

- Rutkowski, J., Hewitt, M., Taggart, C., & Weaver, M. (2007). *Preparing music teacher educators*. Presentation at the Society for Music Teacher Education, Greensboro, NC.
- Ryan, K. A. (1974). If I had to do it all over again. *Theory into Practice*, 13(3), 159-166.
- Schwartz, H. (1996). The changing nature of teacher education. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.). *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 2-13). New York: Macmillan.
- Smith, F. (1998). *The book of learning and forgetting*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. C., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Woodford, P. G. (2002). The social construction of music teacher identity in undergraduate music education majors. In R. Colwell, & C. Richardson (Ed.). *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 675-694). New York: Oxford University Press.

# Eminence in Music Education Research as Measured in the New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning

Clint Randles  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Julie Hagen  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

BettyAnne Gottlieb  
University Of Arkansas  
Fayetteville, Arkansas

Karen Salvador  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

## ABSTRACT

*The purpose of the present study was to identify (a) scholars, (b) journals, (c) authored monographs, (d) edited books or proceedings, and (e) dissertations that were the most eminent, as measured by the frequency of citation in the New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning (New Handbook). Data from 7,426 citations included in the 60 chapters containing reference sections were analyzed and rank ordered. The most frequently cited scholars were Edwin Gordon and Howard Gardner. The most eminent bibliographic sources were the Journal of Research in Music Education, the Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, Music Matters, the Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning, and dissertations by Mitchell Robinson and Kari Veblen. The authors include researchers, curriculum specialists, psychologists, sociologists, and philosophers from both music and general education. Results from this study clearly indicate the wide variety of sources that impact the field of music education research.*

## INTRODUCTION

Measures of eminence are to music education scholarship as the Academy Awards are to the motion picture industry. Periodically, many disciplines define which endeavors

constitute outstanding examples of work in their fields. In the motion picture industry, Oscars are awarded to the Best Picture, Best Director, and so on, each year. In music education scholarship, we do not have such a process in place to collectively select and recognize outstanding authors, researchers, journals, and dissertations. Many people choose a movie to see based on its performance at the Academy Awards or seek out the movies of actors or directors who have previously received Oscars. In the same way, music teachers, university students, professors, authors, and researchers may benefit from periodic reviews of eminence in music education scholarship. Such studies could help us see trends in research, select books with which we should be familiar, decide which journals to read, and structure our research and teaching to contribute more coherently to our growing body of scholarship.

Eminence has frequently been determined by rates of citation. Hamann and Lucas (1998) used citation information contained in six nationally distributed music education research journals from 1990-1995 to determine which journals are most eminent. Standley (1984) measured scholar eminence by ranking the number of times authors were cited in the *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, and the *Journal of Music Therapy* from each journal's inception through 1982. Using the same method and the same journals, Brittin and Standley (1997) updated this study to include 1983-1992. In a 1992 study, Sample investigated the eminence of specific research articles by tabulating the number of times they were referenced in the *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *Contributions to Music Education*, and the *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* from 1963 to 1989. Tabulation of citations has also been used to determine what research interests (i.e., populations and variables) were studied most frequently. For example, Schmidt and Zdzinski (1993) sampled database research (descriptive or experimental studies with numbers as their data) from six music education, therapy, and psychology journals. Yarbrough (1984) reviewed the contents of the *Journal of Research in Music Education* and classified the articles by methodology, content, and topic. Kratus (1993) used rates of citation in the chapter indices of the *Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning (Handbook)* to determine the eminence of authors, journals, monographs, edited books, and dissertations.

*The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning (New Handbook)* (Colwell & Richardson, 2002) is a comprehensive review of research in music education. It is not merely a revision of the previous *Handbook*; it is entirely redesigned and includes completely original material. The *New Handbook* has 1,175 pages divided into 61 chapters in ten sections: Policy and Philosophy; Educational Context and the Curriculum; Musical Development and Learning; Musical Cognition and Development; Social and Cultural Contexts; Music Teacher Education; Music Education Connections; Neuroscience, Medicine, and Music; Outcomes in General Education; and Research Design, Criticism, and Assessment in Music Education. Each section was edited by an eminent scholar (in music education or a related field) and each chapter was written by an author or group of authors who were selected based on debate in multiple open plan-

ning meetings held over several years in a variety of venues including MENC inservices in Phoenix and Washington D. C. (Colwell & Richardson, 2002, i-ii).

The present study is a replication of Kratus's 1993 investigation of the *Handbook*. In that study, the *Handbook of Music Teaching and Learning* (Colwell, 1992) was used to identify "which music education (a) scholars, (b) journals, (c) authored monographs, (d) edited books or proceedings, and (e) dissertations were the most eminent, as measured by the frequency of citation..." (Kratus, 1993, p. 23). Kratus's study utilized a different method for counting authorship from previous eminence research in music education. In preceding studies, each time an author was cited, he or she was counted once, even in articles with multiple authors. Essentially, this would mean that a study with five authors was five times as eminent as a study with one author. Therefore, Kratus used fractions for studies with multiple authors. That is, two authors of the same work would each receive .5 citations, three authors would each receive .33 citations, four authors would each receive .25 citations and so on. Those researching eminence in business also use this method (Pirkul, Jacob, Ryu, & Savoie, 2007).

Kratus's study has been criticized because he:

...counted citation frequency within an edited volume of music research essays [*Handbook*] whose preface stated that the content was not intended to be exhaustive of the topic and whose authors were selected by an individual editor rather than by peer review. (Brittin & Standley, 1997, p. 148)

However, no source could be exhaustive regarding all research in a topic as broad as music education research. Faced with page and word count limits, authors and editors are likely to restrict themselves to the most important and salient topics and therefore to citing the most eminent works in their field. Based on their literature review, Brittin and Standley stated that:

scholarly standards for evaluation of eminence within a body of research call for the following procedures: (1) that an identifiable field and period of research be clearly specified and objectively evaluated in its entirety; (2) that the most eminent, refereed publication sources within that field be selected for analysis with the assumption that those selected sources will have been subjected to the most stringent standards of peer review for the determination of their content; and (3) that procedures and methodology of evaluation be clearly elucidated with enough specificity for replication. (1997, p. 148)

The present study uses the *New Handbook* as its "field and period of research" and evaluates it in its entirety. Authors for the *New Handbook* were selected based on open debates in public planning meetings held from 1995-1999. At these meetings, members of the public were invited to make suggestions regarding not only authorship but also the structure and organization of the *New Handbook*. This constitutes a form of peer review and resulted in well over 100 contributors from music education and related fields. In addition, each chapter was subjected to peer review, which utilized over 500 reviewers (Colwell & Richardson, 2002, x).

The purpose of the present study was to identify (a) scholars, (b) journals, (c) authored monographs, (d) edited books or proceedings, and (e) dissertations that were the most eminent, as measured by the frequency of citation in the *New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning (New Handbook)*. The *New Handbook* “is not an update of the first *Handbook*; rather it complements and extends that publication” (Colwell & Richardson, 2002, v). Therefore, this study also compared results from the *New Handbook* to those found by Kratus (1993) in his study of *Handbook* in an attempt to identify eminence trends in music education research.

## METHOD

Following procedures established by Kratus (1993), the researchers counted citations in the reference sections located at the end of the 61 chapters in the *New Handbook*. Chapter 2 does not contain a reference or endnote section and therefore was not included when calculating mean numbers of citations among chapters. There are 7,426 citations included in the 60 chapters containing reference sections, resulting in a mean of 123.8 citations per chapter. Excluding chapter 2, the number of citations per chapter ranges from a high of 284 to a low of 26.

The main index in the back of the *New Handbook* was used to identify the most frequently cited scholars. Citation frequency was then counted two different ways; by total number of citations, and by number of citations per chapter. These two methods of data collection resulted in two different kinds of data. Total number of citations was used to determine an author's depth of eminence in the music education field, while number of different chapters cited was used in determining an author's breadth of eminence across multiple areas within music education. For example, authors with 20 citations were seen as more deeply influential in the field of music education than authors with 10 citations; authors with citations in 10 different chapters were seen as influencing more areas within music education than authors who were cited in 5 different chapters. Since the chapter authors could cite themselves, the researchers, in accordance with procedures used by Kratus (1993), used the number of different chapters cited as way of keeping in check the eminence from a chapter with many self-citations. Self-citing was allowed because often those individuals chosen to author a chapter were leading contributors in their particular area of research. Care was taken to assure that female scholars who have changed names over their research careers were counted under both names by examining the main index, where maiden names were listed with married names.

Counts of citations per scholar were totaled, taking into account the distinction between multiple-author work and single-author work. Multiple-author work was counted fractionally according to the total number of contributing authors. For example, a citation with 3 authors was counted as a 1/3 fractional contribution for each of the three authors contributing to the work, while a single-author work was counted as one

full citation. It is therefore possible for an author to have a measure of eminence containing numbers to the right of the decimal point, if they co-authored a cited work.

Journal eminence was calculated in much the same way as author eminence. Total number of citations per journal was counted two different ways; by total number of citations, and by number of citations per chapter. This resulted in two types of data, one indicating the most deeply influential journals to the field of music education as a whole and the other indicating the journals that are influencing more varied areas within music education.

Monograph (i.e., book, published text, textbook series) eminence was calculated by counting the number of different chapters in which the monograph was cited. It was unnecessary to distinguish between total citations and number of chapters cited as a monograph can only be cited once per chapter. Edition distinction was not made; all editions were figured as contributing to the same individual monograph count total. Edition distinction was made, however, when different editions of a monograph had different editors. The monograph category did not include edited books, conference proceedings, or dissertations.

Eminence of edited books and published proceedings was calculated by counting the total number of citations as well as the number of different chapters in which the monograph was cited. It was necessary to distinguish between total citations and number of chapters cited as edited books and published proceedings can be cited more than once in a single chapter. As with monographs, edition distinction was not made except when different editors were involved.

Eminence of dissertations was measured by counting the number of chapters in which a dissertation was referenced, in much the same way as with monographs. Data were collected and tabulated for each of the five categories (scholars, journals, authored monographs, edited books/proceedings, and dissertations) using an excel spreadsheet, sorted by category; thus providing a common data collection source and means of tabulating data. Four researchers counted the 60 chapters containing reference lists. Frequent member checks were necessary during the process of counting to assure that each researcher used the same procedure. The rank orders included the 10 most frequently cited items in each category.

## RESULTS

Eminence of researchers, as measured by the number of citations and number of chapters in which cited, is listed in Table 1. Citation totals were taken to one decimal place to account for fractionalized credit for multiple-authored references. All ten of the researchers with the highest number of citations were cited in the most chapters, with the addition of Elliott, whose 21 citations were in 17 chapters. Gordon was the most cited author with 60 citations, 30 of which appeared in a single chapter: Developmental

characteristics of music learners [chapter 22]. Gardner, the second most cited author, was referenced in 35% more chapters than any other author.

Ranked by Number of Citations		
Rank	Author	# Citations
1	Gordon, E. E.	60
2	Gardner, H.	38.3
3	Eisner, E. W.	38.2
4	Bresler, L.	32.5
5	Campbell, P. S.	30.3
6	Swanwick, K.	30
7	Colwell, R.	29.5
8	Hargreaves, D. J.	27.4
9	Reimer, B.	24.7
10	Davidson, J. W.	21.1

  

Ranked by Number of Chapters in Which Cited		
Rank	Author	# Chapters
1	Gardner, H.	23
2.5	Elliott, D.	17
2.5	Reimer, B.	17
5	Colwell, R.	16
5	Eisner, E. W.	16
5	Hargreaves, D. J.	16
7	Campbell, P. S.	15
8.5	Bresler, L.	13
8.5	Gordon, E. E.	13
10.5	Davidson, J. W.	12
10.5	Swanwick, K.	12

Table 2 shows the journal rankings. With over 200 citations each, *The Journal of Research in Music Education*, and the *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* account for 47% of the citations for the ten most cited journals and each appears in over half the chapters in the *New Handbook*. Nine of the 10 journals with the most citations also appear in the rankings for number of chapters in which cited. *Music Perception*, ranked 7.5 for number of citations, was cited in 10 chapters, while *Contributions to Music Education*, with 22 citations, was ranked 10 for number of chapters in which cited.

Ranked by Number of Citations		
Rank	Journal	# Citations
1	Journal of Research in Music Education	240
2	Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education	210
3	Psychology of Music	117
4	Music Educators Journal	77
5	Arts Education Policy Review	70
6	Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning	59
7.5	British Journal of Music Education	53
7.5	Music Perception	53
9	Journal of Aesthetic Education	47
10	Educational Researcher	39

  

Ranked by Number of Chapters in Which Cited		
Rank	Journal	# Chapters
1	Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education	39
2	Journal of Research in Music Education	38
3	Music Educators Journal	28
4	Psychology of Music	24
5	Journal of Aesthetic Education	20
6	Arts Education Policy Review	19
7	British Journal of Music Education	17
8	Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning	16
9	Educational Researcher	15
10	Contributions to Music Education	14

The rank order for authored monographs is presented in Table 3. Eleven of the 20 items on the list are tied with five citations each. Elliott's *Music Matters* was the most frequently cited monograph, referenced in 15 of the 17 chapters in which he was cited. The two most cited authors have multiple monographs on the list. Gardner has three items and Gordon two. The third most referenced monograph was the *National Standards for Arts Education*. The list includes books addressing cultural issues (Bruner, Campbell, Green, Small, and Volk), constructivism (Upitis), and the psychology of music (Bamberger, Gardner, Hargreaves).

Table 3  
Eminence of Authored Monographs

Rank	Author	Title	# Citations
1	Elliott, D.	Music matters	15
2	Gardner, H.	Frames of mind	12
3	Consortium of National Arts Educ. Associations	National standards for arts education: What every young American should know and be able to do in the arts	9
5.5	Gordon, E. E.	Learning sequences in music	7
5.5	Mark, M. L.	Contemporary music education	7
5.5	Reimer, B.	A philosophy of music education	7
5.5	Schön, D.	The reflective practitioner	7
8.5	Hargreaves, D.	The developmental psychology of music	6
8.5	Serafine, M. L.	Music as cognition	6
15	Bamberger, J.	The mind behind the musical ear	5
15	Bruner, J.	Culture of education	5
15	Campbell, P. S.	Songs in their heads	5
15	Gardner, H.	Intelligence Reframed	5
15	Gardner, H.	The Unschooled Mind	5
15	Gordon, E. E.	Primary measures of music audiation	5
15	Green, L.	Music, gender, and education	5
15	Small, C.	Musicking: the meanings of performing and listening	5
15	Stake, Bresler & Mabry	Custom and cherishing: The arts in elementary schools	5
15	Uptis, R.	Can I play you my song?	5
15	Volk, T.	Music, education, and multiculturalism: Foundations and principles	5

The most frequently and broadly cited book or proceeding was the *Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning*, the predecessor to the *New Handbook* (see Table 4). Nine of the 15 items are ranked both for the number of citations and the number of chapters in which cited. Three handbooks on teaching are found on the lists, including *The Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (two editions), and *The Handbook of Research on Teaching* (three editions). The only proceeding ranking in the top 10 was that of *The Sixth International Conference on Music Perception*.

Table 4  
Eminence of Edited Books and Proceedings

Ranked by Number of Citations			
Rank	Editor	Book	# Citations
1	Colwell	Handbook of research on music teaching and learning	36
2	Hargreaves & North	The social psychology of music	26
3	Rideout	On the sociology of music education	23
4	Houston/Sikula, Buttery & Guyton	Handbook of research on teacher education	22
5	Fiske	Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning	18
6	Gage/Wittrock/Richardson	Handbook of research on teaching	17
7	Deutsch	Psychology of music	15
9	Jorgensen & Lehmann	Does practice make perfect?	13
9	Keeves	Educational research methodology and measurement	13
9	Wallin, Merker & Brown	The origins of music	13
11	Deliege & Sloboda	Musical beginnings: Origins and development	12
11	Lundquist & Szego	Music of the world's cultures: A sourcebook	12
11	Woods, Luck, Brochard, O'Neill & Sloboda	Proceedings of the sixth international conference on music perception	12
Ranked by Number of Chapters in Which Cited			
Rank	Editor	Book	# Chapters
1	Colwell	Handbook of research on music teaching and learning	20
2	Rideout	On the sociology of music education	11
3.5	Sloboda	Generative processes in music	9
3.5	Gage/Wittrock/Richardson	Handbook of research on teaching	9
6	Hargreaves & North	The social psychology of music	8
6	Deutsch	Psychology of music	8
6	Houston/Sikula, Buttery & Guyton	Handbook of research on teacher education	8
9	Fiske	Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning	6
9	Deliege & Sloboda	Musical beginnings: Origins and development	6
9	Deliege	Perception and cognition of music	6
10	Woods, Luck, Brochard, O'Neill & Sloboda	Proceedings of the sixth international conference on music perception	5

Table 5 contains the list of most eminent dissertations. Included on this list are 11 items, 7 of which are tied with 3 citations each. One of the top two cited dissertations (Robinson) focused on collaboration. Research topics common among the top cited dissertations include the role and identity of the teacher (Veblen, L’Roy, and Wolfgang), music transfer (Veblen, Mbanugo, and Rose), and creativity (Daignault and Hickey). Multiple dissertations came from three universities, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Northwestern University, and the University of Oregon.

Table 5  
Eminence of Dissertations

Rank	Author, Year, Title, University	# Citations
1.5	Robinson, M. (1999). A theory of collaborative music education between higher education and urban public schools. University of Rochester, New York.	5
1.5	Veblen, K. K. (1991). Perceptions of change and stability in the transmission of Irish traditional music: A study of the music teacher’s role. University of Wisconsin, Madison.	5
3.5	L’Roy, D. (1983). The development of occupational identity in undergraduate music education majors. University of North Texas.	4
3.5	Parr, N. (1996). Toward a philosophy of music teacher education: Applications of the ideas of Jerome Bruner, Maxine Greene, and Vernon A. Howard. Indiana University.	4
8	Daignault, L. (1997). Children’s creative musical thinking within the context of a computer-supported improvisational approach to composition. Northwestern University.	3
8	Hickey, M. (1995). Qualitative and quantitative relationships between children’s creative musical thinking processes and products. Northwestern University.	3
8	Holmquist, S. P. (1995). A study of community choir members’ school experiences. University of Oregon.	3
8	Mbanugo, C. E. (1986). Music transmission processes among children in an Afro-American Church. State University of New York at Buffalo.	3
8	O’Toole, P. A. (1994). Redirecting the choral classroom: A feminist poststructural analysis of power relations within three choral classrooms. University of Wisconsin, Madison.	3
8	Rose, A. M. (1990). Music education in culture: A critical analysis of reproduction, production, and hegemony. University of Wisconsin, Madison.	3
8	Wolfgang, R. E. (1990). Early field experience in music education: A study of teacher role socialization. University of Oregon.	3

## DISCUSSION

A study of eminence as measured by the *New Handbook* is important due to its diversity of both authors and topics. The authors include researchers, curriculum specialists, psychologists, and philosophers from both music and general education. The results from this study clearly indicate the wide variety of sources that impact the field of music education research.

Only five of the 10 scholars ranked as most eminent in the *New Handbook* (Colwell, Eisner, Gardner, Gordon, and Reimer) appear in Kratus’s (1993) compilation. Kratus also found considerable differences in eminence between his study and a 1984 study by Standley. Kratus allows for these differences by commenting on the diverse approach in method, as well as the inclusion of citations from various sources. Because the present study incorporates the same method employed by Kratus, and because the source used is similar in scope and format, it is fair to say that differences in the current study and Kratus’s are not a result of these circumstances. However, Kratus does acknowledge the difference in publication dates of the sources reviewed as a possible reason for the dissimilarities between his and Standley’s study. The *Handbook* was published in 1992, whereas the *New Handbook* was published in 2002. As a result, certain scholars who were more frequently cited in earlier decades do not appear in the present study. The inclusion of scholars such as Bresler and Campbell are perhaps indicative of music education research incorporating qualitative inquiry and a multicultural approach.

Similar to Kratus’s (1993) findings, the present study also illuminates the importance of *The Journal of Research in Music Education* and *The Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*. However, unlike Kratus’s study in which *The Journal of Research in Music Education* was cited 496 times, followed by *The Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* with 188 citations, the present study shows a more equal distribution among several sources (refer to Table 2). With few exceptions, the same sources appear in both Kratus’s and the present study. One can infer that these journals have consistently published research in music education over several decades with the current trend being toward a wider variety of important research venues than in the past. Considering the eminence of the journals listed in Table 2, it is fair to say that these periodicals should be included in the library of music education research institutions. Additionally, graduate students studying music education should be familiar with the breadth and scope of these publications

Notable differences exist between the top-ranked authored monographs and edited books and proceedings in the current study and the findings of Kratus’s (1993) study. First, only six of the 20 top-cited authored monographs in the current study also appear on Kratus’s list. Of the remaining works, most were written since the publication of the 1992 *Handbook*. Indeed, the top-cited authored monograph is Elliott’s *Music Matters*, published in 1995. Second, some of the differences can be attributed to new directions in music education in the ten-year difference between publication dates of the *Handbook*

and the *New Handbook*, such as world music and technology. Similar to Kratus's findings, there is still a strong impact from the fields of psychology, philosophy, and general education. Perhaps this list of most cited monographs can offer guidance to music educators looking to further expand their collection of important and influential works.

There are no similarities between the top-cited dissertations in the current study and Kratus's (1993) study. However, it is interesting to note that Uptis, author of a top-cited monograph in the *New Handbook*, was the author of a top-cited dissertation in the *Handbook*. Perhaps what is most notable about the top-cited dissertations was best said by Kratus, "it should hearten doctoral students to know that a dissertation can influence the research in the profession and not need be merely an 'academic exercise'" (p. 31).

The authors of this study do not intend to equate eminence with excellence. The frequency of citations provides information about the specific people and topics within a field, but does not measure the quality of the scholarly writing and/or research. Also, because the *New Handbook* has two editors and an editorial advisory board, both the chapter authors and content are not necessarily objective. These aforementioned limitations notwithstanding, the *New Handbook* is thorough in that it has 109 chapter authors, 105 advisory reviewers, and 129 reviewers. At the very least, the results of this study offer a greater understanding of the eminent scholars and current trends influencing music education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## REFERENCES

- Brittin, R. V., & Standley, J. M. (1997). Researchers in music education/therapy: Analysis of publications, citations, and retrievability of work. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45(2), 145-160.
- Colwell, R. (Ed.). (1992). *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Colwell, R., & Richmond, C. (Eds.). (2002). *New handbook of research on music teaching and learning*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hamann, D. L., & Lucas, K. V. (1998). Establishing journal eminence in music education research. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46(3), 405-413.
- Kratus, J. (1993). Eminence in music education research as measured in the Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 118, 21-32.
- Pirkul, H., Jacob, V., Ryu, Y., & Savoie, M. (2007). UTD top 100 business school research rankings. Retrieved from University at Dallas, School of Management website: <http://somweb.utdallas.edu/top100Ranking/rankingMethod.php>
- Sample, D. (1992). Frequently cited studies as indicators of music education research interests, 1963-1989. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 40(2), 153-157.
- Standley, J. M. (1984). Productivity and eminence in music research. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 32, 149-157.
- Yarbrough, C. (1984). A content analysis of the Journal of Research in Music Education, 1953-1983. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 32, 213-222.

# Essay

## *When Policy Disappoints: Still Worth Less After All These Years*

Julia Eklund Koza  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Madison, Wisconsin

### INTRODUCTION

Rumor has it that the "No Child Left Behind Act" is dead.<sup>1</sup> As the time for reauthorization of this federal law approached, pundits predicted the death of one star in the policy/law constellation that supported greater standardization of the school curriculum, more surveillance and regulation of schools, and a dramatic increase in the use of high-stakes standardized tests. Those of us who opposed the constellation from the outset may be tempted to break out the champagne, but before we do, like the munchkins in the Wizard of Oz, we need to try to determine whether the wicked witch is "morally, ethically, spiritually, physically, positively, absolutely, undeniably, and reliably dead."<sup>2</sup> A cautious approach is needed not merely because "No Child Left Behind" is only one star in a larger policy/law constellation, but also because whether it or the whole constellation is dead will depend both on what "it" is understood to be—on the conception of law or policy that is applied—as well as on the meaning of death.

To many music educators, the policy/law constellation that includes the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act" (Goals 2000), the "No Child Left Behind Act" (NCLB), the MENC-endorsed voluntary national standards in music that were published in 1994, and state versions of those national standards held much promise.<sup>3</sup> I was not among them, but it is now clear, even to initial supporters, that these initiatives have not delivered on what they appeared to promise. I begin this essay by describing some of the promise the constellation held for many music educators, focusing, in particular, on the text of the introduction to the 1994 voluntary national standards in music. Next, I detail the nature and scope of the disappointment. Third, relying on the work of Steven Ball, I advance a broad conception of law and policy, which can help inform discussions of why this constellation has proven disappointing. Specifically, I examine how powerful systems of reasoning that sort and order people and knowledge come into play in law and policy processes, and I discuss how a broad conception of law and policy can invite examination of the context from which this law/policy constellation emerged. Finally, I illustrate how a broad conception can inform discussions of whether NCLB or the entire