

QRME

Qualitative Research in Music Education

Jennifer S Walter, Editor
Volume 3, Issue 1
February 2021

**Integrated Music Education in Elementary Classrooms:
Music and Grade-Level Teacher Perspectives and Practices**

Daniel C. Johnson

**Department of Music, University of North Carolina Wilmington
Wilmington, North Carolina, USA**

Kristin Harney

**School of Music, Montana State University-Bozeman
Bozeman, Montana, USA**

Amorette B. Languell

**Department of Music, Northern Michigan University
Marquette, Michigan, USA**



**UNC
GREENSBORO**

Abstract

Integrated Music Education (IME) involves collaborative and experiential instruction, designed to address both music and non-music standards. The purpose of this study was to explore music and grade-level teachers' perceptions of IME and to examine their observed instructional practices. The corresponding research questions were: (a) what were participants' perceptions about IME; and (b) how did the participants' observed instructional practices demonstrate IME quality (i.e. disciplinary and interdisciplinary instruction)? We chose a multiple case study design and recruited a purposeful sample of teacher-participants, focusing on the research questions in context. In each of two cases, one music teacher and two of their grade-level teacher colleagues served as participants. We collected data in two forms: interviews and classroom observations. To determine the level of integration via the observations, we adapted existing models and created a protocol to rate disciplinary and interdisciplinary instruction. After inductive and deductive analysis of interview data and rating observations, five themes emerged: how participants defined IME, benefits of IME, factors that supported and hindered IME practice, and needs for its continuation. Our ratings largely confirmed these themes but also revealed a disconnect between teacher perceptions of higher IME levels and their lower-level practices. Implications for preservice and in-service teacher education include aligning definitions with practice, enhancing teacher collaboration, and developing focused professional development. Taken together, these may address the challenges of IME while simultaneously recognizing its opportunities for both elementary music and grade-level teachers.

Keywords: elementary education, music education, music integration, arts integration

Introduction

For decades, innovative educators have designed interdisciplinary curricula which conceptually and practically integrate arts and non-arts subjects, thereby addressing standards in multiple disciplines (Barrett, et al., 1997; Bresler, 1995; Burnaford, et al., 2013; Cslovjecssek & Zulauf, 2018). This type of pedagogy aligns with the Connecting process standard of the National Core Arts Standards [NCAS] (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards, 2015). Although the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) adopted the NCAS in 2015, the three remaining processes of Creating, Performing, and Responding received more attention. The Connecting process promotes understanding societal, cultural, and historical contexts, thereby offering practical applications to link music with other subjects. De-emphasizing this core artistic process is something of a missed opportunity because educators using integrated arts curricula have documented enhanced student understanding and engagement, including significant gains in student achievement, attitudes, attendance, and behavior (Noblit et al., 2000; Noblit et al., 2009).

Often termed integrated arts instruction, authentic interdisciplinary education involves multimodal and interactive teaching presentations as well as collaborative and experiential activities (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards, 2015). Music is one of the most commonly offered arts subjects in American public schools (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2012; O’Keefe et al., 2016). In addition, music is an integral part of every past and present human civilization, addressing a myriad of personal and social purposes (Campbell, 2004; Wade, 2004). As such, music provides one of the most appropriate means of delivering an integrated arts curriculum.

Common components in teacher education curricula, music and arts methods courses routinely play an important part in teacher licensure for pre-service elementary education majors (Battersby & Cave, 2014; Cslovjecssek & Zulauf, 2018). As an effective extension of these arts methods courses, Integrated Music Education (IME) offers interdisciplinary ways to foster critical and creative thinking skills, to promote abstract reasoning, and to involve students with multi-sensory and multi-modal activities in academic learning (Barrett et al., 1997; Fowler, 2001; LaGarry & Richard, 2018; Smithrim & Uptis, 2005). Since the 1990's, some music and grade-level teachers have designed meaningful and effective integrated curricula to address both music and non-music standards; other teachers' efforts, however, have been more limited and generally less effective (Abril & Gault, 2006; Hallmark, 2012). The purpose of this study was to explore music and grade-level teachers' perceptions of IME and to observe their instructional practices. The corresponding research questions to study participants' IME perceptions and practices were: (a) what were participants' perceptions about IME; and (b) how did the participants' observed instructional practices demonstrate IME quality (i.e. disciplinary and interdisciplinary instruction)?

Review of Literature

Characterizing Integrated Music Education

In an early research publication on integrated arts education, Bresler (1995) described four different levels of integration: subservient, affective, social, and co-equal. The least involved type, subservient integration, describes situations where the arts serve other disciplines (e.g., memorizing song lyrics to help remember a set of facts). Affective integration indicates that teachers use the arts to affect mood or inspire creativity (e.g., playing background music to help students relax or concentrate, or drawing while listening to music). When the arts serve a

social function such as musical presentations at school board meetings or as a way to manage class behaviors, social integration occurs. Finally, co-equal integration signifies that teachers equally value and recognize understandings in both the arts and non-arts discipline (e.g., exploring the concept of contrast in music and literature).

Bresler's co-equal style of arts integration positions music as an "equal partner, integrating the curriculum with arts-specific contents, skills, expressions, and modes of thinking" (Bresler, 1995, p. 33). This style appears in previous literature with different labels, such as "concept-based arts integration" (Wolkowicz, 2017, p. 42), "conceptual connections" (Wiggins, 2001, p. 42), "two-way integration" (Barry, 2008, p. 33; Berke, 2000, p. 9), "syntegration" (Russell-Bowie, 2009, p. 1), and "integrity between the disciplines" (Barrett et al., 1997, p. 35). Similarly, the Kennedy Center's professional development program, Changing Education through the Arts (CETA), promotes a co-equal understanding of arts integration. CETA defines arts integration as "an approach to teaching in which students construct and demonstrate understanding through an art form. Students engage in a creative process which connects an art form and another subject area and meets evolving objectives in both" (Silverstein & Layne, 2010, para 1). Regardless of the specific labeling of arts integration approaches or styles, researchers agree that the majority of arts integration activities occurring in schools aligns with Bresler's subservient integration level, while those on the co-equal level are the least common (Bresler, 2002; O'Keefe et al., 2016; Wiggins, 2001).

Challenges and Benefits of Integrated Music Education

Specifically regarding music integration with other subject areas, previous literature suggests that although music and grade-level teachers engage in this curricular approach, music integration is frequently of limited scope and sometimes superficial (Abril & Gault, 2006;

Bresler, 2002; Giles & Frego, 2004; NCES, 2012; O’Keefe et al., 2016; Saunders & Baker, 1991). It appears that grade-level teachers generally hold positive attitudes about music (Giles & Frego, 2004), but they are not inclined to take responsibility for teaching musical concepts (Giles & Frego, 2004; O’Keefe et al., 2016). Hallmark summarized the situation by noting that, “a gulf exists between the idea of high-quality arts integration and its actual practice in schools” (2012, p. 95).

Challenges associated with arts integration include a lack of sufficient training in music integration for grade-level teachers, lack of sufficient integration training for arts specialists, lack of administrator support, and lack of time (Battersby & Cave, 2014; Cosenza, 2005; Hallmark, 2012; LaGarry & Richard, 2018; May & Robinson, 2016; O’Keefe et al., 2016; Wolkowicz, 2017). As Hallmark observed, “given traditional expectations of content sequencing, public performances or exhibits, and responsibilities toward large numbers of students, arts teachers rarely have time for quality arts integration work” (2012, p. 93). Additionally, researchers note the need for more collaboration among music and grade-level teachers (Bresler, 2002; Della Pietra, 2010; Munroe, 2015; O’Keefe et al., 2016; Strand, 2006) and effective professional development for arts integration (Burnaford et al., 2013; Hallmark, 2012; Krakaur, 2017; LaGarry & Richard, 2018).

Positive academic and social outcomes appear to be the primary benefits of integrated arts education for students (Catterall et al., 2012; Goff & Ludwig, 2013; May & Robinson, 2016). Additionally, arts integration may enhance the perceived relevance of the arts within the larger curriculum (Anderson, 2014; Bresler, 1995; Fowler, 2001; Hallmark, 2012; Wolf, 1992). In related research literature, authors identified numerous rationales for arts integration that benefitted both teachers and students. The primary advantages for music and grade-level teachers

included enhancing classroom learning environments (Cosenza, 2005; Deasy, 2008; Irwin et al., 2006), supporting student academic achievement (Burton et al., 2000; Moss et al., 2018), encouraging student creativity (Baer & Kaufman, 2012; Deasy, 2008; Root-Bernstein, 2001), and facilitating active participation in collaborative curricular planning (Barrett et al., 1997; Bresler, 2002; LaGarry & Richard, 2018; O’Keefe et al., 2016; Strand, 2006).

Although championing K-12 discipline-specific arts instruction, Hallmark also noted that when music is only taught separately from other subjects, “its very isolation may be its biggest vulnerability” (2012, p. 94). Instead, one avenue Hallmark suggested for the arts to safeguard their place in schools was to define and promote high-quality arts integration within the field. In view of the benefits and challenges of IME described in previous research, we designed this study to examine IME from music and grade-level teachers’ perspectives. In addition to addressing the gap in the literature on interdisciplinary pedagogy and its impact on quality of instruction, the purpose of this study was to explore music and grade-level teacher perspectives and practices on IME. We asked these two corresponding research questions: (a) what were participants’ perceptions about IME; and (b) how did the participants’ observed instructional practices demonstrate IME quality (i.e. disciplinary and interdisciplinary instruction)?

Methodology

We chose a multiple case study design for this investigation because this approach offered a deeper understanding of the problem from both music and grade-level teachers, considering both their perspectives and practices, thereby adding confidence to our findings (Miles et al., 2014; Stake, 2006). We also used a purposeful sample, strategically selected, to focus on the specific research questions in context of music and non-music instruction (Miles et al., 2014; Stake, 1995). To answer our research questions with qualified participants (Creswell,

2013), we selected two cases, each consisting of one music teacher and two of their grade-level teacher colleagues. All six participants had experience with and actively practiced IME.

Data Sources

In this multiple case study, we collected two types of data from two sites. Each site for our study represented a single case, with each case including three participants who taught at the same school: one general music teacher (K – 5) and two grade-level teacher colleagues (one K- 2 and the other 3 – 5). Based on their own interest and experience with IME, we invited two music teachers who had grade-level colleagues with IME experience. Both music teachers identified two grade-level teachers as additional participants at their school site, for a total of six participants. All participants planned their lessons collaboratively but taught each lesson independently. Abby, Briana, and Charlotte taught in a university town in the Northwestern United States. Dorothy, Emily, and Francine taught in a city in the Southeastern United States. Using pseudonyms, we list them and summarize their professional backgrounds in Table 1. These participants provided our data sources via interviews and observations (Miles et al., 2014).

Consistent with qualitative research, our investigation included multiple forms of data; we interviewed the six individual teachers as detailed in Appendix A and observed eight lessons as described in Appendix B (Emerson et al., 2011; Siedman, 2013; Stake, 1995). For each of the four self-contained classes, we observed two lessons, one with their music teacher and one with their grade-level teacher. We also video-taped each classroom observation which lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. We then conducted and transcribed the interviews, which ranged from 45 to 90 minutes. Throughout this IRB-approved study, we used pseudonyms for participants to protect their anonymity.

Data Analysis

We analyzed data sets inductively and deductively, by searching for themes within each case and across cases. Single-case analysis began with open coding. By reading complete sets of data for each individual participant, we gained a holistic understanding of the perceptions and experiences of each teacher (Emerson et al., 2011; Saldaña, 2016). We then applied focused coding to lay the groundwork for cross-case analysis by identifying recurring themes (Miles et al., 2014) and conducting this analysis in a similar manner. Furthermore, we used inductive coding to allow codes to emerge during data collection and analysis, quoting participants' own words to maintain their uniqueness (Creswell, 2013; Miles et al., 2014; Saldaña, 2016; Stake, 1995).

Because the instructional decisions teachers make have a major impact on students' "learning, identity, and future educational opportunities" (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005, p. 172), we analyzed for IME quality, with particular attention to disciplinary and interdisciplinary standards. Especially given the challenges of teaching in 21st century settings, examination and measurement of instruction have become prevalent research and policy foci (Cslovjecsek & Zulauf, 2018; Rowan & Raudenbush, 2016). After consulting a number of widely-used teaching standards and other measures of instructional quality (e.g. Danielson, 2007; Interstate New Teacher Assessment Support Consortium, 1992; Marzano & Toth, 2013; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; North Carolina Department of Public Instruction [NCDPI], 1998/2013; US Department of Education, 2002), we designed a focused observational protocol with four dimensions: disciplinary instruction, interdisciplinary instruction, classroom climate/culture, and facilitating learning. Of those, disciplinary and interdisciplinary instruction were the most relevant to our study. The corresponding instructional standards appear in professional teaching standards documents (e.g. NCDPI, 1998/2013).

We chose to adapt the NCDPI standards because they present disciplinary instruction on an equal level with interdisciplinary instruction, allowing for us to rate both types of teaching separately and equitably. While these first two dimensions were the focus of our observational ratings for IME quality, the NCDPI standards also include the two related dimensions of classroom climate/culture and facilitating learning, which we used to broaden our understanding of the learning context. We then used four conventional ratings for each dimension: emerging (not demonstrated), developing (somewhat demonstrated), proficient (effectively demonstrated), or exemplary (meritoriously demonstrated). In our findings, we connected these ratings with their corresponding levels of interdisciplinary instruction: subservient, affective, social, and co-equal (Bresler, 1995). For a display of our protocol, see Appendix B.

We ensured trustworthiness and validity through data triangulation, peer review, and participant checks (Creswell, 2013; Miles et al., 2014). Collecting data from a variety of sources allowed us to confirm and disconfirm evidence for emerging themes (Stake, 1995). As advocated by experts in the field (Emerson et. al, 2011; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2014), we used our researcher-generated observation protocol to aid in categorizing and organizing observations. Prior to beginning the data analysis, we completed a preliminary analysis of one classroom observation together to ensure consensus when using the protocol. We analyzed all of the remaining data independently, and then collectively agreed upon final ratings for each observation.

Findings / Discussion

After analyzing participant responses, we identified five emergent themes that described IME in terms of the perspectives and practices of these six educators: (a) Defining IME; (b) Benefits of IME; (c) Supports for IME; (d) Obstacles to IME; and (e) Needs for IME. See Table 2 for a display of the supporting topics of each theme. In this section, we connect our findings

with the related literature to show points of intersection and inconsistencies. Although not transferable to all elementary general music settings, our findings may directly benefit both classroom and general music teachers, along with their students.

Defining Integrated Music Education

Initially, we asked participants to define IME. Their responses indicated both an inexact use of terminology and a range of integration, which we aligned with Bresler's (1995) four arts integration levels. Many participants noted ways that music served other disciplines or teaching goals, aligning with Bresler's subservient level. For example, kindergarten teacher Briana said, "...[music integration is] any time you can integrate any sort of musical element into what you're doing." Kindergarten teacher Emily expanded on that same idea by saying:

I would define arts integration as taking the concepts of music and art and trying to weave it into lesson plans and curriculum, by pulling in songs or art projects that go with books and stuff that we read. Just using it.

Participants' descriptions of activities in which music served to enhance the classroom atmosphere aligned with Bresler's second level of integration, affective. For example, Briana described her use of music in the classroom as a way, "...to make it more fun; sometimes just listening to me talk is not really that interesting." Similarly, Emily made a distinction between musical activities and other classroom content, noting that after her class has a short break with music, "then we can get back to work." This statement aligned with what we observed in Emily's classroom. Using our observation protocol, we rated her as developing in the authenticity of the relationship between musical activities and the classroom content, and as emerging in the balance of emphasis between subject areas. See Table 3 for all observation rating data.

Articulating Bresler's (1995) third level, integration addressing social functions, Briana also said, "We always stand up and move our bodies after the first bit before I move into the lesson." Similarly, third-grade teacher Charlotte reported that she used music "to reorganize into discussion groups, as a mixer." Finally, aligning with Bresler's fourth or co-equal level, the music-teacher participants defined music integration as a more complex enterprise. Probably as a function of her professional background, Abby said:

I just try to make concept connections...thinking about texture in painting and texture in music or thinking about phrasing in poetry and phrasing in music, rather than thinking at the surface level of a quarter note, "that's like math because it says a fraction."

Anticipating some thinking models, she proceeded to say that "I feel like a lot of people feel like the connections need to be a straight line, but I think you can sort of circulate your way around, and then they really do connect." We observed this idea of connection in both of Abby's lessons where we rated the authenticity of the relationship between content areas as proficient.

Summarizing some differences in integration levels, music teacher Dorothy said:

...a lot of people think of music integration [as] something like, "you just use music to support another subject," but actually it's truly integrating two things together...instead of singing a song about the moon or the moon cycles, it's actually using music to teach...I think the integration goes a lot deeper than what most people think...whenever you have integrated something it should be an equal balance; it should be supported on both sides.

Dorothy's statement demonstrated the inconsistencies we identified among teachers' IME definitions, their perceptions, and their practices. While Dorothy stated the need for "an equal balance," we rated the balance of emphasis in one of her observed lessons as emerging.

Describing cross-curricular outcomes, fifth-grade teacher Francine said, "If you have the

connection across the different subjects between reading and music, for example, that connection is going to make you stronger in both areas."

As a related idea, music teacher participants distinguished authentic IME from more superficial integration. For example, Abby said:

I think that they [grade-level teachers] should [integrate music], but I think that it needs to be genuine...I think if it's not going to be done well, they shouldn't do it. I think if they're willing to put forth the time...I think that it needs to be thought out and something the teacher wants to do...

Dorothy, the other music teacher, notably made a similar observation by saying:

I just saw a Twitter post last week, "Oh, I'm going to integrate music - the beat with some math concept," and it was singing a song to the math topic which you're not teaching any real musical skills there. So it's not technically integration in my opinion...So I think when they use the term integration there it's really one-sided most of the time, especially when you are coming from a music teacher standpoint, I think a lot of times grade-level teachers think that it is integrating, but it's actually not because they are not supporting the music side of things.

The music teachers questioned the authenticity of IME understandings and practices among their grade-level teacher colleagues. Our classroom observations confirmed this; we rated authentic interdisciplinary relationships as developing or emerging for three of the grade-level teachers and proficient for one.

Another topic related to defining IME was its sporadic use. Many participants reported integrating music on an intermittent basis. For example, Briana said, "It's when I can fit it in...how relevant it is..." Similarly, Dorothy said, "I feel like it's valuable for certain things, not

100 percent of the time though.” Fifth-grade teacher Francine described the connection between depth and frequency of music integration by saying:

On a very basic level, when we're practicing reading fluently, we have a conversation on a weekly basis about the connection between music and reading because we are discussing pace and rhythm and expression. So, I think on a very basic level it's discussed with my students once a week. On a more involved level...that's maybe a couple times a year.

Perhaps because they lacked sufficient guidance or experience, the grade-level teachers primarily demonstrated superficial inclusion of music to support sight-word instruction, daily routines, transitions, and movement breaks. As we observed, this integration level reinforced previous research studies which suggested that when grade-level teachers integrated music with other disciplines, their practices were inconsequential (Giles & Frego, 2004; O’Keefe et al., 2016; Saunders & Baker, 1991).

Benefits of Integrated Music Education

When we analyzed for IME benefits, two categories of benefits emerged: academic and non-academic. The academic benefits included two topics: cross-curricular learning and learning styles. In addition, we found three topics related to non-academic benefits: student engagement, classroom management, and life skills.

Academic Benefits

The grade-level teachers often described connections between disciplines such as English Language Arts (ELA) and music, or mathematics and music in terms of music supporting students’ academic learning. For example, Emily said:

Students need to recall and be familiar with grade level sight words. So when we did the sight word songs that hit on those standards...In the afternoon when we do some math, we have math songs that we do that are different math standards...counting, skip counting, being able to add fluently within five. But the morning is our reading and our literature-based standards.

In some cases, participants described connections between music and another discipline that highlighted student learning in both subjects. For example, Francine explained a lesson that connected vocabulary in music and poetry:

The purpose of it was to tie everything together for them to write a poem from the viewpoint of Langston Hughes, utilizing the vocabulary and the ideas that they had talked about in music with [the music teacher] to give their poem a rhythm and a beat that would particularly tie into that time period when Langston Hughes was writing poems.

In a parallel example, Abby expressed similar cross-curricular learning goals from a music-teaching perspective. She said:

... they [the students] understand that the syllables in a word are rhythmic, and so each syllable has to have a note head. So, they start to understand how to set lyrics to a rhythm, but... I do it the reverse for a while, where I have the lyrics and I have them make the rhythm, and then in fourth and fifth [grade] they write their own lyrics and they have to set it.

In related examples, Abby's third grade music class matched rhythms to the phrase "horrible, terrible, no good, very bad day," and her kindergarten music class selected music to match the emotions of the characters they were reading about in a story. These teachers' accounts of music integration supporting their students' academic achievement aligned with the findings of

previous studies (Burton et al., 2000; Moss et al., 2018). During the observations, however, we did not rate any lesson as having exemplary interdisciplinary instruction. This inconsistency between perception and practice relates to the obstacles and needs we observed and discuss later in this section.

Participants' comments regarding different learning styles and IME revealed how they valued different learning modalities and differentiated instruction through the arts. For example, Charlotte said:

I think IME is very valuable, because I think kids remember things when they're tied to music. And we remember song lyrics and things like that. We have a lot of kinesthetic learners. And so, when they're able to move and learn at the same time, that is super helpful to them, and I think that just reaching all our learners in different ways, and giving them these options, is very helpful....I think it [IME] is very relevant. I think that it's just as important as anything else.

Abby made comments that related learning modalities to curricular content by saying:

...some students might be really strong in science, but in music, they're just kind of like, "meh"... So, when you incorporate science, it starts to click for them. [Students think,] "Oh, yeah, music can be scientific, and science can be musical." Or vice versa, I've had kids who really struggle in reading and writing, but they... have no issue doing that [writing song lyrics] for some reason...I think it's so important that they [students] see that learning isn't compartmentalized.

The use of different learning modalities and differentiated instruction was also apparent during our observations. In terms of the facilitating learning dimension, we rated seven lessons as proficient with the variety of demonstrations provided in each class.

Non-Academic Benefits

Every participant noted non-academic student benefits of music integration, including student engagement. Emily said, “Most kids love arts and music, that's like their favorite special, so anytime that we're able to do things that usually engage them more, they're more likely to pay attention.” She also said that she targets student interest by “...familiarizing myself with the kids’ tastes and finding some of the stuff that's out there that's fun, and popular...” Similarly, Francine said:

I would like to incorporate [music] because I know a lot of my students this year are very gifted artistically, whether it's music or otherwise....it would just be beneficial to make that connection with students to see where they have other interests or strengths outside of just my reading classroom...bring in something that they do show a strength in and they have a passion about...If they see I'm valuing the things they're interested in, then I feel like they also make an effort to value what I'm trying to teach in my classroom.

Issues related to classroom management emerged as a second non-academic topic. Emily described the role of music in managing student behaviors, stating:

We have tried in the past, where we haven't used those songs and used those routines in the morning and it's been a little more chaotic, and more pushy-shovey; not wanting to sit by that person. We've kind of eliminated that by [incorporating] the morning songs and the hand shaking, and they're more willing just to sit. It doesn't matter who's sitting next to them.

Similarly, Briana said that integrating music helped with managing transitions like cleaning up and lining up. She said, “instead of constantly having to be like, ‘Okay, stop. Look at me. Listen, this is your job,’ they just know that you hear that song [and] this is your job; what you need to

be doing...” More globally, Charlotte summarized the effect of including music in her lessons by reporting, “...I use music more as a way to kind of enrich my own lesson, or just kind of, just like helps mood and helps like, transition, and all of those things.”

Participants also identified a range of non-academic benefits related to music integration that promoted various life skills, aligning with previous research suggesting a connection between positive social outcomes and music integration (Catterall et al., 2012; Goff & Ludwig, 2013; May & Robinson, 2016). These non-academic benefits included building student confidence, developing empathy and other social skills, and promoting collaboration. Briana commented that music integration helps her students to believe, “...it's okay to sing in front of people....having performances, and having them [students] become confident in themselves and express themselves in a different way.” Considering the topic more holistically, music teacher Abby said:

I think that it's important to sometimes incorporate other subjects because I think it puts it [music] in a framework...it makes it so that the kids can understand that music isn't just an isolated place where you come in, but it doesn't really relate to like your real life skills. So, I like to integrate it so that they understand how music is really connected with lots of different things...

Similarly, music teacher Dorothy articulated multiple social benefits of participating in musical activities including building students' collaborative and interpersonal skills, empathy, and morale. She said:

That's one of my primary reasons why I teach games, singing games in my classroom....the way that I taught the task [before] was through direct instruction because I wasn't able to really put them into groups because they would fight...but if you allow

them to play a game, there's a lot of motivation there, but they also realize that they can work together.

Finally, in a commentary on the benefit of teachers modelling collaboration, Abby said:

It's great for the students to see teachers collaborating, I do stuff with my gym teacher a lot, and with the librarian specialist, especially, but just to see us working together and to see how our jobs and our lives intersect.

The non-academic benefits of IME discussed in this section most closely pertain to the classroom climate/culture and facilitating learning dimensions of our observation protocol. Considering these ratings, our classroom observations supported these participant statements as we rated all teachers as proficient in terms of teacher/student relationships and teacher/student communication. Previous research also suggests that music integration enhances classroom learning environments (Cosenza, 2005; Deasy, 2008; Irwin, et. al, 2006) and promotes communication (Catterall et al., 2012; Goff & Ludwig, 2013).

Supports for Integrated Music Education

When discussing supports for IME, five ideas emerged from participant responses. We categorized two of these supports as tangible and three others as behavioral. More specifically, they were: artists-in-residence and professional development, and teacher attitudes, teacher skills, and professional communication, respectively. Taken together, they described what measures enabled music and grade-level teachers to practice and sustain IME in their classrooms.

Tangible Supports

The first tangible support for IME that participants named was enrichment in the form of artists-in-residence. For example, music teacher Abby said her school hires “people to work with our kids which is helpful because that's how I find that a lot of my teachers end up integrating

things.” Similarly, Charlotte said, “...we definitely have more resident artists that come in...I think with the music, we've had a lot of events like drumming, which has been awesome, and dancing.”

Although not available to all participants, the second tangible support was professional development. Music teacher Dorothy reported that, “I just did a workshop a couple weeks ago...It was geared towards grade-level teachers and it was about using music to improve literacy in the classroom.” Similarly, kindergarten teacher Briana described her experience following a professional development workshop:

One of the sessions was “Singing in the Classroom,” and so I tried this year to do more, because [the presenter] sang in the morning. So, [now] we do things like we pick and choose what we're going to sing.

Instructional technology was the third tangible support cited by several participants. As kindergarten teacher Emily said, her music-teacher colleague:

...has some awesome folktale kind of nursery rhyme books that also have a song that goes with them...she has uploaded all of those for us... so the kids see it in music and see it in my room, and it ties literacy to music.

Similarly, Francine reported that she and her music-teacher colleague “...collaborated on a slideshow that included our learning targets and some vocabulary across the curriculum.” In addition, Dorothy described the essential role technology played facilitating inter-teacher collaboration by saying, “...we had a Google Excel spreadsheet with the musical terms and the poetry journal all inside....We talked mostly through that mechanism, through Google drive, or through email.” As another example of technology-based assistance, Dorothy also indicated that shared resources were a helpful support for IME. She said, “Something that I've been working on

for all grade levels is a song database with keywords and the global regions of study.” Voicing a contrary perspective on technology as something of a crutch, Emily said:

I use a lot of technology for the song and the music part, for art projects and stuff. I usually have to look up ideas; I can't usually just think of [ideas] myself and...I don't know if that's good or not. I wish that I just had more of an innate ability to know songs and have a repertoire built up to pull from instead of having to look them up all the time.

Behavioral Supports

Participants also described their own attitudes, skills, and communications about IME as important behavioral supports. For example, kindergarten teacher Emily said, “I grew up singing children's songs, I grew up with nursery rhymes and all of that. I think if I didn't like music and singing, I probably wouldn't be as wanting to integrate it as much.” Also illustrating her self-efficacy, kindergarten teacher Briana spoke about her own comfort level with regard to the context of her students as an accepting audience. She said:

...my own comfort in singing in front of children is probably fairly high, like I'm not afraid to sing in front of them. But...when you notice other people can hear you...or [the teacher] next door will say, "Oh we heard you singing," then you kind of feel a little self-conscious. But in front of kids, I'm not. You know, I'll make a mistake, and say, "Oops!" And they don't care.

Regarding communication, participants at one school site described both administrative and collegial communication as being critical to successful IME. Citing administrative input, music teacher Dorothy said:

There is a big pull for integration in the classroom...the instructional coach at my school has been really supportive in trying to figure out ways to...put core subject classes in my own teaching and...support certain areas in the schools that are low performing.

At the same school, fifth-grade teacher Francine reinforced this attitude by saying, “I do think at [my school] that [IME] is valued more, whether that's because we're a global school and so the administration values it...I think a lot of it has to do with [the music teacher] as well.” Discussing inter-teacher communication, Dorothy also said she rotated among other classes to teach songs to her grade-level teacher colleagues. Kindergarten teacher Emily commented on the positive nature of those interactions, stating that her music teacher colleague “...has been huge in helping me try to integrate music overall ...[with] resources that they're doing: folktales, books, and songs...so I can do that in the classroom.”

The two dimensions of our observation protocol that most directly aligned with the behavior supports discussed above were facilitating learning and interdisciplinary instruction. While we rated all teachers' observations for facilitating learning as developing or proficient, the ratings for interdisciplinary instruction varied by teacher colleagues. In particular, the teacher colleagues at each school site had very closely matched ratings (with the same or within one rating) for the balance of emphasis in interdisciplinary instruction standard. These parallel ratings could indicate that the interdisciplinary instruction quality depended on teacher communication between particular teachers and their paired colleagues. While other explanations are possible, the related arts integration literature on the importance of facilitating student learning and collaborative curricular planning supports this explanation (Barrett et al., 1997; Bresler, 2002; LaGarry & Richard, 2016; O'Keefe et al., 2016; Strand, 2006).

Obstacles to Integrated Music Education

The following four topics emerged as obstacles to IME and pertained to: teacher responsibilities and expectations, curricular standards, formalized IME assessment, and teachers' self-efficacy. These were impediments or challenges that participants encountered in their experiences with IME. The most predominant obstacle that participants cited was an imbalance in responsibilities and expectations among their colleagues. This particular obstacle contributed to the large gap between the idea of quality arts integration and its actual practice in schools (Hallmark, 2012). The most obvious imbalance described how participants perceived music teachers as more responsible for integrating content than their grade-level teacher colleagues. Characterizing the relationship between music and grade-level teachers as different "sides," music teacher Dorothy explained, "I think it's a struggle to get the grade-level teachers to get involved. Sometimes they'll come to me and say, 'This is what we're doing,' but at the same time...they're not really integrating music on their side." Francine, her fifth-grade colleague, reinforced this imbalance by saying:

We, as Gen. Ed. teachers, don't think about that the other way around. ... I haven't ever really thought, "Oh well, I also could be supporting music, or art, or whatever that may be." So, I don't necessarily feel responsible for it [IME], but I do see where I think we need to be working together more...

We confirmed these imbalances through observations, noting that curricular content mostly addressed non-music objectives. Using our observation protocol, we also rated five of the eight lessons as emerging with respect to curricular balance. These findings are consistent with previous literature documenting grade-level teachers' self-perceived lack of responsibility for teaching musical concepts (Giles & Frego, 2004; O'Keefe et al., 2016).

Knowing what to teach, in terms of curricular standards, was a second obstacle that participants cited. While every teacher expressed familiarity with the standards in their own content areas, they differed in their knowledge of the standards of other disciplines. The two music teacher participants expressed a basic understanding of the non-music content standards such as mathematics and ELA, however, the grade-level teachers reported that they were not familiar with music standards and assumed those were addressed in music classes. Kindergarten teacher Briana said she focused on, “mostly [the] phonics side and math side [of standards]. Yeah. I'm not overly familiar with the music scene.” In another example, third-grade teacher Charlotte suggested collaborative planning as a means for helping grade-level teachers address music standards, stating:

...having that knowledge of the standards and then maybe working with a music teacher would be really helpful. Even if it just starts with one lesson a year. You and the music teacher and the other third grade teacher sit down to create that lesson together...[it] would be very beneficial.

As evidenced by our observations, we rated all teachers as proficient regarding standards-based instruction within their discipline and proficient or exemplary in terms of their-content-specific knowledge. Conversely, one teacher rated as emerging, six teachers rated as developing, and one teacher rated as proficient with respect to interdisciplinary instruction standards, consistent with their stated unfamiliarity and inexperience in teaching interdisciplinary standards. This finding is also consistent with the related literature documenting a lack of preparation for IME among grade-level teachers (Battersby & Cave, 2014; May & Robinson, 2016; O’Keefe et al., 2016; Wolkowicz, 2017).

A third obstacle that emerged as a weakness in IME teaching practices was the lack of formalized IME assessment. Generally, grade-level teachers used informal assessments and observations of IME, with a focus on their content area. For example, fifth-grade teacher Francine described student reactions and comments as IME assessments by saying:

I continue to hear them [the students] talk about, “Oh yeah, remember when we did the drums?” or “Remember when we talked about this with [the music teacher]?” And I hear them using the vocabulary terms that we had discussed. And I definitely hear it [fluency] in their reading to me. They've been working really hard to focus on their expression and reading. So, it has made a difference.

Her music-teacher colleague, Dorothy, had a similar observational approach to assessment. She said:

...I had looked at what they [the students] wrote down and it was kind of an assessment to see how they were doing. It was actually pretty successful because the kids that normally fall asleep and are disengaged in music were [engaged]...They didn't quit. They did the work.

With more of a focus on her own content, kindergarten teacher Emily described her assessment of IME by saying:

...some of them [the students] did [meet the learning goals] because they participated. I want participation and I want to see them engagedwith the sight-word songs, I want to see them spelling the word [and] saying the word, which probably 80 percent were on task and doing that. The steady beat... probably like five were able to really keep a steady beat while we were doing that, which was good. It kind of lets me see who can do it. I mean, overall, they did. Most of them participated.

This informal approach to assessing IME contrasts with the importance of standardized test scores, which Dorothy reported were a major concern at her school and in her county. Informal assessments were the only type of IME assessments that we observed, although the overall instruction did not appear to suffer. While we rated six of the eight lessons as proficient with respect to overall assessment of student learning, we observed that assessment practices of IME were superficial.

The fourth obstacle to IME that emerged was participants' self-perceived lack of efficacy to integrate music across the curriculum. Reporting this as a rating on a ten-point scale (ten being the highest), many grade-level teachers gave themselves a low score, depending on the nature of the musical experience. For example, third-grade teacher Charlotte said, "It depends if I'm singing or if we're listening to it [music]. So, if it was singing or writing a song to go with content, it would be like one [on a scale of one to ten]." Clarifying this perspective, kindergarten teacher Emily said her comfort level, "depends on how easy I feel it [a song] is and how familiar with it I am." She went on to explain that when she doesn't feel comfortable, she found herself saying, "I wish I could do more, and I wish I knew how to make it more meaningful." In contrast, both music teachers rated their comfort and ability regarding IME higher than the grade-level teachers. Abby rated her comfort at "an eight or nine," and her knowledge "more like a six, depending on the subject." For her self-rating, Dorothy responded:

I'd say five out of ten just because I feel like I don't know a lot of that curriculum from the other side. I look at it, and I have to have the teachers explain it to me, but I'm always willing to learn.

We rated the four grade-level teachers as developing in terms of the authenticity between their content areas and music, while we rated the two music teachers as proficient in terms of

interdisciplinary authenticity. Taken together, these four obstacles to IME are consistent with the research literature characterizing IME as being limited and of low quality (Abril & Gault, 2006; NCES, 2012). They also confirm observation-based findings in previous studies, indicating that the majority of arts integration activities align with subservient level, while co-equal are least common (Bresler, 2002; O'Keefe et al., 2016; Wiggins, 2001).

Needs for Integrated Music Education

On balance with the observed obstacles presented above, the final theme emerged as areas of need to enhance IME instruction. In comparison to obstacles, we defined these needs as contributions the school or district could supply to enhance IME practices and possibly address obstacles to IME. These needs took the form of three more specific topics: resources, time, and professional development. When present, time and professional development appeared as IME supports, however they emerged as needs for IME more often because they were absent for most of the participants.

With attention to practical lesson planning and delivery, many participants cited their need for resources. Abby noted the importance and need for conveniently acquiring IME teaching materials: "I have a budget... if I need this book or I need this material, or whatever. I have everything like that at my fingertips, which is not always the case." More specifically, other participants responded with needs for ready-made resources designed for IME such as convenient and screened materials with pre-planned frameworks to design cross curricular connections. Charlotte said, "...the best thing is when you can give [teachers] something and then teachers can use it the next day..." As Emily said, "...I look around for something and if I can find it, I use it, and if I can't find anything, I just don't do any music with it."

Similarly, Briana expressed frustration about spending time online searching for resources related to her curriculum that she “could just teach in a few minutes.” Echoing the importance of high-quality materials from a music-teacher perspective, Dorothy underscored the need for “video or written lesson plans that were curated...I like it that they [lessons] are out there, but you really have to search for them. So maybe just a curated standard set of lessons that were tried and true ideas.”

The second topic was the need for more instructional and collaborative planning time to incorporate IME in the classroom. Generally, the way our participants cooperatively planned for instruction was not well-defined. Their processes seemed varied and more practical than strategic or fixed. For example, Briana expressed a desire for “more time to plan together. I think it would be great if we were working on, you know, similar texts or things, and she [the music teacher] was doing something with it in there...if you can find the time.” Also addressing the lack of time for collaborative planning, Francine said:

We don't necessarily have a common planning time that we use to be able to discuss, "OK. How are we going to do this? How are we going to make it work?"[My music teacher colleague] and I worked it out to be able to plan together, but because it's not necessarily something that's required by administration, I think it doesn't happen a lot of times, whereas with our own grade level team, we are required to plan with them. And so I think that's something that definitely could be worked on, making sure that collaboration and common planning is happening at some point.

Regarding the need for individual instructional planning time, Abby reflected:

...a lot of it is a “time and effort” thing: "How long is this going to take me to put together?" Because you know, when you're doing it [an IME lesson] for the first time,

you're like, "I could put this together for six hours and it could be garbage." So, a lot of the things that I try are fairly quick and easy.

Succinctly, Briana said that she needed, "Time for planning. Yeah, like trying to add one more thing to integrate...is hard." Charlotte echoed this perception about adding another activity by saying, "It's hard to think about, you're so focused on what needs to get done that sometimes taking that time to integrate something makes it harder. Or, you're worried, 'Is it going to get them [the students] more off task?'" Previous researchers have also reported inadequate planning time as a challenge (Cosenza, 2005; LaGarry & Richard, 2018; O'Keefe et al., 2016), characterizing time as an essential component in promoting collaboration among teachers (Bresler, 2002; Della Pietra, 2010; Munroe, 2015; Strand, 2006), and noting that arts teachers rarely have time for quality arts integration work because of their heavy teaching demands (Hallmark, 2012).

A final topic was the need for professional development in IME. When offered, it would provide teachers with the support and confidence they need to practice IME more often and successfully. For example, Francine said, "...when I saw the question about professional development I really thought, you know, that's something I would be interested in because I've never really had that opportunity." Similarly, Abby highlighted the need for approved professional development on a district level. She said, "I think teachers should be integrating music, but I think that there needs to be district provided quality professional development to teach teachers how to do it."

In a related comment, Briana suggested a teachers-teaching-teachers model for professional development saying, "Maybe watching someone else? Because...you spend so much time in your room. It's so great to see how other people do it, and that isn't often there."

The lack of professional development in music integration is consistent with findings from earlier studies (Hallmark, 2012; LaGarry & Richard, 2018). Similarly, the need for specific teaching resources and planning time reinforce the general lack of effective arts integration in the related literature (Burnaford et al., 2013; Krakaur, 2017).

On the whole, we found that the observed disciplinary instruction did not have a direct link to the overall quality of interdisciplinary instruction. Overall, participants demonstrated proficient or exemplary levels of disciplinary instruction, while their interdisciplinary instruction was at the emerging or developing level. We observed that they struggled the most with balancing time between content-areas and authentic, interdisciplinary connections. It seemed that a high level of IME was not a requirement for high-quality instruction. Instead, a high level of authentic IME might enhance student engagement and achievement. We did not consider those outcome measures in our current study but they appear in previous research (Burton et al., 2000; Moss et al., 2018).

Summary

In summary, the themes and ratings discussed above addressed our research questions: (a) what were participants' perceptions about IME; and (b) how did the participants' observed instructional practices demonstrate IME quality (i.e. disciplinary and interdisciplinary instruction)? We found that participants' perceptions about IME included inexact use and understanding of related terminology, as well as applying a range of integration levels. This variety of integration parallels the four levels Bresler defined (1995). Four descriptive themes emerged from participants' rich and thoughtful interview responses: academic and non-academic benefits of IME, tangible and behavioral supports for IME, obstacles to IME instruction, and needs for implementing IME in the classroom.

To address the second research question, we found multiple points of connection between participants' perceptions about IME and their observed IME practices. In particular, we found that emergent themes from the interviews and ratings from classroom observations were consistent regarding definitions of IME, academic and non-academic benefits, and obstacles to IME. One disconnect was the way that some participants described co-equal integration, yet demonstrated subservient and social integration. This difference between perception and practice applied to the higher IME levels and ratings, while teachers describing IME in terms of lower-level activities demonstrated parallel practices, rated as emerging or developing. The low levels of music integration in the classroom observations are consistent with previous findings (Abril & Gault, 2006; Giles & Frego, 2004; O'Keefe et al., 2016), while the difference between IME perceptions and practice reinforces the obstacles and needs we found, consistent with Hallmark's conclusions (2012).

Implications

Practical implications of this study include recommendations for advancing IME at the pre-service and in-service teacher levels. It is essential for in-service elementary music teachers to embrace all four NCAS process standards, including Connecting along with Creating, Performing, and Responding (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards, 2015). By highlighting Connecting as an important and perhaps even co-equal artistic process, music and grade-level teachers may more fully appreciate and share the interdisciplinary benefits of music with their students. For teachers to implement successful and high-level IME practices in their classrooms, it is constructive and perhaps necessary for both grade-level and music teachers to have at least a consistent understanding of IME. Accomplishing this via enhanced and focused communication would also increase teacher collaboration and counteract the attitude both grade-level and music

teacher-participants described as having unequal responsibilities for IME. Planning IME instruction cooperatively instead of in isolation would also expand the presence of music in general education classrooms (Bresler, 2002; Della Pietra, 2010; Munroe, 2015; O’Keefe et al., 2016; Strand, 2006), thereby challenging the notion that music is reserved for the “specialist” teachers who are considered musically “talented.”

Another practical implication is aligning music teacher and grade-level teachers’ understandings of IME with its actual instructional practices. As shown in our findings, this is sometimes missing, yet is critical for successful IME implementation. One essential step in this direction for in-service music and grade-level teachers is recognizing the importance of relevant, practical, and repeated experiences with IME, resulting in an understanding of music and non-music standards to increase teachers’ self-efficacy and comfort level (Burnaford et al., 2013; Hallmark 2012; Krakaur, 2017; LaGarry & Richard, 2018). Along with the lower levels of music integration, which have a purpose in grade-level instruction (Giles & Frego, 2004; Hallmark 2012), implications of this study are to promote and highlight the enhanced impact higher levels of music integration have on student engagement and achievement (Burton et al., 2000; Moss et al., 2018). This type of integrated instruction may lead to higher student achievement as demonstrated by test scores and other, less tangible measures (Johnson & Howell, 2009; Noblit et al., 2000; Noblit et al., 2009).

At the pre-service level, methods courses in both music and general elementary teacher education could strengthen their integrated music content to promote a mindset for integrated learning practices. If teacher-educators model and promote the value of IME among pre-service teachers, they can instill this instructional approach for future generations. Perhaps revitalizing interest in IME among teacher-educators (Battersby & Cave, 2014) will also have the added

benefit of making an often-required “arts” course more professionally relevant to pre-service teachers. Beyond music, these implications have broader applications for integrated arts education, with cross-curricular benefits for students and teachers through dance, drama, and the visual arts.

Directions for future research include investigating student achievement and engagement as a function of interdisciplinary instruction. By considering student responses to IME pedagogy, we may learn more about its potential impact from academic and non-academic perspectives. In addition, we may also understand more about the implications of high-quality teacher preparation and professional development as demonstrated in music and grade-level classrooms. Finally, we plan to replicate this study at the middle-school level to learn more about differences and similarities by age and grade levels in order to develop a more complete understanding of IME.

References

- Abril, C. R., & Gault, B. M. (2006). The state of music in the elementary school: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 54*(1), 6-20.
- Anderson, A. (Ed.). (2014). *Arts integration and special education: An inclusive theory of action for student engagement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Baer, J., & Kaufman, J. C. (2012). Divergent thinking. In J. Baer & J. C. Kaufman (Eds.), *Being creative inside and outside the classroom: How to boost your students' creativity - and your own* (pp. 13-60). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Barrett, J., McCoy, C., & Veblen, K. (1997). *Sound ways of knowing: Music in the interdisciplinary classroom*. New York, NY: Schirmer.
- Barry, N. H. (2008). The role of integrated curriculum in music teacher education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 18*(1), 28-38.
- Battersby, S. L., & Cave, A. (2014). Preservice classroom teachers' preconceived attitudes, confidence, beliefs, and self-efficacy toward integrating music in the elementary curriculum. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education 32*(2), 52-59.
- Berke, M. K. (2000). Curriculum integration: A two-way street. *General Music Today, 14*(1), 9-12.
- Bresler, L. (1995). The subservient, co-equal, affective, and social integration styles and their implications for the arts. *Arts Education Policy Review, 96*, 31-37.
- Bresler, L. (2002). Out of the trenches: The joys (and risks) of cross-disciplinary collaborations. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 152*(Spring), 17-39.
- Burnaford, G., Aprill, A., & Wiess, C. (2013). *Renaissance in the classroom: Arts integration and meaningful learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Burton, J.M., Horowitz, R., & Abeles, H. (2000). Learning in and through the arts: The question of transfer. *Studies in Arts Education*, 41(3), 228-257.
- Campbell, P. S. (2004). *Teaching music globally*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Catterall, J. S., Dumais, S. A., & Hampden-Thompson, G. (2012). The arts and achievement in at-risk youth: Findings from four longitudinal studies. Washington, D. C.: National Endowment for the Arts, Research Report #55. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.gov/research/arts-at-risk-youth.pdf>
- Cosenza, G. (2005). Implications for music educators of an interdisciplinary curriculum. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, 6(9), 1-7.
- Cslovjecsek, M., & Zulauf, M. (2018). *Integrated music education: Challenges of teaching and teacher training*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research designs: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust., F., & Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 390 – 441). Jossey-Bass.
- Deasy, R. J. (2008). Why the arts deserve center stage. *School Administrator* 65(3), 12-15, 17.
- Della Pietra, C. J. (2010). Preservice elementary classroom teachers' attitudes toward music in the school curriculum and teaching music. *Research and Issues in Music Education* 8(1), 1-15.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Fowler, C. B. (2001). *Strong arts, strong schools: The promising potential and shortsighted disregard of the arts in American schooling*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Giles, A. M., & Frego, R. J. D. (2004). An inventory of music activities used by elementary classroom teachers: An exploratory study. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 22(2), 13-22.

Goff, R., & Ludwig, M. (2013). Teacher practice and student outcomes in arts-integrated learning settings: A review of literature. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from <http://www.wolftrap.org/~media/Files/PDF/ArtsIntegratedLearningWhitePaper2513.ashx>

Hallmark, E. F. (2012). Challenge: The arts as collaborative inquiry. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 113(3), 93-99.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment Support Consortium. (1992). Model standards for teacher licensing and development. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from <http://programs.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf>

Irwin, R. L., Gouzouasis, P., Leggo, C., & Springgay, S. (2006, March 6 – 9). *Investigating curriculum integration, the arts and diverse learning environments* [Paper presentation]. World Congress on Arts Education, Lisbon, PT. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.497.8270&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Johnson, D. C., & Howell, G. (2009, September 10 – 12). *Drop-out prevention among at-risk students through integrated arts education: A school-university-community partnership*

- [Poster presentation]. Society for Music Teacher Education Symposium. Greensboro, NC.
- Krakaur, K. (2017). *Arts integration for understanding: Deepening teacher practice in and through the arts* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Maryland. Retrieved from <https://drum.lib.umd.edu/handle/1903/19930>
- LaGarry, A. E., & Richard, B. (2018). Arts integration in rural Minnesota: A collaborative arts integration framework. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 119(3), 146-157.
- Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. D. (2013). *Teacher evaluation that makes a difference*. Alexandria: ASCD.
- May, B. N., & Robinson, N. R. (2016). Arts teachers' perceptions and attitudes on arts integration while participating in a statewide arts integration initiative. *Journal of Music Teacher Education* 25(3), 12–26.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Moss, T. E., Benus, M. J., & Tucker, E. A. (2018). Impacting urban students' academic achievement and executive function through school-based arts integration programs. *SAGE Open*, 8(2), 1-10.
- Munroe, A. (2015). Curriculum integration in the general music classroom. *General Music Today*, 29(1), 12–18.
- National Center for Education Statistics [NCES]. (2012). Arts education in public elementary and secondary schools. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/frss/publications/>

- National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. (2015). *National Core Arts Standards*. Dover, DE: State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education.
- National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future: Report of the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future*. New York, NY: The Commission on Teaching & America's Future.
- Noblit, G., Corbett, D., & Wilson, B. (2000). *The arts and education reform: Lesson from a four-year evaluation of the A+ Schools program, 1995–1999*. Winston-Salem, NC: The Thomas S. Kenan Institute for the Arts.
- Noblit, G., Corbett, D., Wilson, B., & McKinney, M. (2009). *Creating and sustaining arts-based school reform: The A+ Schools Program*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (1998/2013). North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards. North Carolina State Board of Education, Department of Public Instruction. Retrieved from https://files.nc.gov/dpi/north_carolina_professional_teaching_standards_2.pdf
- O'Keefe, K., Dearden, K. N., & West, R. (2016). A survey of the music integration practices of North Dakota elementary classroom teachers. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 35(1), 13–22.
- Root-Bernstein, R. S. (2001). Music, creativity, and scientific thinking. *Leonardo*, 34(1), 63-68.
- Rowan, B., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2016). Teacher evaluation in American schools. In D. Gitomer & C. Bell, (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 1159-1216). American Educational Research Association.
- Russell-Bowie, D. (2009). Syntegration or disintegration? Models of integrating the arts across the primary curriculum. *International Journal of Education in the Arts*, 10(28), 1-23.

- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Saunders, T. C., & Baker, D. S. (1991). In-service classroom teachers' perceptions of useful music skills and understandings. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 39(3), 248-261.
- Siedman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Silverstein, L., & Layne, S. (2010). *Defining arts integration*. Retrieved from http://www.kennedy-center.org/education/partners/defining_arts_integration.pdf
- Smithrim, K., & Uptis, R. (2005). Learning through the arts: Lessons of engagement. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'Éducation*, 28 (1/2), 109-127.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Strand, K. (2006). The heart and the journey: Case studies of collaboration for arts integrated curricula. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 108(1), 29-40.
- US Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2002). Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education.
- Wade, B. C. (2004). *Thinking musically: Experiencing music, expressing culture*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wiggins, R. A. (2001). Interdisciplinary curriculum: Music educator concerns. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(5), 40-44.
- Wolf, D. P. (1992). Assessment as an episode of learning. *Assessment Update* 4(1), 5-14.

Wolkowicz, T. (2017). Concept-based arts integration: Lessons learned from an application in music and biology. *Music Educators Journal*, 103(4), 40-47.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.) Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Table 1
Participant Profiles

Participant	Teaching Area	Teaching Experience	Degrees/Certifications	Interdisciplinary Preparation
Abby	K-5 Music	6 years	BME; M.Ed.; certified K-12 music	Undergraduate & graduate level training; taught undergraduate music integration course
Briana	Kindergarten	13 years	BA; MA; certified K-8	Attended arts integration PD
Charlotte	3 rd Grade	10 years	BA; MA; National Board certification; certified K-8	Undergraduate training
Dorothy	K-5 Music	4 years	BM, MM, & DMA in flute performance; Kodaly Level I; music theory pedagogy certificate; certified K-12 music	Attended two half-day Kennedy Center for the Arts workshops
Emily	Kindergarten	14 years	BA; MA; certified K-6	No specific training
Francine	5 th Grade ELA	8 years	BA; National Board Certification; certified K-5; certified middle grade Social Studies and Language Arts	No specific training

Table 2
Findings

Themes		
Defining IME	Inexact terminology usage A range of integration	
Benefits of IME	Academic	Non-Academic
	Cross-curricular learning Learning styles	Student engagement Classroom management Life skills
Supports for IME	Tangible supports	Behavioral supports
	Artist-in-residence enrichment Professional development	Teacher attitudes Teaching skills Professional communications
Obstacles to IME	Imbalanced responsibilities and expectations Lack of curricular standards knowledge Lack of formalized IME assessment Lack of teachers' self-efficacy	
Needs for IME	Instructional resources Planning and instructional time Professional development designed for IME	

Table 3
Observation Ratings

	Northwest Teachers				Southeast Teachers			
	<u>Music</u>		<u>Grade Level</u>		<u>Music</u>		<u>Grade Level</u>	
	Abby (K)	Abby (3)	Briana (K)	Charlotte (3)	Dorothy (K)	Dorothy (5)	Emily (K)	Francine (5)
Interdisciplinary Instruction								
Disciplinary standards	P	D	D	D	Em	D	D	D
Authentic relationships	P	P	D	Em	Em	P	D	P
Balance of emphasis	P	Em	Em	Em	Em	P	Em	P
Disciplinary Instruction								
Disciplinary standards	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Discipline-specific knowledge	P	P	P	P	P	Ex	P	P
Student engagement	P	P	D	D	D	D	D	P
Critical thinking/collaboration	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Ex
Classroom Climate/Culture								
Teacher/student relationship	P	P	P	P	D	P	P	P
Teacher communication	P	P	P	P	P	D	P	P
Diversity advocacy	P	Ex	P	P	D	Ex	P	Ex
Facilitating Learning								
Variety of demonstrations	P	P	P	D	P	P	P	P
Quality of assessment	P	D	P	P	P	D	P	P
Alignment	D	P	D	P	D	D	P	P

Note. Em = emerging; D = developing; P = proficient; Ex = exemplary

Appendix A Interview Questions

Demographics/Education/Background:

1. Name, position, grade(s)
2. School, district
3. How long have you been teaching in your current position? Overall?
4. What degrees/certifications do you hold?
5. What do you consider to be the definition of music integration?
6. How long have you been integrating music?
7. How often do you integrate music?
8. What percentage of your teaching involves music integration?
9. What training have you received related to music integration? Undergraduate courses? Professional development? Other?
10. Rate your own comfort/ability/knowledge regarding music integration lessons.

Lesson/Observation:

1. Talk me through your lesson plan.
2. Was this lesson an extension of the previous lesson?
3. What prior knowledge did students have before today's lesson?
4. How well do you think it went?
5. How would you describe the way/s you integrated music (or other content area) in this lesson?
6. What changes would you make to today's lesson if you were going to teach it again?
7. Did the students meet your goals/objectives? How do you know?
8. Describe any collaborative preparation for this lesson you had with a teacher/colleague.
9. Are you addressing music and grade-level standards or just your specific discipline? Why? How?

Grade-Level teacher—

- 10a. How comfortable are you teaching music skills/concepts in your classroom?
- 10b. Do you feel responsible for meeting music objectives in your classroom?
- 10c. Should music teachers integrate content from other subjects with music? How often?

Music teacher—

- 10d. How comfortable are you teaching skills/concepts of other disciplines in your classroom?
- 10e. Do you feel responsible for meeting objective in other disciplines in your classroom?
- 10f. Should grade-level teachers integrate music content with other subjects? How often?

Teacher Perceptions:

1. What structures does your district or school have in place to support music integration?
2. What factors impact your decisions to integrate music with other subjects?
3. What factors impact your ability to integrate music with other subjects?
4. What would be most helpful to you in preparing music integration lessons?
5. What would be most helpful to you in delivering music integration lessons?
6. How valuable do you think integrating music instruction with other content areas is to you (personally), for professional collaboration, and for your students?
 - a. How is it important? (or not important)
 - b. Why is it important? (or not important)
7. How relevant is music integration to your overall instruction?
8. How do you decide about integrating music with another content area?
9. How does integrating music with another content area influence your students' learning?
10. In what other ways does integrating music with another content area influence your students?

Appendix B
Observation Protocol

Ratings	Dimensions	Evidence Observed or Collected (open-ended response)
Emerging	<p>CLASSROOM CLIMATE/CULTURE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students do not have a positive relationship with the teacher. 2. The teacher does not communicate effectively. 3. The teacher does not embrace diversity in the class or school community. <p>DISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The teacher usually does not align discipline-specific instruction to meet grade-level standards. 2. The teacher does not demonstrate their discipline-specific knowledge to support their instruction. 3. The teacher does not make instruction relevant to students. 4. The teacher does not assist students in developing skills in teamwork, critical-thinking, or in other higher-order thinking. <p>INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The teacher's instruction does not lead students to show evidence that they meet standards in either discipline. 2. The teacher does not demonstrate the use of authentic relationships between disciplines (lack of valid connection). 3. The teacher does not demonstrate a balance of emphasis between the disciplines in the lesson (understandings in music and another discipline are not equally valued and recognized). <p>FACILITATING LEARNING</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The teacher usually does not use a variety of methods or collect evidence of student learning in different formats. 2. The teacher usually does not analyze student learning. 3. The teacher does not use appropriate objectives or assessments for the lesson. 	
Developing	<p>CLASSROOM CLIMATE/CULTURE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students generally have a positive and nurturing relationship with the teacher. 2. The teacher sometimes communicates effectively. 3. The teacher somewhat embraces diversity in the class and/or school community. <p>DISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The teacher somewhat aligns discipline-specific instruction to meet grade-level standards. 2. The teacher somewhat demonstrates their discipline-specific knowledge to support their instruction. 3. The teacher somewhat makes instruction relevant to students. 4. The teacher somewhat assists students in developing skills in collaborative teamwork, critical-thinking, and/or other higher-order thinking. <p>INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION</p>	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The teacher’s instruction leads students to show evidence that they meet standards in only one discipline. 2. The teacher marginally demonstrates the use of authentic relationships between disciplines (minimally valid connection). 3. The teacher somewhat demonstrates a balance of emphasis between disciplines in the lesson (understandings in music and another discipline and somewhat equally valued and recognized). <p>FACILITATING LEARNING</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The teacher sometimes uses a variety of methods or collects evidence in different formats to assess students learning. 2. The teacher sometimes analyzes students learning. 3. The teacher uses somewhat appropriately aligned objectives and assessments for the lesson. 	
<p>Proficient</p>	<p>CLASSROOM CLIMATE/CULTURE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each student has a positive and nurturing relationship with the teacher. 2. The teacher communicates effectively, 3. The teacher regularly embraces diversity in the class and school community. <p>DISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The teacher regularly aligns discipline-specific instruction to meet grade-level standards. 2. The teacher regularly demonstrates their discipline-specific knowledge to support their instruction. 3. The teacher regularly makes instruction relevant to students. 4. The teacher regularly assists students in developing skills in collaborative teamwork, critical-thinking, and other higher-order thinking. <p>INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The teachers’ instruction leads students to show evidence that they meet standards in each integrated discipline. 2. The teacher demonstrates the use of authentic relationships between disciplines (valid connection). 3. The teacher effectively demonstrates a balance of emphasis between the disciplines in the lesson (understandings in music and another discipline are equally valued and recognized). <p>FACILITATING LEARNING</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The teacher uses a variety of methods or collects evidence in different formats to assess student learning 2. The teacher analyzes student learning. 3. The teacher uses appropriately aligned objectives and assessments for the lesson. 	
<p>Exemplary</p>	<p>CLASSROOM CLIMATE/CULTURE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each student has a positive and nurturing relationship with the teacher as an adult who cares. 2. The teacher consistently communicates effectively. 3. The teacher consistently embraces diversity in the class, school community, and the world. <p>DISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION</p>	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The teacher effectively aligns all discipline-specific instruction to meet grade-level standards.2. The teacher effectively demonstrates their discipline-specific knowledge to support their instruction.3. The teacher effectively makes all instruction relevant to students.4. The teacher effectively assists students in developing skills in collaborative teamwork, critical-thinking, and other higher-order thinking <p>INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The teacher’s instruction leads students to show evidence that they meet standards in each integrated discipline equally.2. The teacher highlights authentic relationships between disciplines (exceptional connection).3. The teacher meritoriously demonstrates a balance of emphasis between the disciplines in the lesson (understandings in music and another discipline are highlighted and promoted). <p>FACILITATING LEARNING</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The teacher effectively uses a variety of methods and collects evidence in different formats to assess student learning.2. The teacher effectively analyzes student learning.3. The teacher effectively uses appropriately aligned objectives and assessments for the lesson.	
--	---	--