues)*

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1994	42.1	Fung
1994	42.1	Moore
1994	42.1	Speer
1994	42.1	Walls
1994	42.1	Zervoudakes & Tanur
1994	42.2	Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys
1994	42.2	Green
1994	42.2	Harrison, Asmus, & Serpe
1994	42.2	Koza
1994	42.2	Kratus
1994	42.3	Lucas
1994	42.3	McPherson
1994	42.3	Sheldon
1994	42.3	Wiggins
1994	42.4	Cutietta, Klich, Royse, & Rainbolt
1994	42.4	Fredrickson
1994	42.4	Gregory
1994	42.4	Price, Yarbrough, Jones, & Moore
1994	42.4	Volk
1995	43.1	Brittin & Sheldon
1995	43.1	C. Colwell
1995	43.1	Geringer
1995	43.1	Gregory
1995	43.1	Southcott
1995	43.2	Arnold
1995	43.2	C. M. Smith
1995	43.2	Della Pietra & P.S. Campbell
1995	43.2	Demorest & May
1995	43.2	S. Wilson & Wales
1995	43.3	Hargreaves, Comber, & Colley
1995	43.3	Hendel
1995	43.3	N. Cooper
1995	43.3	Rose & Wagner
1995	43.3	Sims
1995	43.3	Yarbrough, Karrick, & Morrison
1995	43.4	C. Schmidt
1995	43.4	D. Hamann & Lawrence
1995	43.4	Ellis
1995	43.4	Kantorski
1995	43.4	McCarthy

(*table continues)*

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1996	44.1	Brendell
1996	44.1	C.M. Johnson
1996	44.1	Fung
1996	44.1	LeBlanc, Sims, Siivola, & Obert
1996	44.1	Rogers
1996	44.1	Wilson & McCrary
1996	44.1	Zdzinski
1996	44.2	Crowe
1996	44.2	Howe
1996	44.2	Montgomery
1996	44.2	Standley
1996	44.3	Costa-Giomi & Descombes
1996	44.3	D. Scott
1996	44.3	D. Williams
1996	44.3	Geringer, Cassidy, & J. Byo
1996	44.3	Killian
1996	44.3	Madura
1996	44.3	Yarbrough
1996	44.4	Bernstorf & Burk
1996	44.4	Brittin
1996	44.4	Goolsby
1996	44.4	Harrison
1996	44.4	Hartley
1996	44.4	Heston, Dedrick, Raschke, & Whitehead
1996	44.4	Rutkowski
1997	45.1	Brittin & Standley
1997	45.1	C. Madsen
1997	45.1	Demorest & Serlin
1997	45.1	Goolsby
1997	45.1	J. Byo
1997	45.1	Livingston
1997	45.1	McPherson, Bailey, & Sinclair
1997	45.1	Parrish
1997	45.1	Siebenaler
1997	45.1	Teachout
1997	45.2	Bergonzi
1997	45.2	Brittin & Duke
1997	45.2	C.M. Johnson & Darrow
1997	45.2	Cutietta & MacAllister
1997	45.2	Geringer, Cassidy, & J. Byo

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1997	45.2	Gillespie
1997	45.2	Kelly
1997	45.2	Kostka
1997	45.2	Lee
1997	45.2	Phillips & Aitchison
1997	45.2	Saunders & Holahan
1997	45.2	Sims & Cassidy
1997	45.3	Blocker, Greenwood, & Shellahamer
1997	45.3	Bowers
1997	45.3	Flowers, Wapnick, & Ramsey
1997	45.3	LeBlanc, Jin, Obert, & Siivola
1997	45.3	Linklater
1997	45.3	McCoy
1997	45.3	Nierman & Veak
1997	45.3	Sheldon & Gregory
1997	45.3	Sinsel, Dixon Jr., & Blades-Zeller
1997	45.3	Teicher
1997	45.3	Wang & Sogin
1997	45.3	Wapnick, Darrow, Kovacs, & Dalrymple
1997	45.4	Beckett
1997	45.4	Bergee
1997	45.4	Byrnes
1997	45.4	C. Smith
1997	45.4	Chinn
1997	45.4	Dunn
1997	45.4	Fredrickson
1997	45.4	Killian
1997	45.4	O. Taylor
1997	45.4	Sheldon
1997	45.4	Skadsem
1998	46.1	Corenblum & Marshall
1998	46.1	D. Hamann, Lineburgh, & Paul
1998	46.1	Davidson, D. Moore, Sloboda, & M. Howe
1998	46.1	Flowers
1998	46.1	Gillespie & D. Hamann
1998	46.1	Gromko & Poorman
1998	46.1	Karrick
1998	46.1	Klinger, P.S. Campbell, & Goolsby
1998	46.1	Legette

(table continued)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1998	46.1	Levinowitz, Barnes, Guerrini, Clement, D'April, & Morey
1998	46.1	Orman
1998	46.1	Rodriguez
1998	46.2	Bowles
1998	46.2	Demorest
1998	46.2	DeNardo & Kantorski
1998	46.2	Duke, Prickett, & Jellison
1998	46.2	Gromko & Poorman
1998	46.2	LeCroy
1998	46.2	Livingston
1998	46.2	Lynchner
1998	46.2	Morrison
1998	46.2	Wallick
1998	46.2	Wiggins & Bodoin
1998	46.3	Burnsed
1998	46.3	C.M. Johnson
1998	46.3	Cofer
1998	46.3	D. Hamann & Lucas
1998	46.3	Kelly
1998	46.3	LeBlanc, Jin, Simpson, Stamou, & McCrary
1998	46.3	Rohwer
1998	46.3	Saunders, Holahan, & Getnick
1998	46.3	Sheldon
1998	46.4	C. Madsen
1998	46.4	Davis
1998	46.4	Duke & Henninger
1998	46.4	Geringer & C. Madsen
1998	46.4	Gholson
1998	46.4	Prickett & Bridges
1998	46.4	Wapnick, Mazza, & Darrow
1998	46.4	Yarbrough & K. Madsen
1999	47.1	Austin & Reinhardt
1999	47.1	Delzell, Rohwer, & Ballard
1999	47.1	Doerksen
1999	47.1	Fredrickson
1999	47.1	Frego
1999	47.1	Jellison & Wolfe
1999	47.1	Morrison & Yeh
1999	47.2	Gauthier & McCrary

(table continued)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1999	47.2	Geringer & Worthy
1999	47.2	Goolsby
1999	47.2	Gudmundsdottir
1999	47.2	Ralston
1999	47.2	S. Byo
1999	47.2	Shiraishi
1999	47.3	Costa-Giomi
1999	47.3	Daugherty
1999	47.3	Gillespie & D. Hamann
1999	47.3	McLean
1999	47.3	Sheldon, Reese, & Grashel
1999	47.3	Siebenaler
1999	47.4	Conway
1999	47.4	Duke
1999	47.4	Karpf
1999	47.4	Killian
1999	47.4	Woody
1999	47.4	Yarbrough & Henley
2000	48.1	C.M. Johnson
2000	48.1	Howe
2000	48.1	Humphreys & Stauffer
2000	48.1	Morrison
2000	48.1	Norris
2000	48.1	Prickett & Bridges
2000	48.1	Sheldon
2000	48.2	Betts & Cassidy
2000	48.2	D. Hamann, Baker, McAllister, & Bauer
2000	48.2	Ekholm
2000	48.2	Holahan, Saunders, Goldberg
2000	48.2	Kostka
2000	48.2	Sehmann
2000	48.3	Brittin
2000	48.3	Colprit
2000	48.3	Flowers
2000	48.3	Geringer
2000	48.3	McCrary
2000	48.3	Worthy
2000	48.4	McGuire
2000	48.4	Miranda

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2000	48.4	P.S. Campbell
2000	48.4	Price
2000	48.4	Wapnick, Mazza, & Darrow
2001	49.1	Broomhead
2001	49.1	Burnsed
2001	49.1	de l'Etoile
2001	49.1	Rife, Shnek, Lauby, & Lapidus
2001	49.1	Volk
2001	49.1	Woody & Burns
2001	49.2	Forbes
2001	49.2	Henley
2001	49.2	Lien & Humphries
2001	49.2	Paul, Teachout, Sullivan, Kelly, Bauer, & Raiber
2001	49.2	Reames
2001	49.2	T. Cooper
2001	49.3	Butler
2001	49.3	Hebert
2001	49.3	Hickey
2001	49.3	Kreutzer
2001	49.3	Price & Orman
2001	49.3	Priest
2001	49.3	Shields
2001	49.4	Duke & Colprit
2001	49.4	Hewitt
2001	49.4	Jorgensen
2001	49.4	Kratus
2001	49.4	Misenhelter & Price
2002	50.1	Brittin
2002	50.1	C. Madsen & Hancock
2002	50.1	Conway
2002	50.1	Duke & Henninger
2002	50.1	Hellman
2002	50.1	Henninger
2002	50.2	C. Madsen & K. Madsen
2002	50.2	Hopkins
2002	50.2	Kennedy
2002	50.2	Kostka
2002	50.2	Orman
2002	50.2	VanWheelden

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2002	50.3	Bergee & Cecconi-Roberts
2002	50.3	Flowers & Wang
2002	50.3	Hewitt
2002	50.3	McGuire
2002	50.3	Zdzinski & Barnes
2002	50.4	C. Madsen & Kelly
2002	50.4	Ebie
2002	50.4	Gromko & Russell
2002	50.4	Jellison
2002	50.4	Sims & Nolker
2002	50.4	Stauffer
2003	51.1	Allsup
2003	51.1	Conway
2003	51.1	Howe
2003	51.1	K. Madsen
2003	51.1	Trollinger
2003	51.1	Woody
2003	51.2	Bergee
2003	51.2	Berger & Cooper
2003	51.2	C.M. Johnson
2003	51.2	Custodero & Johnson-Green
2003	51.2	Hancock
2003	51.2	Scheib
2003	51.3	Adderley, Kennedy, & Berz
2003	51.3	Cavitt
2003	51.3	Colwell & Heller
2003	51.3	Dekaney
2003	51.3	Fredrickson & Coggiola
2003	51.3	L. May
2003	51.4	Bauer, Reese, & McAllister
2003	51.4	Bergee & Platt
2003	51.4	Kiehn
2003	51.4	Orman
2003	51.4	Propst
2003	51.4	Sichivitsa
2004	52.1	C. Madsen
2004	52.1	Coggiola
2004	52.1	Gromko
2004	52.1	Guilbault

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2004	52.1	Miranda
2004	52.1	Norris
2004	52.2	C.M. Johnson & Stewart
2004	52.2	Geringer & Allen
2004	52.2	Marjoribanks & Mboya
2004	52.2	Morrison, Montemayor, & Wiltshire
2004	52.2	Ryan & Costa-Giomi
2004	52.2	Sheldon
2004	52.3	Abeles
2004	52.3	Henry
2004	52.3	Kennedy
2004	52.3	Teachout
2004	52.3	Trollinger
2004	52.4	Demorest & Schultz
2004	52.4	Hewitt & B. Smith
2004	52.4	Howe
2004	52.4	McKeage
2004	52.4	Sheldon
2005	53.1	Brittin
2005	53.1	Killian & Henry
2005	53.1	M. Schmidt
2005	53.1	Price & Chang
2005	53.1	Sheldon & DeNardo
2005	53.1	Sims
2005	53.2	Bergee & McWhirter
2005	53.2	Brophy
2005	53.2	C. Schmidt
2005	53.2	Hewitt
2005	53.2	Silvey
2005	53.2	Wapnick, Ryan, L. Campbell, Deek, Lemire, & Darrow
2005	53.3	Costa-Giomi, Flowers, Sasaki
2005	53.3	Geringer, Allen, & MacLeod
2005	53.3	Gromko
2005	53.3	Herbst, de Wet, & Rijsdijk
2005	53.3	K. Madsen & Cassidy
2005	53.3	L. Williams
2005	53.4	Bergee & Westfall
2005	53.4	C.M Johnson & Stewart
2005	53.4	Cooper

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2005	53.4	Flowers & O'Neill
2005	53.4	Hornbach & Taggart
2005	53.4	J. Byo & Cassidy
2006	54.1	Abril & Gault
2006	54.1	Custodero
2006	54.1	Fitzpatrick
2006	54.1	Smialek & Boburka
2006	54.1	Woody
2006	54.2	Duke & Davis
2006	54.2	Jutras
2006	54.2	Schmidt, Zdzinski, & Ballard
2006	54.2	Strand
2006	54.2	Woody
2006	54.3	Bergee
2006	54.3	Lane
2006	54.3	Price
2006	54.3	Simmons & Duke
2006	54.3	Taylor
2006	54.4	C.M. Johnson & Memmott
2006	54.4	Geringer, C. Madsen, MacLeod, & Droe
2006	54.4	Miksza
2006	54.4	Persellin & Fox
2006	54.4	Rohwer & Polk
2006	54.4	Wehr-Flowers
2007	55.1	Hewitt
2007	55.1	Korenman & Peynircioglu
2007	55.1	Lum & P.S. Campbell
2007	55.1	Matthews & Kitsantas
2007	55.1	Stegman
2007	55.2	Goodrich
2007	55.2	Hedden, Heller, Humphreys, & Slattery
2007	55.2	Kuehne
2007	55.2	M. Campbell & L. Thompson
2007	55.2	Orman & Price
2007	55.3	Abril & Flowers
2007	55.3	B. Smith & Barnes
2007	55.3	Demorest & Clements
2007	55.3	Hash
2007	55.3	Norris & Borst

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2007	55.3	P.S. Campbell, Connell, & Beegle
2007	55.4	Bergee
2007	55.4	Fredrickson
2007	55.4	Geringer & C.M. Johnson
2007	55.4	Killian & Basinger
2007	55.4	Miksza
2007	55.4	Volk
2008	56.1	Abril & Gault
2008	56.1	C. Madsen & Geringer
2008	56.1	Conway & Holcomb
2008	56.1	MacLeod
2008	56.1	Napoles
2008	56.1	Teo, Hargreaves, & Lee
2008	56.1	Ward-Steinman
2008	56.2	Hancock
2008	56.2	Isbell
2008	56.2	Kinney
2008	56.2	Lum
2008	56.2	Morrison, Demorest, & Stambaugh
2008	56.3	Conway & Hodgman
2008	56.3	Droe
2008	56.3	McClung
2008	56.3	Russell
2008	56.3	Watts & P.S. Campbell
2009	56.4	Duke, Simmons, & Cash
2009	56.4	Hartley & Porter
2009	56.4	Ilari & Sundara
2009	56.4	Kinney
2009	56.4	Schwartz
2009	56.4	Soto, Lum, & P.S. Campbell
2009	57.1	C. Madsen, Geringer, & K. Madsen
2009	57.1	Ciorba & N. Smith
2009	57.1	Hash
2009	57.1	Hayward & Gromko
2009	57.1	Morrison, Price, Geiger, & Cornacchio
2009	57.2	Abeles
2009	57.2	Gromko, Hansen, Tortora, Higgins, & Boccia
2009	57.2	Guilbault
2009	57.2	Hancock

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2009	57.2	Hourigan
2009	57.2	Ryan & Andrews
2009	57.3	Bautista, Echeverria, Pozo, & Brizuela
2009	57.3	Cash
2009	57.3	D. Smith
2009	57.3	Montemayor & Moss
2009	57.3	Napoles
2009	57.3	Reifinger
2010	57.4	Frewen
2010	57.4	Geringer, MacLeod, & Allen
2010	57.4	Kinney
2010	57.4	Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs
2010	57.4	Nabb & Balcetis
2010	57.4	Rickels, Councill, Fredrickson, Hairston, Porter, & M. Schmidt
2010	58.1	K. Hamann
2010	58.1	Killian & Wayman
2010	58.1	Koops
2010	58.1	Price, C. Madsen, Cornacchio, & Webb
2010	58.1	Russell & Austin
2010	58.1	Stamou, C. Schmidt, & Humphries
2010	58.2	Fisher
2010	58.2	Hackworth & Fredrickson
2010	58.2	Latimer Jr., Bergee, & Cohen
2010	58.2	M. Schmidt
2010	58.2	Seddon & Biasutti
2010	58.2	Woody & Lehmann
2010	58.3	Beegle
2010	58.3	Conway, Eros, Pellegrino, & West
2010	58.3	Geringer
2010	58.3	Juchniewicz
2010	58.3	Watson

APPENDIX B

AUTHORS OF *MEJ* ARTICLES, 1991–2010, IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER BY ISSUE NUMBER

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1991	77.6	Bassin
1991	77.6	Fisher
1991	77.6	Garcia
1991	77.6	Giles
1991	77.6	Grashel
1991	77.6	Silsbury
1991	77.7	LeBlanc
1991	77.7	Mamlin
1991	77.7	Rideout
1991	77.7	Rinehart
1991	77.7	Robinson
1991	77.7	Wilson
1991	77.8	Cooper
1991	77.8	Cutietta
1991	77.8	Cutietta & Brennan
1991	77.8	Grier
1991	77.8	Kuzmich
1991	77.8	Love
1991	77.8	Pembrook
1991	77.9	Anderson
1991	77.9	Cowden
1991	77.9	Karjala
1991	77.9	Powell
1991	77.9	Reimer
1991	77.9	Rogers
1991	78.1	Baltzer
1991	78.1	Eastlund
1991	78.1	Lee
1991	78.1	Patchen
1991	78.1	Rozen
1991	78.1	Shoop
1991	78.1	Taylor
1991	78.2	Bash
1991	78.2	Boshkoff
1991	78.2	Ely
1991	78.2	Merrion
1991	78.2	Murdock

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1991	78.2	Smith
1991	78.2	Walczyk
1991	78.3	Collett
1991	78.3	Duerksen & Darrow
1991	78.3	Hanson, et al
1991	78.3	Modugno
1991	78.3	Scripp & Meyaard
1991	78.3	Shuler
1991	78.4	Campbell
1991	78.4	Farber
1991	78.4	Kratus
1991	78.4	Meadows
1991	78.4	Mortenson
1991	78.4	Thomas
1992	78.5	Anderson
1992	78.5	Foree
1992	78.5	Neiman & Thomas
1992	78.5	Norcross
1992	78.5	Palmer
1992	78.5	Pemberton
1992	78.5	Thoms
1992	78.6	Brewster
1992	78.6	Gerber
1992	78.6	Hinckley
1992	78.6	Lounsbury
1992	78.6	Plondike
1992	78.6	Reul
1992	78.6	Teske
1992	78.7	Allen & Kennan-Takagi
1992	78.7	Atterbury
1992	78.7	Koza
1992	78.7	Lindeman
1992	78.7	Palmquist & Payne
1992	78.7	Richardson
1992	78.7	Scanlan, et al
1992	78.8	Boardman & Alt
1992	78.8	DeNicola
1992	78.8	Ely
1992	78.8	Strouse

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1992	78.8	Zentz
1992	78.9	Anderson
1992	78.9	Anderson (two articles in this issue)
1992	78.9	Campbell
1992	78.9	Conlon
1992	78.9	Schmid
1992	78.9	Seeger
1992	78.9	Tucker
1992	79.1	Bennett
1992	79.1	Brunner
1992	79.1	Ely
1992	79.1	Gillespie
1992	79.1	Hughes
1992	79.1	LeCroy
1992	79.1	Nieber
1992	79.1	Zerull
1992	79.2	Boardman
1992	79.2	Boardman (two articles in this issue)
1992	79.2	DeNardo & O'Hearn
1992	79.2	Kohut
1992	79.2	Sinor
1992	79.2	Svengalis
1992	79.2	Williams
1992	79.3	Boody
1992	79.3	Buck
1992	79.3	Greenburg
1992	79.3	Mason
1992	79.3	Moore
1992	79.3	Peters
1992	79.3	Willman
1992	79.3	Willman (two articles in this issue)
1992	79.4	Achilles
1992	79.4	Borroff
1992	79.4	Boswell
1992	79.4	Darrough
1992	79.4	Ernst & Emmons
1992	79.4	Haworth
1992	79.4	Myers
1992	79.4	Schafer

(right continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1993	79.5	Ameigh
1993	79.5	Bish
1993	79.5	Blakeslee
1993	79.5	Gregory
1993	79.5	Kersten
1993	79.5	Michelson
1993	79.6	Ames
1993	79.6	Bland
1993	79.6	Bullen
1993	79.6	Drago
1993	79.6	Gonzo
1993	79.6	Kiester
1993	79.6	Smith
1993	79.6	Speake
1993	79.7	Beery
1993	79.7	Caldwell
1993	79.7	Ely
1993	79.7	Reimer
1993	79.7	Szabo
1993	79.7	Ulrich
1993	79.7	Wagner & Brick
1993	79.8	Grashel
1993	79.8	Grossman
1993	79.8	Henry
1993	79.8	Johnson
1993	79.8	Mueth
1993	79.8	Workinger
1993	79.8	Yudkin
1993	79.9	Appell
1993	79.9	Burnaford
1993	79.9	Chamberlin, et al
1993	79.9	Cutietta
1993	79.9	Drago
1993	79.9	Johnson
1993	79.9	Wiggins
1993	80.1	Bess & Fisher
1993	80.1	Daniel
1993	80.1	Dunnigan
1993	80.1	Grashel

(table continued)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1993	80.1	Lucia
1993	80.1	Paxcia-Bibbins
1993	80.1	Walczyk
1993	80.2	Charboneau
1993	80.2	Lyon
1993	80.2	Phillips
1993	80.2	Sarath
1993	80.2	Sibbald
1993	80.2	Snedeker
1993	80.2	Walker
1993	80.3	Bartholomew
1993	80.3	Lehman
1993	80.3	Peterson
1993	80.3	Petrella
1993	80.3	Rao
1993	80.3	Stern & Cox
1994	80.4	Fredrickson
1994	80.4	Gumm
1994	80.4	Matheny
1994	80.4	Nelson
1994	80.4	Smith
1994	80.4	Stuessy
1994	80.4	Stycos
1994	80.4	Werner
1994	80.5	Bassin
1994	80.5	Goolsby
1994	80.5	Kite, et al
1994	80.5	LeCroy
1994	80.5	Manins
1994	80.5	Niebur
1994	80.5	Stevens & Davis
1994	80.6	Aaron
1994	80.6	Brunner
1994	80.6	Byo
1994	80.6	Gallant
1994	80.6	Masterson
1994	80.6	O'Brien
1994	80.6	Thoms
1994	80.6	Woody

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1994	81.1	Campbell
1994	81.1	Drafall & Grant
1994	81.1	Eshelman & Nelson
1994	81.1	Goodkin
1994	81.1	Sandene
1994	81.1	Whitaker
1994	81.1	Woody
1994	81.2	Barnicle
1994	81.2	Barrow
1994	81.2	Brophy
1994	81.2	Campbell
1994	81.2	Goodnite
1994	81.2	Junda
1994	81.2	Morrison
1994	81.3	Campbell
1994	81.3	Fallis
1994	81.3	Griswold
1994	81.3	Howle
1994	81.3	Miller
1994	81.3	Sandene
1995	81.4	Campbell
1995	81.4	Corbin
1995	81.4	McCullough-Brabson
1995	81.4	Reese
1995	81.4	Sarrazin
1995	81.4	Wignes
1995	81.5	Campbell
1995	81.5	Fallin
1995	81.5	Fant
1995	81.5	Forest
1995	81.5	Humpal & Dimmick
1995	81.5	Robinson
1995	81.6	Campbell
1995	81.6	Fiese & DeCarbo
1995	81.6	Frego
1995	81.6	Karjala
1995	81.6	Meredith
1995	81.6	Yudkin
1995	82.1	Bissell

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1995	82.1	Campbell
1995	82.1	Fung
1995	82.1	Hinckley
1995	82.1	Hinz
1995	82.1	McAdams & Nelson
1995	82.2	Campbell
1995	82.2	DiNatale & Russell
1995	82.2	Hinz
1995	82.2	Rees & Downs
1995	82.2	Rogers
1995	82.3	Beery
1995	82.3	Goolsby
1995	82.3	Hopton-Jones
1995	82.3	Linklater
1995	82.3	Svaline
1995	82.3	Weinstein
1996	82.4	Berg & Smith
1996	82.4	Demorest
1996	82.4	Gleason
1996	82.4	Mahlmann
1996	82.4	Mead
1996	82.4	Mobley
1996	82.5	Bernstorf
1996	82.5	Goldstaub
1996	82.5	Howard
1996	82.5	Kassner
1996	82.5	Rutkowski
1996	82.6	Armstrong & Armstrong
1996	82.6	Boardman
1996	82.6	Grashel
1996	82.6	McCarthy
1996	82.6	Vincent & Merrion
1996	82.6	Volk
1996	83.1	Cope
1996	83.1	Gustafson
1996	83.1	Kendall
1996	83.1	Robinson
1996	83.1	Shuler

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1996	83.1	Woodford
1996	83.2	Anderson & Wilson
1996	83.2	Asmus & Haack
1996	83.2	Goodson & Duling
1996	83.2	Patchen
1996	83.2	Patchen
1996	83.3	Baltzer
1996	83.3	Brophy
1996	83.3	Brunner
1996	83.3	Gremli
1996	83.3	Stambaugh
1996	83.3	Wagner
1997	83.4	Krueger
1997	83.4	Nimmo
1997	83.4	Orlofsky & Smith
1997	83.4	Trimis
1997	83.4	Wiggins & Wiggins
1997	83.5	Allsup
1997	83.5	Gaare
1997	83.5	Howle
1997	83.5	Lichtenwalner & Lockart
1997	83.5	Sinor
1997	83.6	Bauer
1997	83.6	Brahmstedt & Brahmstedt
1997	83.6	Hickey
1997	83.6	Junda
1997	83.6	Shamrock
1997	84.1	Brophy
1997	84.1	Deal & Taylor
1997	84.1	Kaschub
1997	84.1	Stufft
1997	84.1	Wells
1997	84.2	Huang
1997	84.2	Jordan-DeCarbo
1997	84.2	Mahlmann
1997	84.2	Richardson
1997	84.2	Tanner & Hood
1997	84.3	Coffman & Levy
1997	84.3	Kaschub

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1997	84.3	Reimer
1997	84.3	Rodriguez
1997	84.3	Spaeth
1998	84.4	Bitz
1998	84.4	Chivington
1998	84.4	Faulkner
1998	84.4	Kassner
1998	84.4	Snyder
1998	84.5	Graham
1998	84.5	Kassell
1998	84.5	Kassner
1998	84.5	Trimis
1998	84.6	Jarjisian
1998	84.6	Kassner
1998	84.6	Latten
1998	84.6	Rudaitis
1998	84.6	Stollak & Alexander
1998	85.1	Folstrom
1998	85.1	Kenny
1998	85.1	Reese & Davis
1998	85.1	Tarnowski, et al
1998	85.1	Ulveland
1998	85.2	Bissell
1998	85.2	Fenton
1998	85.2	Guelker-Cone
1998	85.2	Pedrick
1998	85.2	Smaligo
1998	85.3	Fonder
1998	85.3	Geiersbach
1998	85.3	Reese
1998	85.3	Scott
1998	85.3	Sindberg
1999	85.4	Fallis
1999	85.4	Hickey
1999	85.4	Lehman
1999	85.4	Spaeth
1999	85.4	Waters
1999	85.5	Bieber
1999	85.5	Ellis

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
1999	85.5	Hower
1999	85.5	Stamer
1999	85.5	Wiggins
1999	85.6	Battisti
1999	85.6	Boespflug
1999	85.6	Dalby
1999	85.6	George
1999	85.6	Whitcomb
1999	86.1	Levinowitz
1999	86.1	Reimer
1999	86.1	Roebuck
1999	86.1	Scott-Kassner
1999	86.1	Tarnowski
1999	86.1	Turner
1999	86.2	Asmus
1999	86.2	Goolsby
1999	86.2	Gordon
1999	86.2	LeCroy
1999	86.2	Stauffer
1999	86.3	Azzara
1999	86.3	Friar
1999	86.3	Leonhard
1999	86.3	McCusker
1999	86.3	Thompson
2000	86.4	Barresi
2000	86.4	Crocker
2000	86.4	Demorest
2000	86.4	Demorest
2000	86.4	Keenan-Takagi
2000	86.4	Williamson
2000	86.5	Campbell
2000	86.5	Colwell
2000	86.5	Hinckley
2000	86.5	Mark
2000	86.5	McClung
2000	86.5	Piersol
2000	86.6	Bush
2000	86.6	Kassner
2000	86.6	Keyes

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2000	86.6	Madsen
2000	86.6	Peterson
2000	86.6	Rutkowski
2000	87.1	Apfelstadt
2000	87.1	Broeker
2000	87.1	Goetze
2000	87.1	Mairs
2000	87.1	McCoy
2000	87.1	Persellin
2000	87.1	Reynolds
2000	87.2	Demorest & Morrison
2000	87.2	Flohr, et al
2000	87.2	Fox
2000	87.2	Hodges
2000	87.2	Hodges (two articles in this issue)
2000	87.2	Monsour
2000	87.3	Cutietta & Thompson
2000	87.3	Fallin & Royse
2000	87.3	Haack & Smith
2000	87.3	Hamann
2000	87.3	Hamann & Gordon
2000	87.3	Klotman
2000	87.3	Smith & Haack
2001	87.4	Adamek
2001	87.4	Bernstorf
2001	87.4	Damer
2001	87.4	Damer (two articles in this issue)
2001	87.4	McCord
2001	87.4	Zdzinski
2001	87.5	Barrett
2001	87.5	Burton
2001	87.5	Ellis & Fouts
2001	87.5	Latten
2001	87.5	Snyder
2001	87.5	Wiggins
2001	87.6	Bauer
2001	87.6	Beckstead
2001	87.6	Chiodo
2001	87.6	Gary

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2001	87.6	Sheldon
2001	87.6	Strauss
2001	87.6	White & White
2001	88.1	Brophy
2001	88.1	Hickey
2001	88.1	Hickey & Webster
2001	88.1	Pogonowski
2001	88.1	Reese
2001	88.1	Wilson
2001	88.2	Boardman
2001	88.2	Byo
2001	88.2	Corbin
2001	88.2	Gordon
2001	88.2	Morrison
2001	88.2	Stabley
2001	88.3	deVries
2001	88.3	Farberman
2001	88.3	Goodkin
2001	88.3	Gorelick
2001	88.3	Krueger
2001	88.3	Peterson
2001	88.3	Reimer
2001	88.3	VanWheelden
2002	88.4	Barnes
2002	88.4	Beck
2002	88.4	Honea
2002	88.4	Kassner
2002	88.4	Merrill
2002	88.4	Mixon
2002	88.4	Priest
2002	88.5	Brand
2002	88.5	Calogero
2002	88.5	Hansen & Bernstorf
2002	88.5	Lehman
2002	88.5	McDonald & Fisher
2002	88.5	Roebuck
2002	88.6	Burrack
2002	88.6	Conway
2002	88.6	Frederickson

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2002	88.6	Gary
2002	88.6	Mason
2002	88.6	Stamer
2002	89.1	Campbell
2002	89.1	Mark
2002	89.1	Mark (two articles in this issue)
2002	89.1	McCarthy & Goble
2002	89.1	McGuire
2002	89.1	Rideout
2002	89.1	Webster
2002	89.2	Campbell & Brummett
2002	89.2	McDonald, et al
2002	89.2	Merrill
2002	89.2	Peterson
2002	89.2	Wis
2002	89.2	Wolbers
2003	89.3	Brenan & Witte
2003	89.3	Hawkins & Beegle
2003	89.3	Mark
2003	89.3	Stegman
2003	89.3	Tomassetti
2003	89.3	Walker
2003	89.3	Wis
2003	89.4	Bergee & Demorest
2003	89.4	Cavner & Gould
2003	89.4	LaCombe
2003	89.4	Morin
2003	89.4	Patterson
2003	89.5	Abril
2003	89.5	Cavner & Gould
2003	89.5	Conway
2003	89.5	Stevens
2003	89.5	Wilson
2003	90.1	Beck
2003	90.1	Campbell & Beegle
2003	90.1	Ginocchio
2003	90.1	Smith
2003	90.1	Strand
2003	90.2	Barry & Conlon

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2003	90.2	Brown
2003	90.2	DeLorenzo
2003	90.2	Hart
2003	90.2	Strouse
2004	90.3	Ferguson
2004	90.3	Gray
2004	90.3	Kelly & VanWheelden
2004	90.3	Rosenbloom
2004	90.3	Woody
2004	90.4	Bartram
2004	90.4	Bell
2004	90.4	Kersten
2004	90.4	Linaberry
2004	90.4	Robinson
2004	90.4	Scott & Harrassowitz
2004	90.5	Avery
2004	90.5	Burton
2004	90.5	Hammel
2004	90.5	Kostka
2004	90.5	Skoog
2004	90.5	Vance
2004	91.1	Bell & Robinson
2004	91.1	Colgrass
2004	91.1	Conway, et al
2004	91.1	Reimer
2004	91.1	Rogers
2004	91.1	Scheib
2004	91.2	Allsup & Baxter
2004	91.2	Byo
2004	91.2	deVries
2004	91.2	Kindall-Smith
2004	91.2	Lovingood
2004	91.2	Orzolek
2005	91.3	Bennett
2005	91.3	Gauthier
2005	91.3	Mixon
2005	91.3	Rappaport
2005	91.3	Sindberg
2005	91.3	Wiggins

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2005	91.4	Barrett
2005	91.4	Dunbar-Hall
2005	91.4	Fallin & Garrison
2005	91.4	Green
2005	91.4	Hanley & Montgomery
2005	91.4	Hanley & Montgomery (two articles in this issue)
2005	91.4	Rideout
2005	91.5	Bobetsky
2005	91.5	Broomhead
2005	91.5	Burrack & McKenzie
2005	91.5	de l'Etoile
2005	91.5	Lew & Campbell
2005	91.5	Siligo
2005	92.1	Abrahams
2005	92.1	Campbell
2005	92.1	Dalby
2005	92.1	Szabo
2005	92.1	Volz
2005	92.1	Zielinski
2005	92.2	Costes
2005	92.2	Isbell
2005	92.2	Schneider
2005	92.2	Sheron & Kish
2005	92.2	Smith
2005	92.2	Trollinger
2006	92.3	Barefield
2006	92.3	Clukey
2006	92.3	Krueger
2006	92.3	Riveire
2006	92.3	Russell
2006	92.3	Winslow & Winslow
2006	92.4	Fitzgerald
2006	92.4	Haack
2006	92.4	Lapka
2006	92.4	McCord & Fitzgerald
2006	92.4	McCord & Watts
2006	92.4	Montgomery & Martinson
2006	92.5	Belz
2006	92.5	Carolin

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2006	92.5	Conway
2006	92.5	Grecher & Tobin
2006	92.5	Hiatt & Cross
2006	92.5	Scheib
2006	93.1	Abril
2006	93.1	Klonoski
2006	93.1	Liperote
2006	93.1	Parr
2006	93.1	Sarrazin
2006	93.2	Damm
2006	93.2	Dawson
2006	93.2	Ester, et al
2006	93.2	Maltas & McCarty-Clair
2006	93.2	Manfredo
2006	93.2	Smith
2007	93.3	Campbell
2007	93.3	Campbell & Brummett
2007	93.3	Conkling
2007	93.3	Reimer
2007	93.3	Thompson
2007	93.3	Wiggins
2007	93.4	Freer & Dansereau
2007	93.4	Haston
2007	93.4	Lanier
2007	93.4	Rufino
2007	93.4	Ruthmann
2007	93.4	Woody
2007	93.5	Abril & Gault
2007	93.5	Allsup
2007	93.5	Edwards & Dendler
2007	93.5	Tutt
2007	93.5	Webb
2007	94.1	Freer
2007	94.1	McCarthy
2007	94.1	Reese
2007	94.1	Thompson
2007	94.1	Williams
2007	94.2	Barron
2007	94.2	Freer

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2007	94.2	Kratus
2007	94.2	Lau
2007	94.2	Scholtens
2008	94.3	Chesky
2008	94.3	Horvath
2008	94.3	LaPine
2008	94.3	Palac
2008	94.3	Sternback
2008	94.4	Conway
2008	94.4	Lehman
2008	94.4	Lychner
2008	94.4	Shieh
2008	94.4	Williams
2008	94.5	Blair & Kondo
2008	94.5	Brown
2008	94.5	Jenkins
2008	94.5	Jorgensen & Pfeiler
2008	94.5	MacKay
2008	95.1	Bowman
2008	95.1	Campbell & Lum
2008	95.1	Freer
2008	95.1	Hill
2008	95.1	Soto
2008	95.1	Sullivan
2008	95.2	Berg
2008	95.2	Criss
2008	95.2	Elpus
2008	95.2	Geraldi
2008	95.2	Parker
2008	95.2	Turner
2009	95.3	Blair
2009	95.3	Clements
2009	95.3	Freer
2009	95.3	Howell
2009	95.3	Johnson
2009	95.3	Lum
2009	95.3	Ulrich
2009	95.4	Garner
2009	95.4	Gerrity

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2009	95.4	Hale & Green
2009	95.4	Hourigan
2009	95.4	Kerstetter
2009	95.4	Mixon
2009	95.4	Scruggs
2009	95.4	Sindberg
2009	95.4	Stegman
2009	96.1	Bartolome
2009	96.1	Beckmann-Collier
2009	96.1	Cane
2009	96.1	Hourigan & Hourigan
2009	96.1	Kassner
2009	96.1	Schraer-Joiner & Prause-Weber
2009	96.2	Bergonzi
2009	96.2	Burrack
2009	96.2	Dekaney & Cunningham
2009	96.2	Mills
2009	96.2	Reese
2009	96.2	Small
2010	96.3	Bernard
2010	96.3	Dell
2010	96.3	Kindall-Smith
2010	96.3	Koster
2010	96.3	Nicolucci
2010	96.3	Standerfer & Hunter
2010	96.4	Bruns
2010	96.4	Dovel
2010	96.4	Graulty
2010	96.4	Guptill & Zaza
2010	96.4	Jorgensen
2010	96.4	Semmes
2010	97.1	Criss
2010	97.1	Harrison
2010	97.1	Koops
2010	97.1	Nicolucci
2010	97.1	Tanner
2010	97.1	Townsend
2010	97.2	Bauer
2010	97.2	Frederickson

(table continues)

Year	Volume.Issue	Author
2010	97.2	Norris
2010	97.2	Peterson & Madsen
2010	97.2	Robertson & Eisensmith
2010	97.2	Salvador

APPENDIX C

FOLDER ORGANIZATION FOR PUBLICATION DOWNLOADS

Folder Name	Content
Folder A	MEJ, 1991–2000
Folder B	JRME, 1991–2000
Folder C	MEJ & JRME, 1991–2000
Folder D	MEJ, 2001–2010
Folder E	JRME, 2001–2010
Folder F	MEJ & JRME, 2001–2010
Folder G	MEJ, 1991–2010
Folder H	JRME, 1991–2010
Folder I	MEJ & JRME, 1991–2010