A META-AGGREGATIVE ANALYSIS OF MUSIC COMPOSITION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Graeme Materne

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF MUSIC

December 2020

Committee:

Elizabeth Menard, Advisor

Elaine Colprit

ABSTRACT

Elizabeth Menard, Advisor

In 2004, Goran Folkestad analyzed teachers' approaches to instructing music composition and creativity in a meta-analysis. He found that there were no obvious changes in instruction across all age ranges, that students' creative experiences were informed by previous musical and cultural experiences, and that "external conditions [for composing were] formulated" (Folkestad, 2004). The aim of the present study is to expand on Folkestad's framework and explore the contexts and strategies that teachers use to successfully integrate music composition in their secondary classrooms. A total of ten studies were analyzed using a meta-aggregative approach in order to identify strategies, contexts, and technologies that are conducive to teaching music composition in secondary school classrooms. A comparison of Folkestad's original findings with the current data was also undertaken. The data indicated that the original themes presented by Folkestad were consistent with trends that emerged in the present analysis. In addition to these findings, it was also determined that four new trends may be added to this list: (1) establishing a creative environment for students that allows them to experiment is crucial for composition development; (2) feedback is essential for students to learn how to critique their own works and peers' works; (3) technology can be used to differentiate composition instruction across a variety of ability levels; and (4) collaboration may help students gain confidence while developing their compositions.

This thesis is dedicated to my father, Harry P. Materne III.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many individuals who need acknowledging here, far too innumerable to count. First and foremost, I would like to thank my parents for their continued support throughout this endeavor. My mother instilled in me a love of the arts, and my father taught me how to love learning. My brother was also someone that helped lend an ear when I needed his advice.

I would be remiss if I did not thank my many friends and colleagues who helped encourage me throughout this study. From the early days of planning with the curriculum lab group to the late-night vent sessions with my roommates Hayley Plauger and Kacie Pummill, these moments helped push me through to this—hopefully—glorious finale.

A tremendous "thank you" goes to my committee, Drs. Elizabeth Menard and Elaine Colprit. Dr. Menard: you have taught me how to be a critical evaluator and a disciplined teacher. I am immensely thankful that you gave me a chance during my undergraduate career to assist with facilitating composition in Music Plus. If not for that, I do not know if I would have had the chance to perform this study under your guidance. Dr. Colprit: where do I start? You continually feed my desire to question the musical world. I so look forward to discussing any manner of topics when we have the time. I will greatly miss those talks when I have moved on from Bowling Green.

Last and certainly not least, I would like to acknowledge my better half, Serena Holdosh, who has been my guide through this Herculean trial. Her kindness, knowledge, and patience during bouts of inspiration and anxiety are emblematic of the type of person she encourages me to be.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In her textbook *Music Outside the Lines,* Maud Hickey (2012) outlined approaches to teaching music composition in K-12 environments, arguing that composition and the creative process should be at the core of music instruction:

> The core of all music teaching should come from the creative essence of music. It begins by organizing the curriculum with the end goals in mind, but must follow a map through the unknown territories that composition and improvisation will bring (p. 156).

Composing is a creative activity that is accessible to everyone, but it is often omitted from music instruction as children progress through school. Unfortunately, music composition is often "…viewed as a special skill that only an elite few can do" (Hickey, 2012, p. 13). Music composition is often thought of as an activity that musicians can perform once they have learned prerequisite skills including a background in music theory. It is often reserved for those students who are exceedingly bright or for students who go on to pursue music composition in higher education. Hickey defined music composition as a process of "…organizing music parts into logical, interesting, and feelingful form" (p. 7). A more technical definition of music composition can be found in *Encyclopedia Brittanica*, which states that composition is the "act of conceiving a piece of music, the art of creating music, or the finished product" (Crossley-Holland & Ringer, 2013). The composition process is unique to every composer, one that composers of all levels learn to craft throughout their lives. In fact, teaching students to compose and think creatively comprises all other musical skills, like listening, performing, theorizing, and arranging.

While there is consensus that teaching music composition benefits students' musical skills, it is scarcely integrated in any extended duration in American music education. This hesitancy is fueled by teachers' fear that they do not have enough time, materials, or training to teach music composition (Hopkins, 2013; Hopkins, 2015; Menard, 2015). It could also be argued that pre-service teachers are not taught how to teach elements of composition and creativity to their students. These are issues that need to be addressed in order to broaden students' musical understanding and musical experiences.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of integrating composition into American music education curricula is relatively young compared to the country's music education history. One of the first organized and well-publicized music composition projects in the United States was the Young Composer's Project (YCP) in 1959. Funded by the Ford Foundation, this project placed young composers in schools around America, where they worked with students and faculty to write original works for the school's student ensembles, such as orchestra, band, and choir (Rinehart, 2002). The Contemporary Music Project (CMP) followed the YCP and was a decade-long program once again developed by the Ford Foundation, which helped to sponsor composition and improvisation in America's schools (Rinehart, 2002). A third project, the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project, was developed by the federal government and "…emphasized composition and the comprehensive study of music" (Rinehart, 2002, p. 3). Comprehensive musicianship is a concept that unifies the YCP, CMP, and Manhattanville. Sindberg (2007) defined comprehensive musicianship as a "…holistic approach to music teaching and learning" (p. 26). Because composition requires students to use a logical sense of form—like Hickey (2012) implies—the student must draw from a variety of different aspects of their musical intellect, such as discriminatory listening, understanding of pitch relationships, theoretical music knowledge, and personal aesthetic tastes in order to create a unique product.

Including music composition in a music education curriculum is a critical way to develop students' musical understanding, which is the student's ability to realize and interpret musical material (Elliott, 1995; Hickey, 2012; Kaschub & Smith, 2009; Reimer, 2003; Webster, 2009). In NAfME's 1994 Benchmark Publication, which outlined the requisite learning and teaching expectations for music educators, Rinehart (2002) stated that "Skill in composition is not an

isolated ability but tends to be associated with other musical skills, including performing and responding to music" (p. 3). Kaschub & Smith (2009) provided a five-prong rationale for integrating composition into music education, which is imbedded with statements that reflect the growth of musical knowledge and self-understanding that takes place when children compose. They explained composing as "…a process that allows the child to grow, discover, and create himself or herself through artistic and meaningful engagement with sounds" (Kaschub & Smith, 2009, p. 5). This is *personal* growth for the student. Students develop a better sense of understanding by applying their prior musical knowledge with the means to create a tangible product. By doing so, students will also be able to identify how they work and what processes are the most beneficial to them when solving musical problems.

The Creative Thinking Process & Music

Music compositions are products of the creative thinking process and manifestations of a student's creativity (Hickey, 2012; Kaschub & Smith, 2009; Webster, 2002). If composition is to be taught, the creative thinking process must be addressed as well. One of the seminal works that addressed a model for the creative thinking process was developed by Graham Wallas. This model was comprised of five distinct stages: (1) preparation, (2) incubation, (3) intimation, (4) illumination, and (5) verification (Sadler-Smith, 2015). Sadler-Smith (2015) defined the preparation and verification steps as "book-ends" to the creative process (p. 345). In the preparation, the individual educates and prepares themselves in the discipline that they are creating in. This creation is presented in the verification step as a tangible, finished product. The three inner steps that Wallas described are all varying degrees of realizing the creative experience. Incubation is a subconscious manifestation of creating, and illumination is the conscious awakening of creative output, with intimation falling between these two levels

(Sadler-Smith, 2015). In essence, the transformation from incubation to illumination is an evolution of the individual's conscious thought.

Another prominent psychologist who has researched creativity is Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi. Csikszentmihalyi (1996) defined creativity as "any act, idea, or product that changes an existing domain, or that transforms an existing domain into a new one" (p. 28). By domain, Csikszentmihalyi is referring to a specialized discipline, like art, music, or psychology. He also believed that there is a difference in the type of creativity that a creative person exhibits within their discipline. "Capital C" creativity is a term that Csikszentmihalyi reserved for truly exceptional creators, such as Mozart, Einstein, or Da Vinci. These were innovators that redefined their domains and shed light on new types of thinking and possibilities. While Csikszentmihalyi believed true creativity is revolutionary, he believed that everyone can be creative and need not accomplish revolutionary changes to be so.

Regardless of the creative magnitude a person possesses, they likely will have experienced Csikszentmihalyi's concept of flow, an experience that is central to his creative theory. Flow is an "optimal experience" that bends the realities of time, letting the participant lose themselves in an activity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). In flow, the individual's "[c]oncentration is so intense that there is no attention left over to think about anything irrelevant, or to worry about problems. Self-consciousness disappears and the sense of time becomes distorted" (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, p. 71). Creative individuals perform flow activities which provide "enjoyable experiences" for that individual (p. 72). Csikszentmihalyi and his team of researchers investigated creative individuals' responses to flow activities and in every instance, his team found that the activity "…provided a sense of discovery, a creative feeling of transporting the person into a new reality" (p. 74). The psychologist elucidated that just because

a person is actively performing a flow activity, does not mean that they will encounter a flow experience. This boils down to the participant's engagement and enjoyment of the task (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). If an individual does not enjoy the task, they may not experience flow.

Creativity has been a foundation in many philosophies of music education. Reimer (2003) described that when an individual creates, they are "…demonstrating qualities one's culture considers creative" (p. 109). This is a rather broad, cultural definition, but it brings an important point to light: a person's voice and identity aligns with the cultural contexts in which they compose (Reimer, 2003; Stauffer, 2003). Reimer (2003) rejected Csikszentmihalyi's definition of "Capital C" creativity, stating that while there may be divine genius in some creators, these creations need to be put on a scale, "a scale applicable to all humans because all humans are capable of being creative to some degree on that scale and are capable of improving that degree if they are helped to do so" (p. 109). It is the music educator's role to help students improve their degree of creativity. Teaching students how to think critically about the music they are playing, hearing, and creating may help them to become autonomous musicians in the future, meaning that they will be able to make informed musical decisions on their own without the assistance of an expert or instructor.

Elliott (1995) stated "…developing students' musical creativity overlaps and extends the process of developing students' musicianship" (p. 215). It is also important to note that the terms "composing" and "creating" are not synonymous. The distinction is found in the fact that composing is a *means* to creating, not creating itself (Elliott, 1995). Unlike the aesthetic philosophy supported by Reimer, Elliott argued in his praxial philosophy that there is no actual creative process, but that the "…cognitive processes involved in producing creative results 'can be understood as exceptional versions of familiar mental operations'" (Perkins, 1981, as cited in

Elliott, 1995, p. 224). It could be argued that Elliott's idea of the creative process borrows from Wallas'. Instead of thinking about the Wallas five-step model as leading to creative output, these five steps can be thought of as the "familiar mental operations" that Elliott referenced.

Like Elliott, Peter Webster (2009; 2002) believed that creativity is part of a person's thought processes. His model of creative thinking "…is a dynamic process of alternation between convergent and divergent thinking, moving in stages over time, enabled by certain skills (both innate and learned), and by certain conditions, all resulting in a final product" (Webster, 2002, p. 26). He described divergent thinking in the composer in an exploratory way, where the musician is searching for as many possibilities as possible. This is contrasted with convergent thought, where the student is refining their material into a coherent product (Webster, 2002). Webster echoed Hickey's sentiments, stating that the process of creative thinking is not saved for the few, but that "[i]t can be defined and identified in all of us" (p. 27). Central to Webster's model is the "interplay" between divergent and convergent thinking. It is the movement between these two processes that enables people to be creative. For creative thought to be realized, Webster (2002) stated that there needs to be a tangible product, which in music could be an analysis, an improvisation, a performance, or a composition.

The Compositional Process

When students compose, they have the opportunity to improve many different musical skills. Notation and note-reading may improve; harmonic relationships may be realized; timbres and textures may be discovered; and rhythm may solidify. If composing is an important part of the development of musicianship, then it is important to understand the compositional process. Barrett (2003) described the composing process as a form of meaning-making for the child:

> If education, and by extension music education, is the development of children's capacity both to construct meaning from encounters with their worlds and to construct their worlds in meaningful ways, then a view of composition as a form of meaning-making seems a worthy enterprise (p. 6).

She supported this meaning-making process through different psychological and sociological lenses, where she referenced Bruner's thoughts of cultural psychology and Vygotsky's concept of social constructivism. Bruner believed that culture was the main influencer in the development of a person's mental processes and Vygotsky "suggested that human learning is inherently social in nature" (Barret, 2003, p. 7). Barrett (2003) explained that "[c]ultural psychology admits that higher mental processes, such as language and music, are both formed by, and formative of, culture" (p. 7). Because music is formative of culture, students engaged with music can derive meaning from creating it. Barrett stated that "[t]his new focus acknowledges the crucial role of the *sociocultural* and *material* worlds in the construction and demonstration of knowledge" (p. 8). She further expanded her rationale for composition as a meaning-making enterprise noting that "…children are able to construct knowledge of themselves (self-identity), as well as their culture (group-identity)" through music composition (p. 10). The composition process allows the student to assimilate their cultural and personal values.

Stauffer (2003) explained that a composer's identity "is made up of the unique qualities of musical sound that allow the informed listener to associate a work with its composer" (p. 91). No matter the composer's evolution of sound or character, their music will still have a unique voice at the end of the day (Stauffer, 2003). Even though children may not have the amount of experience as a professional composer, they still give their music voice and identity because they "create what is meaningful to them on their own terms" (p. 95). She went on to state that

"…because young composers have knowledge that is embedded in culture and experience, they create music grounded in their own lives" (p. 96).

Brown & Dillon (2013) supported the idea that a composer defines their voice and meaning through modes of meaningful engagement with music. The modes of engagement they refer to are attending, evaluating, directing, exploring, and embodying. They further supported that these modes are realized through the creative process:

> We suggest that creative acts reside in two complimentary dimensions: (1) types of actions and the extent of engagement with music through them; and (2) contexts for action and the opportunities for meaning they provide. Through these lenses the experience of meaningful engagement involves an immersion in a creative process that enables a composer to connect with his or her intuitive experience…of music. This occurs as a result of an increased sensitivity and awareness of musical materials. Furthermore, it acknowledges that creating music can facilitate an understanding of structural relations, the potential for expressive development and relationships with others (p. 79).

This concept of meaningful engagement allows composers to appropriate meanings from personal, social, and cultural experiences in their works, ultimately helping to define their compositional voice (Brown & Dillon, 2013). Meaningful engagement is similar to Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) concept of flow, whereby if the experience of composing is meaningful enough, the composer can become transfixed and lost in what they are producing.

Technology & Music Composition

In our ever-evolving technological world, it is important to examine how technology has influenced music composition instruction. In the last twenty years, software, applications, and

interfaces like *Finale™*, *Sibelius™*, *Logic™*, and *GarageBand™* have been developed. These software programs assist with the music composition process. No longer must students use pencil and paper to share their ideas. Anyone can have access to composition on their personal device and listen to what they have composed in real time.

Carter (2013) and Dammers (2013) stated that incorporating technology into teaching music composition streamlines the process for students. One anxiety that many music educators hold is their discomfort with unfamiliar software (Carter, 2013). Unfortunately, many pre-service teachers are not taught how to adequately use notation and looping software, at least on a level where they feel comfortable with teaching their future students how to use it. Dammers (2013) suggested that advances in technology "lower the barriers" into incorporating technology in the music classroom (p. 201). He also listed many affordances of incorporating music technology in instruction, stating that students have "greater control over musical materials," the scope of instruction strays away from a "'one size fits all approach'," and the more affordable prices and portability of computer devices makes the learning process personal and customizable (Dammers 2013, p. 201). With these luxuries that technology affords, it seems that by using it, teaching would be easier.

Teaching Music Creativity in Primary Schools

Creating original musical products is a foundation in many American primary music classrooms with improvisation being a common activity in general music classes (Beegle, 2010; Gruenhagen & Whitcomb, 2014). Beegle (2010) examined her students' approaches to group improvisation where students created short improvisations based on different art forms. She found that student groups used similar methods for the planning, preparation, and execution of their improvisations, namely through "role assignments, exploration, run-throughs, and

discussion and negotiation" (Beegle, 2010, p. 224). She also noted that students would often mimic or replicate an aspect of the original source in their music improvisation. Gruenhagen & Whitcomb (2014) surveyed general music teachers in the United States, wanting to discover the ways teachers implemented improvisation into their instruction. The researchers found that teachers often used call-and-response activities and defined parameters for students to build security in their improvisatory abilities. By establishing improvisation parameters, the teachers were able to manage the task that students performed, which helped them focus on a particular skill to master. Overall, teachers reported that improvisation was an important aspect of their instruction and "…necessary to the development of students' musical skills, as an important way for students to show their musical understanding, and as an empowering and creative process that produced more independent thinkers and musicians" (Gruenhagen & Whitcomb, 2014, p. 392).

Teaching Music Composition in Secondary Schools

A common characteristic of American secondary school's music programs is an emphasis on performance ensembles. While general music is emphasized in primary-school learning, there is a shift to performance-oriented learning once students reach secondary school. This is not to say that a general music class is void of performance, but the focus of a wholistic learning experience—one where students are performing, listening, composing, reacting, and describing—may not be replicated to this extent for older students. Because of the rigorous demands to perform a required number of performances and perform at contest that must be met by school bands, choirs, and orchestras, maximizing rehearsal time may be favored over exploring comprehensive music activities like composing.

Teaching composition at the secondary level can be difficult because of the variety of talent and skill levels that these students possess (Kaschub & Smith, 2009). When discussing the characteristics of upper middle-school composers, Kaschub & Smith (2009) stated that these composers:

> …want freedom but would also like some guidelines. They want to write their *own* music but make every effort to sound just like the pop star currently occupying the top of the charts. They want their music to stand out but also to blend in (p. 205).

When discussing characteristics of high-school composers, the authors noted that these students have a wealth of both aural and musical knowledge, "…allow[ing] them to imagine music far more complex than what they may be able to produce" (p. 233). Contrasting the "emotional turmoil" that middle-school composers deal with, high school composers are more settled and focused on what they are wanting to produce (p. 233). The variation between skill, talent, imagination, and emotion can make the process of teaching composition to secondary-aged students difficult, and the planning and preparation needs to be diversified for the variety of ages. This difficulty lies in the many ways that students learn information. For this reason, it can be said again that composition cannot really be *taught*, but a teacher may be able to *facilitate* it. By facilitating, there is a role reversal, whereby the students become the primary givers of information and the teacher can then help mold, manipulate, and manage what the student presents.

Strand (2006) examined the ways that Indiana public school teachers used composition in their teaching. She created a survey and distributed it to a third of Indiana's public schools and received 339 responses (Strand, 2006). The survey included "…questions about demographics,

practices, and perspectives related to classroom composition" (p. 156). While a majority of teachers (71.9%) believed that children learn a lot through composing, only 5.9% of teachers answered that they often integrate composition into their teaching (Strand, 2006). For those that did not use composition in their teaching, the most common reason was that " there were too many other learning activities to include in the classroom" with the second reason being that there was "a lack of access to technology" (p. 160). Strand also commented that even though many believe that composition is a worthwhile activity, "[t]eachers are still held back by both perceived and real classroom challenges" (p. 165). It is disconcerting that teachers do not feel like they have access to the necessary resources to teach composition effectively. This may go back to the deficiency in teaching pre-service music educators how to teach composition.

Statement of the Problem

Research has shown that including composition in instruction can help expand students' engagement (Bolden, 2009; Hall, 2015; Hopkins, 2013; Menard, 2015; Ward, 2009) and musical understanding (Bolden, 2009; Hopkins, 2013; Menard, 2015). While there are many resources on implementing music composition into curricula, teachers have strayed away from doing this in America's secondary schools. Many secondary music teachers are hesitant to include composition into their teaching because of a belief that they do not have the proper skillset, adequate time, or the correct tools to teach it (Gall & Breeze, 2005; Hopkins, 2015; Hopkins, 2013; Menard, 2015; Wise, 2016). Identifying and compiling clear strategies may help teachers facilitate composition more effectively. With the variety of resources that are published in this line of research, my hope is that these disparate presentations may be combined and simplified to maximize teachers' potential to provide meaningful composition instruction in the classroom.

The Framework

This study began with a search for a potential framework on which I could base my research. I found that inspiration in Folkestad's (2004) meta-analysis, where he proposed "…a model of how to apply a meta-analytic approach to qualitative research in music education" (p. 84) based on creativity and music composition. His goal was to show that meta-analyses should be a focus in qualitative music education research. He examined six multi-year composition case studies and analyzed their emerging trends. The studies were significant in that the data were collected over a period of two to three years (Folkestad, 2004). The studies were not limited to a certain age range, and instead, Folkestad wanted to examine if the "conditions for optimal context" and "characteristics of instruction" differed among ages (p. 87). He found that condition for creative activities and composition are similar across children and adults. It was also found that the creative experience was informed by participants' cultural and musical experiences (Folkestad, 2004). He stated that "…creative music making and music identity are two sides of the same coin, in that the former provides an arena on which the latter can be explored and expressed" (Folkestad, 2004, p. 88). One aspect that was crucial for the musicians' creative experiences was the way that "external conditions are formulated," or proscribed (p. 88). He also stated that it was important for an educator to distinguish the purpose of the composition project, where hopefully the student evolved from working in a prescribed framework to one that was independently generated by the student. By analyzing more contemporary studies in the field, I hope to expand on Folkestad's work and identify current, emerging trends in integrating music composition activities into secondary instruction.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify strategies and contexts that are conducive to teaching music composition in secondary school classrooms. Emerging themes from studies were analyzed. Themes that are widespread throughout studies will be deemed important and codified as successful strategies. In addition, results will be compared with Folkestad's original findings. A problem that is prevalent among music educators is a belief that they are not capable of teaching or integrating composition into music instruction (Hopkins, 2013; Menard, 2015; Strand, 2006). My hope is that by reading this study, music educators will realize that they can indeed integrate music composition into their everyday curriculum and teaching practices by finding clarity in the emerging trends that are presented.

Research Questions

This study was framed around the following questions:

1. What secondary classroom contexts lend themselves to teaching composition?
2. What common themes emerge with teachers who implement music composition activities?
3. How has technology been used to facilitate music composition instruction?

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

In order to study teachers' uses of composition in secondary schools, a meta-aggregative synthesis was used to analyze and identify emerging themes from contemporary research in music composition instruction. Aggregative synthesis is a type of qualitative synthesis, which "entail[s] listing the findings of various primary research studies and then further combining them into themes or similar descriptors to produce a general description of the phenomenon under study" (Paterson, 2011, p. 5). Paterson (2011) stated that the "appeal of qualitative evidence synthesis lies mainly in its ability to effect outcomes that are not feasible or possible in a single qualitative study" (p. 2). Of the two types of meta-qualitative synthesis that Paterson discussed—aggregative and interpretive— an aggregative approach was preferred for this study because of the scope and utility of the findings. An interpretive synthesis would have looked to further interpret the results and draw new conclusions from them (Paterson, 2011). These new conclusions would themselves be new themes. Instead, the aggregative approach was advantageous because it was used to identify and connect existing themes between the selected studies.

An investigation of national and international scholarly publications was undertaken to identify studies for inclusion in this synthesis. The databases Academic Search Complete, JSTOR, *PsychInfo* and *Worldcat* were used for this search. Only peer-reviewed studies were included in this synthesis. The search terms "music composition" and "secondary music" were used as keywords for narrowing the scope of the literature.

To be included, studies needed to focus on teaching music composition in secondary settings. International secondary settings—such as the UK—have a slightly different secondary education procedure than that of the United States. In the UK, students are required to go to what

is called “lower secondary” school from age 12 to age 16 (Internations). Once they have finished this schooling, they “…may either choose to start work or vocational training. Or they can go on to college or sixth form, where 16 to 18-year-olds prepare for university” (Internations). Studies that included teacher and student commentary on perceptions of music composition, technology, and a thorough explanation of the composition teaching process were important to include because of their association with the research questions.

After a thorough review of 50 research studies, ten met all requirements and were selected for analysis in this study. Because this synthesis was intended to serve as an extension of Folkestad’s (2004) model, research conducted before 2005 was not included. After the list of ten studies was finalized, they were analyzed to identify main ideas that aligned with the research questions, and then were coded. For an idea to be deemed “codable,” a repetition of the idea needed to appear in at least three studies involved in the analysis. These codes were then placed into a series of tables, which listed the codes and their comparisons between studies. Next, studies were read a second time to ensure that all information had been gathered, which also included a recoding and reorganization of these tables. Findings between studies were then combined and correlated to identify emerging trends and themes in the data.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Results are organized by research question. Emerging themes were established if a unique code was shared across three studies. Short annotations of the reviewed literature can be found in Appendix A of this document.

Teaching Contexts

A total of ten research publications were analyzed for this study (Table 1). All studies pertained to teaching music composition in secondary music classes. The earliest study that was analyzed was published in 2005 and the most recent was published in 2019. Of these ten studies, three were written by American music educators and seven were written by music educators from Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Germany. The primary settings analyzed in the American publications were traditional orchestra and band classrooms, while the primary settings for international publications were general music-style classrooms. Of the ten studies, three examined both middle-school and high-school aged students.

The settings of two studies (Hall, 2015; Wise, 2016) were alternative forms of performance classes. Hall (2015) worked with ensembles configurated as rock bands. Students were instructed in ensemble workshop environments, where they would collaborate and write original music. Wise (2016) interviewed teachers of different performance ensembles from four different New Zealand secondary schools. A mixture of ensembles was analyzed in this research. Wise focused on the methods that these teachers used to integrate Sibelius and/or looping software like *Garageband*™ into their instruction. Wieneke (2019) did not analyze teaching in a specific setting, but examined approaches to implementing contemporary music projects, which included composition, in high schools across Germany. One of the approaches that these German music educators relied on was the support of the project by the community.

Table 1. Secondary Teaching Settings

Author (Date)	HS	MS	Orch.	Band	Chamber Ensemble	Gen. Music	Performance Classes
Hopkins (2015)	X		X		X		X
Hopkins (2013)		X	X				X
Menard (2015)	X			X		X	X
Wise (2016)*		X	X			X	X
Wieneke (2019)*	X	X					
Hall (2015)*	X						X
Gall & Breeze (2005)*		X				X	
Ward (2009)*	X	X				X	
Breeze (2009)*	X	X				X	
Bolden (2009)*	X					X	

*****denotes international study

Teacher Perceptions

Analysis of teacher and student perceptions of music composition was an important feature in some studies. Researchers obtained data from interviews, journals, recordings, surveys, pre- and post-assessments of student compositions, or any combination of these data collection methods. Perceptions were categorized in two major areas: perceived challenges and perceived benefits of including music composition in the curriculum.

Teachers' Perceived Challenges of Teaching Music Composition

There were four main challenges that emerged as themes addressing teacher perceptions of challenge in composition instruction. One of the teachers' main worries was the composition

project's effect on a traditional classroom environment. This was largely present in performance-based settings, where composition is rarely integrated. There was the assumption that implementation of a composition project would be too drastic of a shift away from the classrooms' traditional learning context. With these potential changes, teachers also worried that they might have difficulty controlling the classroom. Similar to teachers' classroom management worries were their feelings about time management. Teachers worried about managing time in the classroom. Another fear that many teachers had was that their students might lack the required knowledge to compose music. Knowing how to effectively facilitate composition instruction was another concern. During their pre-service careers, many teachers do not receive training to facilitate composition or composition software. Teachers either were not familiar enough with the technology in order to teach its functions or with their ability to give feedback while using technology.

Table 2. Teachers' Perceived Challenges

Author (Date)	Effect on classroom environment	Student readiness & lack of knowledge	Inadequate teacher training to facilitate composition	Time
Hopkins (2015)	X			X
Hopkins (2013)	X	X	X	X
Menard (2015)	X	X	X	X
Wise (2016)*			X	
Gall & Breeze (2005)*	X	X	X	

*denotes international study

Teachers' Perceived Benefits of Teaching Music Composition

Teachers' perceived benefits of composition instruction outnumbered their perceived challenges. All but three articles included information regarding teachers' perceived benefits of including music composition in their instruction. One of the largest perceived benefits was that students engaged more than anticipated with the material. Some teachers held the belief that students might not engage with the new material but instead found that their engagement actually increased. As students composed more, they became more confident in their abilities to do so and began to identify as composers. Contrary to teachers' beliefs that students would not possess adequate musical knowledge, students' musical knowledge increased after composition projects were integrated into the curriculum.

Another perception that shifted was the role that the teacher played. Teachers found that their roles shifted from being a director toward being a facilitator. No longer were teachers having to be the ones instructing, and they could interact with their students on a more personal, one-on-one basis, helping students solve specific obstacles. A final perception of benefit in teachers' instruction was the ability for composition software to differentiate instruction. Music composition software allows for instant playback, which gives students the immediacy of knowing how their material sounds. Because sequencing software is largely visual and is comprised of prerecorded media, it can be used as an introduction to composition for students that may have weaker musical backgrounds.

Table 3. Teachers' Perceived Benefits

Author (Date)	Student engagement	Evolution of teacher role	Development of musical understanding	Student performance	Student Image	Comp. software allows for differentiated instruction	Mistakes are a necessary part of the comp. process
Hopkins (2013)	X	X	X	X	X		
Menard (2015)	X		X		X		
Wise (2016)*						X	
Hall (2015)*	X	X		X			
Gall & Breeze (2005)*						X	
Ward (2009)*	X	X			X	X	X
Bolden (2009)*	X	X	X		X	X	

*denotes international study

Student Perceptions

Only two researchers (Menard, 2015; Ward, 2009) discussed the perceived challenges that students have while composing. Because there were only two articles in this category, the requirement of three articles for emerging themes was lifted; therefore, all student perceptions of challenge will be addressed. Many of the perceived challenges students noted aligned with teachers' perceived challenges of composition instruction that are listed in Table 2.

Students acknowledged that composition projects could alter the way that their classes would function, citing time and the project's fit inside the performance culture as problem areas. They also felt that they may lack required musical knowledge and be able to notate their ideas

effectively. Another challenge that was discovered through the compositional process was that by being off task, the students wasted valuable time during class. A final belief that students held was that they tended to be too critical of their work.

Table 4. Students' Perceived Challenges of Learning Composition

Author (Date)	Time	Notation	Musical Knowledge	Self-criticism	"Messing Around" = Wasted Time	Composition's fit inside the traditional performance culture
Menard (2015)	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ward (2009)*	X				X	

*denotes international study

Similar to the teacher perception of benefits expressed in the studies, students' perceived benefits of composition instruction outnumbered their perceived challenges. The most frequently identified benefit of composing was the overall student enjoyment of the project. Oftentimes enjoyment led to a reinvigoration of students' interest in music class. This enjoyment may also lead to success with composition. While an increase in collaboration occurred because teachers often placed students into groups for the project, it also increased because students were relying on each other more to develop musical material. Studies (Hall, 2015; Menard, 2015; Ward, 2009) suggested that students also found the experience of creating a unique product valuable and that it complemented other aspects of their music learning.

Another emerging benefit was the fact that technology assisted with composing music, making it easier for students to save, share, and listen to their projects. Music technology may be able to enhance a student's experience because it streamlines the process for them.

Table 5a. Students' Perceived Benefits of Learning Composition

Author (Date)	Student enjoyment	Enjoyment led to success	Student self-esteem	Increase in musical understanding	Self-discovery	Collaboration	Students had more ideas than expected	Tech. allows music to be culturally relevant
Hopkins (2015)	X	X						
Menard (2015)	X		X	X	X			
Wise (2016)*								
Hall (2015)*	X	X				X	X	
Gall & Breeze (2005)*	X					X		X
Ward (2009)*	X	X	X		X			
Bolden (2009)*	X					X		X

*denotes international study

Table 5b. Students' Perceived Benefits of Learning Composition Continued

Author (Date)	Technology assists with composition instruction	Creating a unique product & experience	Project makes you think differently about the creative process	Broadened students' horizons	Trusting relationship between teacher and student created a safe learning environment
Menard (2015)		X	X		
Wise (2016)*	X				
Hall (2015)*		X			X
Gall & Breeze (2005)*	X				
Ward (2009)*	X	X	X	X	
Bolden (2009)*					

Teaching Strategies

Composition teaching strategies were defined as the instructional and learning strategies that teachers used to facilitate a certain compositional task. While approaches to composition instruction differed, there were common teaching strategies that teachers used throughout the studies. Teaching strategies were dependent on the makeup of the classroom and class size as well as access to certain luxuries like technology and musical instruments. Nineteen unique teaching strategies were coded in this study. These strategies are listed in Tables 6.1—6.3. Each table pertains to a different strategy area: classroom environment, notation, and instructional techniques.

Table 6. Teaching Strategies—Classroom Environment

Author (Date)	Collaboration	"Multi-composer" context	Creative environment established	Teacher establishes roles for students
Hopkins (2015)	X	X		
Hopkins (2013)	X	X		
Menard (2015)		X		
Wieneke (2019)*	X		X	
Hall (2015)*	X		X	
Gall & Breeze (2005)*	X	X		
Ward (2009)*	X	X	X	
Breeze (2009)*	X	X	X	X
Bolden (2009)*	X	X	X	

*denotes international study

Classroom environment (Table 6) refers to how teachers established the learning environment. Most teachers used a collaborative approach, where students would either be paired or grouped throughout the duration of the assignment. This was primarily done to relieve some of the tension and anxiety that young composers may have when they are learning to compose.

There was often the fear that the piece or assignment may not go well. Another environmental theme that was present in most studies was that of a "multi-composer" context, meaning multiple students simultaneously composing in the same room (Hopkins, 2013, p. 406). It was also vital for teachers to establish a creative environment for their students, one where students could feel encouraged to make and learn from their mistakes as they composed.

Notation (Table 7) is the method that teachers used to have their students represent musical ideas. Essentially, these strategies dictate how the music was displayed and communicated. Standard notation is a reference to the traditional, Western system of music notation. While some handwrote using standard notation, teachers also chose to use notation software like *Sibelius*™ to notate. The majority of teachers used notation software or looping software in their instruction to assist with representing student works. While Wise (2016) found that some teachers used notation software, he and other researchers (Bolden, 2009; Breeze, 2009; Gall & Breeze, 2005; Ward, 2009) found that the majority of teachers that used music technology preferred looping or sequencing software in their instruction. This is likely because prerecorded tracks and sounds are already housed in the program, which makes it easier to differentiate instruction based on student skill level. These programs may make it easier for students to connect to music cultures with which they are more directly involved such as electronic dance music (EDM), rap, pop, and hip-hop.

Instructional techniques (Table 8) is the most diverse table included in this set. These techniques are the ways that teachers implemented composition into their instruction. The ways that teachers implemented these techniques were unique from study to study. This table is meant to serve as a brief overview.

Table 7. Teaching Strategies—Notation

Author (Date)	Pencil & Paper	Technology	Standard Notation	Notation Software	Looping/Sequencing Software
Hopkins (2015)	X				
Hopkins (2013)	X		X		
Menard (2015)	X		X		
Hall (2016)*					
Wise (2016)*		X	X	X	X
Gall & Breeze (2005)*		X	X		X
Ward (2009)*		X			X
Breeze (2009)*		X			X
Bolden (2009)*		X			X

*denotes international study

There is some clarification that is needed for a few of the major categories. “Parameters Established” is a reference to the guidelines that teachers developed to guide student approach to their projects. “Meta-level activities” is an umbrella term that was used to describe activities that were wholistic such as planning, mapping, listening, and reflecting (Wieneke, 2019). The “Feedback Given” category is the combination of both teacher- and peer-driven feedback.

Table 8. Teaching Strategies—Instructional Techniques

Author (Date)	Parameters Established	Composition Journals	Theory & history used	Meta-level activities	Games and activities	Experiment on instruments	Improv.	Feedback given	Detailed learning design	Concrete goals
Hopkins (2015)	X					X	X			
Hopkins (2013)	X					X	X			
Menard (2015)	X	X	X			X				
Wieneke (2019)*	X			X	X	X	X	X		X
Hall (2015)*	X			X		X		X		
Gall & Breeze (2005)*	X					X				
Ward (2009)*	X	X						X		
Breeze (2009)*	X							X	X	X
Bolden (2009)*	X		X					X		X

*denotes international study

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The discussion section has been broken down by research question. It is my intention to aggregate the methods that teachers used and discuss similarities and differences between their approaches. It was also an important consideration to analyze these findings in coordination with Folkestad's work. The meta-aggregative approach that was used for this study brought a couple key points to light: one, many teachers used the same basic approaches when instructing composition; and two, there is not one *correct* way to instruct when composing. Many of the tables are full of unique strategies and situations that are tailored to the instructor's specific teaching context.

Research Question #1: What Secondary Classroom Contexts Lend Themselves to Teaching Composition?

Teaching contexts varied across studies. As depicted in Table 1, most teachers taught in non-performance ensemble environments, really, more of a general music education set-up. Many of these general classroom designs relied on using composition software to aid instruction.

Half of the studies showed that it was imperative for the teacher to establish a creative learning environment. This is a type of learning environment where students feel comfortable to experiment in the learning process. Hall (2015) elucidated by stating, "the provision of a learning environment in which students can feel safe to experiment was as essential as finding the right approach to pedagogy" (p. 108). Breeze's (2009) philosophy of lesson design echoes Hall's statement. For Breeze, an integral aspect of instruction was allowing students to naturally move outside of established constraints and experiment. He stated,

> "Closely linked to this [the phenomenon of 'moving outside'] was a consideration of the influence of the classroom culture, itself part of the larger whole-school

> culture: the freedom to experiment and 'move outside' was seen to be important in providing pupils with a warrant to go beyond the confines of what had been laid out in the composing brief" (Breeze, 2009, p. 215).

Experimentation does not necessarily mean that students will find what they are looking for, but they will at least have explored different options and attempted different possibilities. Ward (2009) stated this rather nicely: "Not all ideas were fruitful, but all mistakes were an important part of the process" (p. 163). The majority of realizations could come from editing and revising along the way. Many students may categorize moments that need editing as "mistakes," but it could be better to define them as learning opportunities. There really are no mistakes in composition, just the distinction of an unfinished product versus a final one.

Another strategy that teachers used to create a comfortable environment was allowing students to collaborate while they composed. Composing music in groups or pairs allowed students to work together on a task that may be daunting for those that have low self-esteem. Ward (2009) found that "[p]upils worked more effectively as a group, and their shared knowledge pushed them beyond the information given" (p. 161). One of the difficulties that students may have is beginning the composition. Having a partner nearby to help spur creativity could be a wonderful tool that new composers may be able to use to start. Collaborative composing may be a way to remedy these potential pitfalls. Teachers who had continued success with teaching composition encouraged collaboration between and among their students.

Having a multi-composer context was an environmental characteristic that bridged studies. It would be every music teachers' dream to have ample space for each student to have their instrument and a quiet area to work. Some teachers perceived that having all students composing in the same room would make it difficult to manage but found that this was not the

case (Hopkins, 2013; Menard, 2015). Teachers of course must use the limited space that they are given. Again, all teachers that have continual success teaching composition used this "multi-composer" context to great success.

It is intriguing to examine the differences between American and international music educators' perceptions. Hopkins (2013, 2015) and Menard (2015) went into detail discussing teacher perceptions of instructing music composition. This may be because the expectation in America is not to primarily focus on composition, even though it is included in the revised core standards for music. International educators—at least in the analyzed studies—did not mention difficulty of integrating composition; it seemed to be understood that this was part of the curriculum. American music educators may be hesitant to facilitate composition because much of the music instruction in secondary schools in the United States revolves around the performance ensemble. Many music educators (Bolden, 2009; Elliott, 1995; Hickey, 2012; Hopkins, 2013; Kaschub & Smith, 2009; Menard, 2015; Reimer, 2003; Webster, 2009) validate that the act of composition does indeed increase musical aptitude. If this is the thinking, then it may be possible for performance and composition to coexist.

A question, though, arises when discussing just *how* to teach composition: "Can it really be taught? Is there pedagogy behind it?" While the answer to that question may be "yes," it can be argued that composition may be *facilitated* instead of *taught*. Facilitation is one aspect of teaching, but it is a more apt action that emphasizes guiding the student in their task rather than specifically helping them achieve a result that is the teacher's desired result. This disparity is especially evident in the digital teaching environment because students have a device between them and the teacher, making it difficult for teachers to give feedback in a traditional manner. Instead of the teacher *teaching* information, they *facilitate* it in a way that almost flips the

classroom. Another way of putting this is that teachers are learning how to assist based on the information the students are presenting them, not the other way around. This context of a flipped classroom is what makes the specification of facilitation crucial to the art of instructing music composition.

Research Question #2: What Common Themes Emerge with Teachers Who Implement Music Composition Activities?

There are many other instructional strategies that teachers used that were consistent across all studies. One overarching theme was teachers' insistence on establishing parameters in their project designs. Hall (2015) stated that, "Clear rules and boundaries helped focus the students' creative thinking and provided an environment in which flow experiences can be readily achieved" (p. 107). Hall referenced Csikszentmihalyi's concept of flow here. The teacher that Bolden (2009) observed established boundaries for students through assignment briefs. These briefs tested students' adaptability and mimicked real-world commissions similar to those that a record company might offer.

The type of parameters changed from one teacher to the next. Menard's (2015) project parameters were more a set of objectives that aligned with the instructional week. These tasks followed composition instruction for the day. This was done in such a way that tasks were manageable for students and divided over a period of seven weeks.

Allowing students to experiment on their instruments was another important teaching strategy that emerged from successful teachers. Unless a musician has exceptionally good ears, instrument experimentation may be required in order to compose. When students can manipulate their material in real-time, they can immediately receive feedback from their instruments. Another strategy that corresponds with experimentation is improvisation. Some teachers

encouraged students to use this technique in order to spur creativity. In Wieneke's (2019) discussion of project design, she noted that it is crucial for teachers to let students improvise, "so they can test their aesthetic ideas and learn to question what they hear and play" (p. 8). This process can also help students begin to discover and define their own musical tastes and preferences.

Giving feedback was a vital practice by many teachers in the analyzed studies. Providing assessment may be the backbone of music teaching. As students practiced composing, teachers gave feedback based on personal experience and expertise. Even though some instructors felt like they did not have sufficient training to teach composition, they found that in the end, they did possess the knowledge and had a lot more to offer their students. Bolden (2009) found that it was important for teachers to give multiple different avenues for the student to explore:

> "To allow the student to maintain a strong sense of ownership over his or her piece, teachers can suggest not just one way to modify a composition, but a variety of options, including foregoing the advice altogether. That way, it is still the student's decisions that move the piece forward" (p. 149).

In time, a student may be able to replicate their teacher's comments and manipulate their work autonomously. Some researchers suggest it may be integral that teachers also allow students to give feedback to their peers. Bolden (2009) found that this was a bedrock in the interviewee's approach. "[The teacher] frequently invites students to discuss and assess their classmates' compositions. [He] draws students in, valuing their input as they contribute knowledge from their own musical worlds…" (Bolden, 2009, p. 145). Allowing students to provide feedback may also give them practice critiquing and analyzing other students' work, a worthy task to develop their ears.

Research Question #3: How Has Technology Been Used to Facilitate Music Composition Instruction?

Composition software helps streamline the composition process in many ways. It allows students to save their progress, share their music with others, and listen back to their work in real-time. By replaying their work this way, the student also receives instant feedback from the program, which they may not receive from an ensemble that was sightreading the work or plunking away one line at a time on their instrument. While there are many instantaneous capabilities that technology provides students, the teacher's interactions may diminish. Gall & Breeze (2005) observed that teachers had difficulty giving feedback to students in real-time. This was especially apparent due to the composition space, where each student sat at computer stations with headphones, limiting what the instructor could hear.

As time goes by, devices continue to shrink, which can be a blessing for students and teachers alike. With smaller devices like tablets, laptops, and phones, the act of composing becomes portable. Many devices come with looping and sequencing software pre-installed. Programs like Apple's *GarageBand*™ have revolutionized the music industry. One of the teachers that Wise (2016) observed stated, "'With GarageBand [composing] is instant and they really can't go wrong and so they can get something up that sounds good to them and can see some structure to what they have done'" (p. 289). These programs also afford students a chance to create music that is culturally relevant to them (Gall & Breeze, 2005; Bolden, 2009). This helps introduce genres and music that may not be "common" in some music rooms. The actual interface, quality, and editing abilities of music technology allowed, "…pupils to value their work, with some professional-sounding results" (Ward, 2009, p. 161). With the right materials, anyone can compose in the comfort of their home.

Music composition technology may also help teachers provide opportunities for differentiation. Students that may have weaker musical backgrounds may find comfort in a program that has done much of the "grunt work" so to speak (Wise, 2016; Gall & Breeze, 2005; Bolden, 2009). Looping programs are also variable. The breadth of learning is modular. It is relatively simple to change assignment briefs to fit the students' needs. Say Student A needs to work on developing the dialogue between instruments in a duet while Student B may need to work on revising paring her salsa band piece by cutting out some instruments from the soundscape.

While using music technology may offer many benefits, some of these advantages may also its downfall. Gall & Breeze (2005), for example, found that students' laziness got the best of them at times. Students would arbitrarily place and overlap samples in ways that were deemed unmusical by the teachers. "In planning the re-run of the [composition project] a year later, the teachers were able to pre-empt this random placing of samples and they stressed the importance of the listening within the composition process, thereby steering pupils away from this unmusical approach" (Gall & Breeze, 2005, p. 428). In order to teach technology, a teacher must also learn how to use it. This process may also be time-consuming, especially with all of the other responsibilities teachers have.

The influence of technology in music education may be no more amplified than it is now during the COVID-19 pandemic. The overhaul that many educators have had to incur on their teaching habits is monumental. While music teaching is certainly not the same through the virtual platform, it is manageable. Telecommunication technologies like Zoom™ and Webex™ help teachers remain in-touch with their students. This type of teaching would not have been possible ten years ago, let alone five, if not for the advancements and capabilities of the internet.

Comparison with Folkestad

It is difficult to measure just exactly how music composition instruction has evolved since Folkestad's publication in 2004. As time passes, newer technologies become available and are invented for mass distribution. Therefore, one can infer that the types of technologies that are used have evolved. Phones have become more powerful; wireless connections have multiplied across the globe; social media have flourished; and global music sharing capabilities have been developed.

It is important, though, to examine how the findings in this study compare to those presented by Folkestad. His findings are listed below for reference:

1. Students' creative experiences were informed by their cultural and musical experiences
2. "External conditions are formulated"
3. Approaches to teaching music composition did not differ across age ranges

The findings in the present study are similar to those that Folkestad has offered. The creative experiences that students had were definitely informed by their cultural experiences. Modern students' culture is heavily influenced by technology. It has been shown that technology enhances the teaching and integration of music composition. Technology is portable, letting students work wherever they please. Looping software also allows students to compose in a variety of relatable genres, allowing students to compose in relevant media.

Parameters were common in most studies. By placing restrictions on what students could compose, it allowed students to experiment in a controlled environment. These parameters also allowed the process of facilitating composition to be controlled by the teacher. There were no apparent differences between composition instruction related to grade level. Middle school

students were taught with the same approaches as high school-aged students. Complexity of projects may have differed, but the strategies largely remained the same.

This study also touched on elements that were not mentioned by Folkestad. One element is the importance of creating an environment conducive for student experimentation. Allowing students to experiment and explore different possibilities facilitated by the teacher may be crucial to developing confident composers. It was also found that supplying students with deliberate and consistent feedback helped them to shape their compositions. This also included giving students the chance to critique peers' compositions, which in turn helped formulate their critique of their own work. A third trend that emerged was the realization that technology allows for a variety of differentiation to take place when facilitating composition instruction. A fourth and relatively universal trend amongst the studies was the decision to allow students to collaborate while they composed. The majority of collaboration also took place in a "multi-composer" context, which did not impinge upon the students' abilities to produce their compositions.

Future Implications

The aim of this study was to collect, organize, and compare the methods that lead to effective composition instruction. I hope that educators may find it possible to integrate music composition in their teaching. Further research may expand this work in areas of music instruction where composition is not prevalent.

At the time he conducted his research, Folkestad (2004) noted that there was a lack of meta-analyses for qualitative research in music education. More research is necessary in order to discover how music composition and music creativity can be encouraged in schools across America. Many articles promote its integration and yet, studies like the ones analyzed in this study are continuing to be written. There is also little literature written for inclusion of music

composition in the choral environment. This may be because choral students do not have access to individual instruments and may not be accustomed to exploring possibilities that the voice offers. Only Menard (2015) and Ward (2009) reported students' perceived challenges of learning music composition. More research may need to be conducted in this area to gauge why this is and if these perceptions of challenges can be altered.

Music Composition Facilitation in Today's Schools

In this study, it was found that Folkestad's original findings are consistent today and may even be expanded to include other suggestions for fostering creative and compositional processes. Four new trends emerged through this analysis:

1. Creating an environment that is conducive for student experimentation is important for students to compose
2. Teacher- and student-driven feedback help aid student choice and creativity
3. Composition software allow for differentiation across ability levels
4. Collaboration helps students gain confidence while producing their compositions

By facilitating instruction in these ways, teachers can control the learning contexts in a variety of ways, which may help students gain a deeper musical understanding through their experimentation with the project.

Facilitating composition can become a reality if teachers take steps to instruct in ways that engage their students on multiple levels. The analyzed studies have shown that there is no *one* way to facilitate music composition. This process is one that is highly flexible depending on teachers' situations. Teachers can facilitate creativity by allowing students to work in collaborative, creative environments that give students opportunities to experiment and engage with the material. Projects can be designed in ways that offer differentiation through established

parameters and allow teachers and students to give ample feedback. For adequate composition instruction, the teacher's role is to facilitate a nurturing environment where change, failure, and experimentation are encouraged. These facilitation measures may create a classroom dynamic that inspires students and reinvigorates their learning and improve their musical understanding.

REFERENCES

Barrett, M.S. (2003). Freedoms and constraints: Constructing musical worlds through the dialogue of composition. In M. Hickey (Ed.), *Why and How to Teach Music Composition: A New Horizon for Music Education* (pp. 3-27). MENC: The National Association for Music Education: Reston, VA.

Beegle, A.C. (2010). A classroom-based study of small-group planned improvisation with fifth-grade children. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 58*(3), 219-239.

Bolden, B. (2009). Teaching composing in secondary school: A case study analysis. *British Journal of Music Education, 26*(2), 137-152.

Brown, A.R. & Dillon, S. (2013). Meaningful engagement with music composition. In D. Collins (Ed.), *The Act of Musical Composition: Studies in the Creative Process* (pp. 79-110). Routledge: New York.

Carter, B. (2013). Digital natives and composition in the middle school band: From imagination to music. In M. Kaschub & J.P. Smith (Eds.), *Composing Our Future: Preparing Music Educators to Teach Composition* (pp. 225-237). Oxford University Press: New York.

Crossley-Holland, P. & Ringer, A.L. (2013). Musical composition. Retrieved September 01, 2020 from https://www.britannica.com/art/musical-composition

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity*. Harper Collins: New York.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow*. Harper Collins: New York.

Dammers, R. (2013). Capitalizing on emerging technologies in composition education. In M. Kaschub & J.P. Smith (Eds.), *Composing Our Future: Preparing Music Educators to Teach Composition* (pp. 201-210). Oxford University Press: New York.

Elliott, D. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education.* Oxford University Press: New York.

Folkestad, Göran (2004). A meta-analytic approach to qualitative studies in music education: A new model applied to creativity and composition. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 161*, 83-90.

Gall, M. & Breeze, N. (2005). Music composition lessons: The multimodal affordances of technology. *Educational Review, 57*(4), 415-433.

Gruenhagen, L. & Whitcomb, R. (2014). Improvisational practices in elementary general music classrooms. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 61*(4), 379-395.

Hall, R. (2015). Enhancing the popular music ensemble workshop and maximizing student potential through the integration of creativity. *International Journal of Music Education, 33*(1), 103-112).

Hickey, M. (2012). *Music outside the lines: Ideas for composing in K-12 music classrooms.* Oxford University Press: New York.

Hopkins, M. (2015). Collaborative composing in high school string chamber music ensembles. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 62*(4), 405-424.

Hopkins, M. (2013). A descriptive case study of two veteran string teachers' perceptions of including composing in middle school orchestra. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 196*(1), 25-44.

Internations. (2020, August 27). *A comprehensive guide about the education system and international schools.* Internations.org. https://www.internations.org/go/moving-to-the-uk/education#:~:text=and%20higher%20education.-

,Secondary%20Education,is%20called%20%E2%80%9Clower%20secondary%E2%80%9D.

Kaschub, M. & Smith, J. (2009). *Minds on music: Composition for creative and critical thinking*. Rowman & Littlefield Education: Lanham, MD.

Menard, E. (2015). Music composition in the high school curriculum: A multiple case study. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 63*(1), 114-136.

Paterson, B.L. (2011). "It looks great but how do I know if it fits?": An introduction to meta-synthesis research. In K. Hannes & C. Lockwood (Eds.), *Synthesizing Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-20). John Wiley & Sons: Chichester, West Sussex, UK.

Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education: Advancing the vision* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Rinehart, C. (2002). *Composing and arranging: Standard 4 benchmarks.* MENC—The National Association for Music Education: Reston, VA.

Sadler-Smith, E. (2015). Wallas' four-stage model of the creative process: More than meets the eye?. *Creativity Research Journal, 27*(4), 342-352.

Sindberg, L.K. (2007). Comprehensive musicianship through performance (CMP) in the lived experience of students. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 174*(3), 25-43.

Stauffer, S. (2003). Identity and voice in young composers. In M. Hickey (Ed.), *Why and How to Teach Music Composition: A New Horizon for Music Education* (pp. 91-112). MENC: The National Association for Music Education: Reston, VA.

Strand, K. (2006). Survey of Indiana music teachers on using composition in the classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 54*(2), 154-167.

Ward, C. (2009). Musical exploration using ICT in the middle and secondary school classroom. *International Journal of Music Education, 27*(2), 154-168.

Webster, P. (2009). Music composition intelligence and creative thinking in music. In. M. Kaschub & J.P. Smith (Eds.), *Composing Our Future: Preparing Music Educators to Teach Composition* (pp. 19-32). Oxford University Press: New York.

Webster, P. (2002). Creative thinking in music: Advancing a model. In M. Sullivan & L. Willingham (Eds.), *Creativity and Music Education* (pp. 16-34). Britannia Printers: Toronto.

Wise, S. (2016). Secondary school teachers' approaches to teaching composition using digital technology. *British Journal of Music Education, 33*(3), 283-295.

APPENDIX A: ANNOTATIONS

Bolden, B. (2009). Teaching composing in secondary school: A case study analysis. *British Journal of Music Education, 26*(2), 137-152.

In this article, Bolden observed and interviewed Jesse, a secondary music composition teacher. Throughout the process, Bolden uncovered what makes Jesse's composition program a success and how the teacher involved his students in the creative process. GarageBand™ was used as the primary mode of composition. This case study reveals the teacher's perceptions and strategies for composing in the secondary setting. The author notes that this composition class is an "anomaly," and that students also have access to join performance ensembles. The central mode of music composition that Jesse employs is the looping software GarageBand. Central to Jesse's beliefs about composition are encouraging student engagement, creating a comfortable creative environment, developing musical understanding with his students, and helping students understand and develop their musical identity.

Breeze, N. (2009). Learning design and proscription: How generative activity was promoted in music composing. *International Journal of Music Education, 27*(3), 204-219.

Breeze examined the effects that an instructor had on the learning design and the set of limitations that encompassed music composition instruction. Information Communication Technology (ICT) was used to facilitate composition learning and instruction. Primary and secondary classes were observed through video recording. The students used sequencing software to compose. Breeze found that setting limitations that are neither too loose or too restrictive allowed students to

create meaningful works and step outside the proscriptive environment and experiment. He also found that a carefully planned learning design helped structure the teaching of the composition assignments.

Gall, M. & Breeze, N. (2005). Music composition lessons: The multimodal affordances of technology. *Educational Review, 57*(4), 415-433.

The goal of the researchers was to see how they could better use technology in their teaching of music composition. The researchers recorded and observed three different teaching approaches that integrated technology to teach composition. Students aged from late elementary to middle school. Using technology to compose was seen as a benefit because of the affordances it offers to the students like saving their work, listening and sharing their music with peers, collaborating, and creating culturally relevant music from the library of sounds the software offers. Some of the difficulties included teachers' approach to observation/feedback and students' ability to discern exactly what they were always doing. The teachers and researchers noted that the physical layout of the software caused students difficulty with understanding how to properly work the software.

Hall, R. (2015). Enhancing the popular music ensemble workshop and maximizing student potential through the integration of creativity. *International Journal of Music Education, 33*(1), 103-112).

Hall proposes that a new approach to ensemble pedagogy is required in order to unlock creative potential in students (reword). Hall focuses on establishing a creative pedagogy for popular music ensembles in the U.K. This workshop

environment encourages students to work collaboratively through a set of guidelines and principles to inspire the creative process. These guidelines were given in the form of compositional briefs, which mimicked real-world scenarios. Expert mentors assist the musicians as facilitators and collaborators. Important teaching strategies that emerged included collaborating in groups, prescribing guidelines, and giving detailed feedback in student evaluation.

Hopkins, M. (2015). Collaborative composing in high school string chamber music ensembles. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 62*(4), 405-424.

Abstract: Investigation of collaborating composition in high school string chamber ensembles. Pre and post surveys were given to students. Hopkins looks at the effects that different composition variables have on the project. Believe to be useful. Orchestra students formed self-selected chamber ensembles to create 2 to 4-minute compositions. 8 chamber groups were selected for analysis by the researcher. This process took 6 days to complete and all performances were video recorded on the final day. A postsurvey was given by the researcher to gauge students' perceptions of the project. Students' playing and verbal responses were coded according to whether they were on- or off-task. Compositions were judged by four independent evaluators. Hopkins gives summaries for each composition. It was discovered that a positive relationship existed between strong collaboration and the quality of composition (p. 419). Half of the groups had a difficult time staying on-task throughout the project. It was also noticed that after a productive session of composing, the next session was not as productive. Productivity increased as the deadline approached. This off-task behavior may be able to be

reduced if teachers train students how to use this time to their advantage. More research needs to be gathered on the ways that teachers interject or give feedback in order to find what works best in this collaborative setting. "The mixed-gender groups had high ratings for their compositions and had high levels of collaboration" (p. 420). The postsurvey revealed a positive relationship between project enjoyment and compositional quality.

Hopkins, M. (2013). A descriptive case study of two veteran string teachers' perceptions of including composing in middle school orchestra. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 196*(1), 25-44.

Hopkins investigated two string teachers' perceptions on the benefits and challenges of including composition in their middle school orchestras. Methods: Two teachers were studied in this investigation. Neither had previously integrated composition into their curriculum. Students were asked to compose a theme and variations for their composition project. Pre- and post-interviews were conducted with the participants. The researcher also took fieldnotes from his experience and asked the teachers to write weekly reflections based on their experiences. Both teachers had rich musical background but did not compose prior to attending college. They both had some experiences with composition at university, but neither was instructed on how to teach composition. Neither had included composition as part of their curriculum. The teachers perceived many different challenges with including composition, including their students' reactions to the project, the potential chaos of the project, their students' readiness, the shift of focus away from performance, and a fear of inadequate

tools for composition. Perceived benefits included "…students' level of engagement…the changed role of the teacher from director to facilitator,…the quality of the students' musical ideas" and development of students' musical understanding and performance skills (p. 36). The role of a teacher leading a composition project is very different from their role as a leader of a rehearsal.

Menard, E. (2015). Music composition in the high school curriculum: A multiple case study. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 63*(1), 114-136.

Menard investigated how music composition was used to foster creativity and musical understanding in two different high school music curricula. One of these settings was a traditional band performance ensemble and the other was a comprehensive general music class. The researcher also investigated teacher and student perceptions of composition. The composition projects lasted for a span of seven weeks, where the lesson lasted a span of 50 minutes. Unlike many of the other articles investigated in this sample, the students used handwritten notation for these projects. A sample of projects from each class were assessed using Amabile's Consensual Assessment Technique. While the context of both classes differed, similar perceptions and beliefs were found between classes. Worries of adding composition by the teachers and students echoed previous studies' findings (lack of time, musical understanding, and teacher training). Both teachers noted that creativity is an important part to students' musical development and that composition could be used as a tool to enhance creativity. Some students that were perceived as the lower-level performers had success in this project. Students

in the TAP class had an easier time adjusting to this project because of class setting and familiarity with the composition process.

Ward, C. (2009). Musical exploration using ICT in the middle and secondary school classroom. *International Journal of Music Education, 27*(2), 154-168.

Ward tests the effectiveness of using ICT for composition in his students' learning. The researcher devised four different projects, each with their own limitations. Projects were based on age and student capabilities. Not only did he want to examine how the students composed, but the researcher wanted to see if it was possible for students to compose with non-tonal elements as well. Ward found that the integration of ICT helped the students explore new sounds, acquaint themselves with the composition process, and obtain quick feedback. Students' enjoyment of the project led to a growth in their self-esteem, self-discovery, and creative processes.

Wieneke, J. (2019). Facilitating contemporary music in projects in schools—A qualitative study in Germany. *British Journal of Music Education,* 1-10. Doi: 10.1017/S0265051719000202

A case study analysis of fostering the creative process in German secondary schools. Grounded Theory Methodology is used. The researcher interviewed a diverse group of individuals throughout the music profession. Interviewees were asked about different methods and approaches to integrate a cooperative, contemporary composition projects in public schools to foster creative development. They found that the structures for contemporary music projects vary depending on the funding, impact of the community, development of partnerships

with outside entities (like universities and music organizations), and amount of time allotted. The creative process was made up of three distinct stages: *Development, Realisation,* and *Closure* stages. Interviewees gave unique approaches to these different stages.

Wise, S. (2016). Secondary school teachers' approaches to teaching composition using digital technology. *British Journal of Music Education, 33*(3), 283-295.

Wise investigates the impact that digital technologies have on the pedagogical process of teaching composition. The researcher interviewed 9 teachers at four U.K. school districts asking how they integrated technology to teach composition. All teachers used digital software like Sibelius, GarageBand, or a combination of the two to assist with their teaching. Some teachers felt that it was important that students learn to use and read notation while others felt that using a looping software (GarageBand) could help spur creativity. The immediacy of aural and visual feedback was one of the perks for using digital technology.