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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

What do music educators believe about culturally responsive teaching? What role does professional development play in the shaping of those beliefs? Culturally responsive teaching centers instruction around the experiences and values of the racially, ethnically, and culturally minoritized students, with the goal of maximizing student engagement, achievement, learning, and enjoyment (Banks, 2016; Campbell, 2018; Gay, 2018; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Shaw, 2016). Across subjects and grade levels, culturally responsive teaching is a critical component of instructional practice in music for educators working with young learners. Further, professional development for in-service teachers may serve to inform and improve its implementation.

Definition of Terms

Initial definitions for key terms are provided here. These terms and others will be explored and expanded in the literature review and discussion.

Culturally responsive teaching (CRT): A pedagogical framework which centers instruction around racially, culturally, and linguistically minoritized students, to maximize students’ experiences in school music-making. Geneva Gay’s (2018) specific framework is used here.

Teacher belief: Personally held attitudes and values of educators, which may or may not align with professional knowledge and instructional practices, and may be expressed in various ways depending on context.

Professional development: Educational opportunities and activities for teachers, to improve instructional practices by addressing the belief-practice interface, towards positive impact on student learning.
“Culturally responsive teaching” first appeared in educational dialogue in the 1990’s through Ladson-Billings’s *culturally relevant pedagogy* (CRP), as “a pedagogy of opposition not unlike critical pedagogy but specifically committed to collective, not merely individual, empowerment” (Ladson-Billings, 2009). Ladson-Billings saw CRP as a way to develop students’ academic success, cultural competence, and social consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 2009), with attention to BBIA (Black, Brown, Indigenous, and Asian) students. Gay expanded CRP into five dimensions of *culturally responsive teaching*: teachers who practice CRT “develop a cultural diversity knowledge base, . . . design culturally relevant curricula, . . . demonstrate cultural caring, . . . build community among diverse learners, . . . [and engage in] effective cross-cultural communications” (Gay, 2002). Brown-Jeffy and Cooper (Brown-Jeffy & Cooper, 2011) included an element of critical race theory, which identifies and deconstructs systemic racial inequities in curriculum, instruction, and educational contexts. Recently, Paris and Alim promote *culturally sustaining pedagogy*, a critical approach to education which “seeks to perpetuate and foster - to sustain - linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of schooling for positive social transformation” (Paris & Alim, 2017, p. 1).

In understanding teachers’ practice of pedagogical approaches, in general, researchers begin with teacher belief (Aragona-Young & Sawyer, 2018; Nolen, Ward, & Horn, 2012; Tam, 2015). Tam (2015) found that teacher belief, teacher practice, and student achievement have a correlative relationship, while Nolen, Ward, and Horn (2012) found that teacher belief and practice may evolve situationally. Further, teacher practice may not always correspond to teacher belief, thus complicating the process of both understanding the belief-practice interface and its impact on students (Tam, 2015; Dos Santos, 2019). More research is needed to understand
teacher belief regarding culturally responsive teaching and the role professional development plays in supporting, extending, and modifying those beliefs.

**Statement of Problem**

Some teacher preparation programs have begun to adopt culturally responsive teaching as an element of their pre-service coursework (Kindall-Smith, 2012), and research may focus on CRT in pre-service music education programs or on the strategies and practices of educators already “doing” CRT (Kindall-Smith, 2013). The issue remains rarely explored in professional development for in-service teachers, and studies in professional development in CRT for in-service music educators are even scarce (McKoy et al., 2017; Koner & Eros, 2018). While some research does examine teacher perceptions of PD in CRT (McKoy et al., 2017), little focuses on the ability of the PD to impact classroom practice or even on the foundational beliefs behind those practices. Further research is needed for designing and implementing effective music education professional development in culturally responsive teaching, to determine its ability to affect holistic teacher change, and to support teachers’ long-term reflection and enactment of the PD.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this emerging grounded theory study is to explore teacher belief regarding CRT (particularly Geneva Gay’s five dimensions), teachers’ perceptions of the impact of its practice on students, and the role teachers believe professional development plays in supporting and advancing these understandings.
Research Questions

The following research questions guide this study:

1. What are music educators’ beliefs regarding culturally responsive teaching? What do music educators believe about how these practices impact students?

2. What role do music educators believe that professional development plays in developing or influencing their beliefs and practices?

Limitations

Initial methodology included purposeful sampling (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019) of teachers from a single school district, but delays in communication with the district necessitated snowball sampling (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019) of local teachers who were willing and available. While this prevented an in-depth case study of a single district, the snowball sampling allowed interviews with teachers from two different districts, as well as from a private school.

An additional limitation regarding participants was the self-select nature of participation in the study. It is likely that only teachers interested in the topic would choose to participate in the project, and furthermore that they might consciously or unconsciously provide only “socially acceptable responses,” giving answers they expected the researcher to approve of or desire (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019, p. 401). Ten teachers is also a small sample size and in no way generalizable across the field of music education.

Interviews occurred during COVID-19 lockdowns in Seattle, WA, in Spring 2020. This prevented in-person interactions or observations of practice. An unexpected benefit was that the Zoom video interview platform facilitated making recordings and transcripts of the interviews. Screen-sharing during the interview also gave participants an opportunity to reflect on and
answer questions without eye contact from the researcher, thus offering an element of privacy and potentially the ability to express themselves more freely. In general, conducting research during COVID-19 offered blessings and curses, deeply shifting data collection and marking this moment in time.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE

Culturally responsive teaching (CRT) relies on the teacher herself. Inherent in the CRT framework are the entity and actions of the teacher: knowing students with informed sensitivity; designing and implementing culturally relevant curricula, instructional strategies, and other practices; and collaboratively evaluating student experience and achievement. In the United States, school music teachers tend to be White (non-Hispanic), middle class, suburban, English-speaking, and female (Bond, 2017), but the racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity of the students themselves increases yearly (Abril & Robinson, 2019). When the practices of music educators (which are based not only upon education and training, but also on cultural experience) do not connect to or reflect students’ own cultural identities or ways of knowing, academic, musical, and personal dissonances can occur (Abril, 2009; Kelly-McHale, 2013; Shaw, 2016). As is standard in public school systems, professional development exists to address gaps between existing and desired instructional techniques and outcomes, cultural or otherwise, with the goal of positively impacting students’ classroom experiences and academic or musical achievement (Koner & Eros, 2019). The following literature review presents research on culturally responsive teaching, both in general education and music education, with an emphasis on Geneva Gay’s five dimensions (Gay, 2002; Gay, 2018). Teacher belief and change are also examined, given the complexity of the belief-practice interface which may inhibit, disrupt, or advance teachers’ practice of CRT. Additionally, literature on professional development is shared, to consider best practices in professional development (PD), as well as perspectives on teachers’ experience receiving PD and its impact.
Culturally Responsive Teaching

The history of United States institutionalized education is characterized by significant challenges and victories for racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically marginalized students (Gay, 2018). From educational efforts that excluded and then attempted to assimilate BBIA and other minoritized students (Banks, 2016; Grande, 2004; Campbell et al., 2019), to advocacy and justice efforts by Black, Indigenous, Asian, Latinx, and White teachers and reformers (Paris & Alim, 2017; Rizga, 2016), there are decades of oppression and resistance. With public school integration in the 1960’s came increased scholarship around systemic reforms and public attention to pedagogies which rejected deficit models for minoritized students and instead centered students’ and communities’ cultural assets in public school learning (Banks, 2016; Gay, 2018.) From Gloria Ladson-Billings’s culturally relevant pedagogy (2009), to James A. Banks’s multicultural education (2016), to Geneva Gay’s culturally responsive teaching (2002), to Sandy Grande’s Red Pedagogy (2004), to Django Paris and H. Samy Alim’s culturally sustaining pedagogies (2017), and more, BBIA and White scholars, students, teachers, and communities persist towards educational justice. This research focuses on Geneva Gay’s five dimensions as they are understood by teachers and other educational professionals in practice and professional development. Her dimensions were chosen over others as a focus of this research because of the contemporary popularity of the phrase “culturally responsive teaching” in United States education, music education, and professional development for teachers.

Geneva Gay’s Five Dimensions of Culturally Responsive Teaching

A professor of education at the University of Washington, Seattle, Geneva Gay worked closely with scholars such as James A. Banks and Gloria Ladson-Billings in both identifying educational crises for minoritized students and shaping research and pedagogy in response. She
does, in fact, continue these efforts to this day within the University of Washington College of Education. Developed in tandem with multicultural education (Banks, 2016) and culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 2009), Gay’s culturally responsive teaching exists to provide a widely adaptable pedagogical framework towards improved academic outcomes for BBIA students (Gay, 2018). Gay embraces, in particular, the notion of “story,” acknowledging that a narrative conception of education in general allows for a dynamic melding of research, theory, and practice, with wide and flexible applications of her framework. Her research developed into what she calls the five dimensions of culturally responsive teaching (see Table 2.1), outlined and explained below.

**Figure 2.1**

*Geneva Gay’s Five Dimensions of Culturally Responsive Teaching (2002)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Develop a cultural diversity knowledge base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Design culturally relevant curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Demonstrate cultural caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Build community among diverse learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>[Engage in] effective cross-cultural communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Developing a cultural diversity knowledge base” refers to cultivating informed awareness of specificities between culture groups, whether types of greetings preferred or how adults and children are supposed to interact in the classroom (Gay, 2002; Gay, 2018). This is only the first dimension, however, and Gay expects teacher to go farther. She also advocates for “designing culturally relevant curricula,” which refers to not just instructional content aligned with students’ preferences or contemporary interests, but curricula which contains “ethnic and
cultural diversity” (Gay, 2018, p. 145). The purpose of this is not simply to increase visibility and representation of racially, ethnically, culturally, or linguistically minoritized students, but also to empower those very same students towards ownership of their learning and school experiences (Gay, 2018).

In addition to the first two dimensions, Gay insists that teachers “demonstrate cultural caring.” This means not only learning if there are culture-specific methods of showing care, empathy, and safety to learn, but then also implementing those things in the classroom. Gay also invokes Kleinfeld’s (1975) idea of a “warm demander,” an adult teacher who shares care for students - especially BBIA students - by lovingly holding them to high standards of achievement. This leads into the fourth dimension, “building community among diverse learners.” This dimension addresses creating an accountability, trusting, equitable, inspiring group of learners who feel cohesive and support each other toward their best work. Finally, the fifth dimension, “engage in effective cross-cultural communications,” acknowledges that methods and even ideologies of knowledge construction vary between cultural groups. Pedagogically speaking, this means teachers should welcome and build in various “protocols of participating in discourse . . . [and] patterns of task engagement and organizing ideas” (Gay, 2002, pp. 111-112). Ultimately, these five dimensions are not simply a way to embrace multiculturalism in the classroom, but to at times times reject European American cultural norms around teaching and learning, restructuring in collaboration with one’s own BBIA students and their communities (Gay, 2002; Gay, 2018).

**Culturally Responsive Teaching in Music Education**

Efforts towards inclusive and socially just music education persist throughout the decades, despite the prevalence of Western European Art Music in school curricula (Campbell,
In particular, the 1967 Tanglewood Symposium and its subsequent declaration regarding diversification of the curricula, prompted a movement towards multicultural music education (Campbell, 2018). More closely aligned with the scholarship of James A. Banks and multicultural education in general, these efforts included embracing a breadth of global music cultures and styles. The in-depth, highly contextualized approach known as “World Music Pedagogy” (Campbell, 2004; Campbell, 2018; Campbell & Lum, 2019; Roberts & Beagle, 2018) is one such example.

Multicultural music education focuses on content more than instructional strategies, and may or may not deal with the often undergirding EuroAmerican epistemologies of music teaching and learning in schools. Additional scholars, musicians, and educators have taken up culturally responsive teaching as an additional effort towards a truly inclusive, just education for BBIA and other culturally or linguistically minoritized students. Researchers like Carlos Abril and Juliet T. Shaw, in particular, have dived deep into CRT and its practice in music classrooms (Abril, 2009; Abril & Gault, 2016; Shaw, 2015; Shaw, 2016; Shaw, 2018). Connie McKoy and Vicki Lind literally “wrote the book” on CRT in music education (2016), emphasizing Geneva Gay’s five dimensions, but also examples of best practice for other educators to imitate. The field continues to advance, whether through the activist research of Juliet Hess and others (Hess, 2019; Hess, 2021), undergraduate training for pre-service music educators (Kindall-Smith, 2013), or through hands-on trainings given to in-service music teachers (McKoy et al., 2017).

While some in-service music educators practice culturally responsive teaching deftly and with sensitivity, many still struggle with recognizing the need. Acknowledging that music teaching and learning is culturally informed can be a difficult shift, particularly if a teacher is part of dominant culture and not used to thinking of their lives as shaped by cultural norms. Both
White and BBIA teachers may discover biases in themselves and their teaching, which persuades them of the need to rework instruction around the student identities represented in their classrooms (Shaw, 2015). Music teachers have also tended to approach CRT exclusively through repertoire, programming “multicultural” pieces in non-Anglo styles and languages, without adjusting majority-culture norms in the rest of the curricula or their instructional styles (Shaw, 2015). Generalized application of multicultural repertoire runs the risk of “other-izing” and essentializing students’ ethnic groups (Erickson, 2005); specific and strategic training may help teachers gain awareness, move beyond crude attempts at CRT, and develop more culturally sensitive instructional practices.

**Teacher Belief**

**Teacher Belief in General Education**

For the purposes of this study, I adopt Dos Santos’s definition of teacher beliefs as “personal constructs that can provide understandings, judgments, and evaluations of teachers’ practices” (2019, p 10). “Practice” will be defined as “curriculum and instructional innovation and implementation” (Richardson, 1994, p. 94). Belief and practice are related, however, in often complex and non-linear ways, and yet they are often approached together in education research (Guskey, 2002; Fullan, 1985; Richardson, 1991). This belief-practice interface informs both the method and analysis of research, and is aimed at understanding teachers’ beliefs so as to influence practice, often with an eye towards improved student experience and achievement (Green, 1971).

One research study in particular is relevant to a careful study of CRT in practice. In 1984, Munby published results of a qualitative case study investigating the beliefs of a seventh/eighth grade science teacher. Through interviews, member-checks, and the arrangement of themes on a
grid, Munby and the participant herself noted and explored some of her core beliefs in science instruction. Dominant themes emerged regarding instructional practices and desired student behaviors, primarily focused on the participant’s hope that students would become self-sufficient and confident in engaging with information in the class. Munby’s research and subsequent discussion demonstrates a prevalent view of the “belief-practice interface” (Roberts, 1980 in Munby, 1984) at the time: teachers hold beliefs about educational values, which are then enacted in instructional practices and evidenced by student behaviors. Munby argues that “the beliefs and principles of a teacher can be expected to constitute a significant part of his or her context for making choices about research findings, implementing novel curricula, or in other ways altering professional practice” (Munby 1984, p. 1). Munby asserts that teachers interpret new information in their specific contexts, using Roberts’s term “modulation” to describe the customized implementation of research-based instructional practices in each teachers’ context, the “theory-practice interface”. In light of the complexity of these processes, teacher belief and supposed related ideas tend to be examined through qualitative interviews and analysis of emergent themes.

Often inherent in explorations of the theory-practice interface are implications for teachers’ professional development. One result of the belief in a somewhat linear conceptualization of teacher change is that adjusting information and instructional strategies applied to teachers themselves will quite naturally influence beliefs and practices in the classroom. Richardson undertook a longitudinal qualitative study of a staff development program in reading instruction to explore the essential dynamic relationship between belief, practice, and staff development (or professional development), with the goal of understanding how one facet may impact another (Richardson, 1994). Richardson’s study addressed research questions
regarding research-based reading comprehension practices, the extent to which teachers were using those practices, barriers to the use of those practices, whether or not a school-based staff development program affects teachers’ practices, and whether or not a teacher’s participation in the program affects student reading performance.

An examination of the questions indicates the specific theory of change from which Richardson and her colleagues proceeded. Rejecting linear theories of either belief to practice or practice to belief, they instead considered “the process of changing beliefs and practices as interactive, depending on the types of changes and the teachers themselves” (Richardson 1994, pg. 90). They also differentiated between beliefs and knowledge, operationalizing beliefs as “an individual’s understandings of the world and the way it works or should work, may be consciously or unconsciously held, and guide one’s actions,” which may or may not be inferred from behavior (pg 91; Rokeach 1968). By separating beliefs from knowledge, teachers are able to simultaneously hold contradictory views. Knowledge may inform beliefs, however, and Richardson acknowledges the role of research-derived knowledge and personal practical knowledge in contributing to teachers’ beliefs. Teachers’ beliefs may also be public or private, with public views on display for others in the profession and private views more likely to actually impact practice. Data collection in their study, therefore, focused on determining and understanding teachers’ private beliefs, whatever their origin, regarding reading instruction.

Of perpetual concern to teacher educators is the perceived gap between belief and practice. This will be discussed more with regard to professional development, below. Its relevance here is to the ways in which teacher belief is considered a factor of - or precursor to - teacher change (and implied student achievement). Because of the complexities of the relationships between belief, change, student achievement, and staff development, staff
development is necessarily undertaken with these things in mind. As Richardson developed not just their method, but also the accompanying staff development program, details were secured in light of definitions of teacher belief and change. For example, Richardson built in high level opportunities for teacher collaboration and reflection, allowing teachers to observe, discuss, and reflect on the benefits of changed practices, supporting changes in belief. Furthermore, teachers contributed to the design of both the staff development program and the research method, allowing them explicit ownership in the construction of their knowledge-informed beliefs and hands-on evaluation of the success (or not) of the program in impacting their instructional practices and related beliefs. Teachers reported that having a sense of control over their learning and practice helped them feel willing and confident to try and evaluate new instructional practices, securing related beliefs about teaching reading. They eventually generated a “descriptive theory of teacher change, a normative theory of teaching, and ideas for the improvement of [their] own practice” and the “emerging theories [helped] develop a sense of educational reform that contradicts many of the assumptions in current reform movements ((Richardson 1994, pg. 199).

Similarly complex relationships between belief and practice were observed in Tam’s (2015) work regarding teacher belief and professional learning communities (PLCs) in curricular design. Although this study will be examined in greater detail during the professional development section, the results regarding teacher belief are worth noting here. Teacher participants underwent professional development in standards-based curricular design, supported by small groups of colleagues in a PLC. Over the course of the study, Tam discovered that teachers were able to design and implement the curricula even if they did not believe it was
important, and also vice versa. Thus teachers’ beliefs may not always align with their practices, even when supported by rigorous professional development.

In 2014, Nolen, Ward, and Horn posited an additional approach to thinking about teacher belief. Rather than conceiving of a somewhat linear relationship between belief, practice, and student outcomes (even given the dynamic, swirling approach of Richardson, those three elements still remained fairly directly linked in other literature), these researchers adopted a “situative perspective,” (Nolen et al., 2014, p. 167), considering teacher belief and teacher change as connected by context-dependent motivation. By understanding teachers as deeply situated within various layers of social contexts, the trio of researchers looked less at the older model of belief-practice interface, and more at the various resources, social identities, and “motivational filters” informing teachers’ instructional behaviors and choices. Their research suggested that these filters change with each community of practice, thus the situational motivational approach. Teacher identity and agency factored highly into actual changes being made, as did the presence of productive friction in their teaching environments. Seeing real-time results of student work influenced teacher perceptions of the success (or not) of various new instructional strategies, which prompted them towards reflection, discourse, and subsequent adjustments in their classrooms. Thus, teachers recontextualized previously held beliefs and practices, based on each instructional context. Of particular importance were the roles of “power, authority, and community in teachers’ motivation to learn” (Nolen et al., 2014, p. 180)

Designers of professional development may be informed by this further complex model when designing PD they hope will spur teacher change.

Although the approach of Nolen et al. moves away from “traditional” belief-to-practice-to results approaches, much of the research in teacher beliefs still adopts this approach to the
perceived relationship between belief and practice. A recent thorough-going literature review on teacher belief (Dos Santos 2019) examined dozens of studies from the past few decades and found consistent approaches and themes. A relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices is consistently understood, although the relationship appears to be “neither direct nor congruent” (Dos Santos 2019, pg. 16). Dos Santos also found that, while many studies explored that relationship, fewer examined the impact of professional development and its role within the belief-practice relationship. Due to this gap, Dos Santos’s own research undertook to better understand the impact of professional development on in-service teachers’ beliefs and practice, with attention to the application of understandings for improved designs of PD. In this way, this thesis research dovetails with that of Dos Santos, focusing on music education, however, rather than language instruction.

Regarding culturally responsive teaching and teacher belief, Aragona-Young and Sawyer looked specifically at teacher belief and multicultural education (Aragona-Young & Sawyer 2018). Hypothesizing that teachers probably did not hold high-level research knowledge about multicultural education, but that professional development in the subject would influence knowledge, belief and practices, the researchers surveyed 59 U.S. elementary school teachers. Survey questions included hypothetical scenarios, which teachers were asked to rank based on their likeliness to respond in a similar way. Each scenario corresponded to an element of Banks’ multicultural education framework, provided hypothetical examples rather than direct personal questions, and gave teachers the opportunity to respond without “virtue signaling” (so that they would be more likely to answer honestly about someone else’s teaching mistake than their own). The survey also included some open-ended questions about culture and instructional planning. Results of mixed methods analysis included emergent themes of surface-level understanding of
culture, race, ethnicity, and their roles in teaching and learning. Inferential analyses covered the other survey questions. Overall, teachers lacked foundational knowledge in multicultural education and although they endorsed its perspectives and principles, they did not endorse its sophisticated practice. Implications included recommendations for improved PD in multicultural education, revealing the researchers’ own conceptualization of teacher change as rather linear: a combination of knowledge and belief, which leads to practice, which can be adjusted through professional development. The researchers attempted to examine additional factors, such as the teachers’ own race, culture, and ethnicity, as well as students demographics and school location.

**Teacher Belief In Music Education**

There are relatively few studies on teacher belief in music education, particularly not regarding culturally responsive teaching. Such studies tend to focus on curricular choices, such as multicultural repertoire programming; some research does address teacher belief, but in a passing fashion, as related to other issues of concern (Legette, 2003). The difficulty of determining and measuring belief is also a factor. Full-time music teachers who are balancing dozens of classes and conscientiously adhering to district requirements may rarely have time for lunch, much less participation in a longitudinal qualitative study. For these reasons, music education belief studies often focus on pre-service music teachers in university-level programs (or their professors), and may resort to surveys as the most efficient research approach.

One such survey was Bond and Russell’s (2019) instrument in their study of music teacher educator perceptions of and engagement with culturally responsive education (CRE, their phrase for CRT and related terminology). Their goals were to describe music teacher educators’ “perceptions of CRE, its importance, and application in practice,” as well as to “describe music teacher educator comfort with and frequency of using strategies aimed to develop the
dispositions and knowledge needed to be a culturally responsive teacher.” Acknowledging the role these educators play in shaping the beliefs and practices of new music teachers, the researchers collected survey data from 228 college-level music teacher educators in the United States. Analysis of the responses to the 18-item instrument suggested that, while fairly familiar with literature on CRT in general, participants were less fluent in music education-specific literature on CRT. They also endorsed CRT practices most commonly associated with general education practices, and although they indicated comfort in modeling CRT practices, they generally felt less comfortable providing situations in which students would need to be culturally responsive and subsequently assessed. Implications included “expanding the teacher knowledge base” (Bond & Russell, 2019, p. 23), with greater value and understanding placed on the tenets of CRE. By using the term “perceptions” rather than “belief,” researchers were able to assess both the participants’ knowledge about CRT and which practices they felt were important. The discussion included aspects of both knowledge and belief, and a mention of the role of teacher agency in teacher change. Suggestions for further research emphasize a qualitative approach and a sense of a direct connection between teacher knowledge, change, and practice. Little to no additional research is available on music teacher belief regarding culturally responsive teaching.

Whether in music education or reading instruction, from a belief-practice interface approach or a situational motivation approach, the end destination of research in teacher belief is usually the same: professional development.

Professional Development

Professional Development in General Education

For on-the-job teachers, professional development is a standard way to receive training, whatever the subject. Professional development, or PD, encompasses work in effecting “a
change in a teacher’s knowledge base and actions,” and is usually understood as a “set of activities designed to promote personal professional change” (Hookey, 2002; Koner & Eros, 2018). In her research on professional development, Shaw has referred to PD as “learning, education, and support activities" that broaden teachers’ knowledge bases for better skill implementation and more effective instruction (Shaw, 2017). Planning of and participation in PD assumes its positive impact on student learning, as research suggests that moderate student academic achievement improvements are related to teacher participation in PD (Youn, 2007).

Despite the best intentions of those who provide professional development to teachers, some content tends to be irrelevant and unhelpful, and some formats are ineffective. Research suggests optimal designs for increased teacher learning (and, implied, student learning). Regarding general features of successful PD, Hammel (2007) indicated that experiences must be tailored to individual needs, support teacher learning beyond the actual training, and include opportunities for collaboration with peers (Hammel, 2007; Koner & Eros, 2018). Looking at specific PD design, Desimone (2009) characterized “high-quality professional development” as having the following five features: content focus, active learning opportunities, coherence, collective participation, and duration. Professional development containing these elements tends to result not just in greater participant satisfaction, but also in improved classroom practice and student achievement (Desimone, 2009; Bautista & Wong, 2017). These five characteristics can be used to tailor (and assess) PD in general education, as well as in music education.

**Professional Development in Music Education**

Successful professional development in music education shares many of the same characteristics of successful PD in general education. A content focus on music, however, requires additional adjustments. Uptis et al. (1999) developed a three-level matrix, focusing on
music teachers’ broad beliefs and philosophies within the PD experience. The matrix emphasizes “necessary conditions for transformation” (including a sense of belonging, comfort, and synthesis), “potential for sustained transformation” (teachers’ and students’ musical and educational roles and identities), and “operationalized long-term transformation” (personal commitment to artistic and intellectual growth). This framework focuses the PD discussion not just on instructional performance, but on positive self-concept and long-term, internally-motivated teacher change (Uptis et al., 1999; Shaw, 2017).

In support of the dual identities of music educators as both musicians and teachers, Barrett (2006) recommends that effective music education PD focus on four dimensions: “contextual fit, disciplinary fit, self-directed inquiry, and collaborative interaction.” More specifically, Stanley et al. (2013) lay out necessary elements for a successful music education PD experience:

- Saturated with musical experiences that are arranged around content-specific skills and strategies
- Intended for sustained learning
- Organized to allow teacher-choice and control over learning in an engaging, voluntary experience
- Focused on teacher wisdom
- Built upon teachers' collective knowledge base
- Suffused with opportunities for reflection
- Geared toward providing site-specific support
- Designed to provide a meaningful mentoring experience
Despite these indications that sustained, self-directed PD experiences (with ample opportunities for reflection, collaboration, mentoring, and music-making) are preferred and considered more successful than other approaches, professional development in music education does not often exist in these spheres. Teachers may usually choose from general education workshops provided by their school districts (that are not music-focused), for one-day or half-day workshops provided by independent music education organizations (i.e. Orff-Schulwerk, Kodály, and Dalcroze), intensive “Levels” programs of continuing development over the course of several consecutive courses, or stand-alone intensive courses such as the week-long World Music Pedagogy begun and sustained at the University of Washington. “Levels” programs align with Stanley’s recommendation for voluntary, sustained training, but opportunities for reflection can be scarce during a busy two weeks. Although the Levels programs and short-term music workshops support participant music-making and content focus, teachers may still be largely on their own for collaboration or mentoring after the event. When it comes to “site-specific” needs, such as instruction in and strategies for the application of the principles of culturally responsive teaching to curriculum and instruction in schools, good luck!

**Need for Study**

While recent research has examined music teacher educators’ beliefs regarding culturally responsive teaching, little work has still to be done with in-service teachers and their beliefs, alongside explorations of professional development. This study undertakes to better understand teacher belief regarding CRT, in order to inform the design and implementation of increasingly effective PD in culturally responsive teaching for the benefit of in-service music teachers and their students.
CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

This research focuses on the beliefs of music teachers regarding culturally responsive teaching, with emphasis on knowledge, practice, and situational motivation as facets of the umbrella term “belief”. These facets are difficult to gauge, and are in fact not likely to be fully understood for their intersectionalities without delving into conversations with the music teachers themselves. Although quantitative approaches have been taken, particularly via survey, (Aragona-Young & Sawyer, 2016; Bond & Russell, 2019), I felt that the best way to deeply explore teachers’ perspectives was through a qualitative approach. I decided on interviews and hoped that understandings emerge and group into themes, thus leading to the development of a grounded theory in response to questions of culturally responsive teaching and professional development.

Emerging Grounded Theory

Emerging grounded theory is a qualitative research design by which the researcher observes patterns in the data and generates a theory or model based on those patterns (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). Systematic grounded theory, developed in the 1960’s, focuses on identifying and understanding a process, as well as analysis via preset coding categories (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Constructivist grounded theory focuses on participant’s perceptions and feelings, rather than expectation of a process (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). Because I was interested in a potentially generalizable model, based on in-depth conversations with participants from which themes would emerge, I chose emerging grounded theory over the other types.

The following research questions guide this study:
1. What are music educators’ beliefs regarding culturally responsive teaching? What do music educators believe about how these practices impact students?

2. What role do music educators believe that professional development plays in developing or influencing their beliefs and practices?

Belief was chosen as a focus for the research questions due to its prevalence as a term in the literature (see Chapter Two), but practice is necessarily included as potential evidence of belief (Dos Santos, 2019; Richardson, 1994; Tam, 2015). Additionally, the interviews developed around the research questions include prompts to explore not only personally held attitudes and values (beliefs), but also personal and pedagogical knowledge around culturally responsive teaching, related to or distinct from those beliefs (Aragona-Young & Sawyer, 2018; Bond & Russell, 2019; Shaw, 2018). Based on additional research regarding the role of situational motivation in teachers’ drive towards change (Abril & Robinson, 2019; Nolen et al., 2012), questions of instructional and social contexts were included, too, as well as explorations of teachers’ various identities and self-reported positionalities.

This study also hints at elements of action research. Action research investigates a “problem to be solved,” and in education, involves practitioners and broader school communities in efforts towards understanding and affecting change (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019, p 587). In this case, the problem to be solved is the need by teachers for improved racial equity and educational justice in public school music education. Focusing on teacher belief and partnering with teachers themselves to reflect on their beliefs and practices, as well as their desires for professional development in culturally responsive teaching, is one way to involve practitioners. When undertaking extensions of this research, involving teachers, students, and families in
trainings, evaluations, community building, and other educational justice efforts would be a further aspect of action research.

**Setting and Participants**

The study occurred in Seattle, Washington, and began in the course of my studies within the Music Education department of the School of Music at the University of Washington. To facilitate access to a single group of in-service teachers (teachers with state certifications who are currently working in classrooms), I initially attempted purposeful sampling of participants from a single, local school district (Creswell, 2019). Lakeview was a school district with which I had an existing relationship as a former student teacher posted there for an internship. Due to a lengthy lack of response from the district, however, I switched to snowball sampling (Creswell, 2019) in order to secure participants in time for data collection, as several existing participants joined me in recommending other participants. This meant that although I initially wanted to focus on only elementary music educators, I “took what I could get”, eventually interviewing a group of music educators with teaching assignments spanning the 13 grades, from elementary school to high school, and which included general music, band, orchestra, and choir. All told, there were 10 participant teachers from three different public school districts and one private school.

Steffey and Wolfe (2001) identify various phases in the career teacher’s lifecycle, including apprentice (two to three years), professional (more than three years experience and the capacity to receive and respond to student feedback), and expert (achievement of high standards within the field and the desired level for all practitioners). Additionally, Koner & Eros refer to these expert-level teachers as “experienced” or “second stage” music educators, generally with four to ten years experience (2018). Participants in this study included two apprentice-level teachers, five second-stage teachers, and three teachers of more than 20 years, who may be
considered expert (Steffey & Wolfe, 2001). Participants taught general music, choir, band, and orchestra across K-12 grade levels; some taught at schools in affluent communities and others in Title I schools receiving significant federal financial assistance (National Center for Educational Statistics). Participants are listed here in chronological order of the occurrence of their interviews, and student racial demographics for the two main districts are included in light of the focus on culturally responsive teaching. During each interview, participants also reported their perceptions of the racial, cultural, and linguistic make-up of their schools’ student populations.

Table 3.1

Participants in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Reported gender</th>
<th>Reported ethnic-racial identity</th>
<th>Years teaching</th>
<th>Subjects taught</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Juan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Elementary &amp; secondary band &amp; orchestra</td>
<td>Rainier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Daniel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elementary general music</td>
<td>Private / Rainier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rowena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elementary general music</td>
<td>Lakeside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cassandra</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Filipina American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elementary general music</td>
<td>Oceanview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jack</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Secondary band &amp; orchestra</td>
<td>Oceanview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leanne</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Secondary choir</td>
<td>Oceanview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jodi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Elementary general music</td>
<td>Lakeside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lauren</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elementary general music</td>
<td>Lakeside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cindy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Secondary choir</td>
<td>Oceanview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.1

*Lakeside School District Student Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender X</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino of any race(s)</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview-Based Research

Conversations between myself and the participants ran one to two hours in length. These exchanges were in fact loosely constructed interviews, also referred to as "semi-structured individual interviews" (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). These interviews took place over Zoom due to the COVID-19 shut-downs in Seattle during 2020 (with the exception of one pre-quarantine interview at a coffee shop and recorded on the researcher’s cellular phone). Interview questions were based on survey instruments developed by Aragona-Young, Sawyer, Bond, and
Russell (Aragona-Young & Sawyer, 2018; Bond & Russell, 2019), adapted with permission, and included in Appendix D. Interviews were recorded and stored on the Zoom platform, with transcriptions provided by both Zoom and a private service. There was only one interview per teacher, although informal exchanges occurred outside of the scope of the research.

**Confidentiality**

I sought and received approval for the study through the University of Washington’s Institutional Review Board. Participants received and signed consent forms before being interviewed. They were able to drop out of the study at any time, and consented for their data to be stored and used in the study and subsequent report. Teachers and school districts received pseudonyms and teachers were invited to review their transcripts and the final report, if they wished. Recordings and transcripts were stored on a secure cloud platform and accessed only by the researcher and her supervisory professor. IRB materials are available in the appendices.

**Interview Analysis**

The semi-structured interview prompts were designed to prompt reflection and conversation about music teachers’ beliefs regarding culturally responsive teaching. They were informed by research in both CRT and PD in music education (Bowles, 2003; Bush, 2007; McKoy et al., 2017; Shaw, 2018), as well as by the instruments developed by Aragona-Young and Bond (Aragona-Young & Sawyer, 2018; Bond & Russell, 2019) and adapted with permission.

When I began preparing for, conducting, and analyzing the initial interviews, I based my understanding of teacher belief on linear models of knowledge to belief to practice (Munby, 1984). I initially felt that it was important to determine teachers’ (monolithic) beliefs regarding
culturally responsive teaching before undertaking inquiry into knowledge and practice, although I anticipated answers in all three areas would be related. As I continued in the literature and interviews, however, I understood the dynamic and overlapping relationships between these professional elements, along with the addition of situational motivation. I probed along these lines and noticed that teachers did indeed “swirl” between all four elements of knowledge, belief, practice, and situational motivation as we talked.

Because of these initial inductions, I adopted elements from Richardson’s study (1994) to distinguish between knowledge, belief, and practice for analysis, while acknowledging that they are inextricable from one another. At the recommendation of Chris Mena, a colleague in the music education graduate program at the UW, I also applied Nolan et al.’s (2012) factor of situational motivation. After the preliminary analysis of all interviews for primary themes, I applied the facets of knowledge, belief, practice, and situational motivation as principal pillar-points for sorting and categorizing the substance of teachers’ statements. For purposes of the analysis of this research, the four facets were operationalized as follows:

- **Knowledge**: Research-derived facts or information about students, schools, curricular content, or instructional practices that is external to the student; may “[depend] on a ‘truth condition’ outside the individual” (Richardson, 1994).
- **Belief**: summarized by the simple phrase “personal attitudes and opinions”, and further understood as “personal constructs that can provide understandings, judgments, and evaluations of teachers’ practices” (Dos Santos, 2019); additionally, “an individual’s understandings of the world and the way it works or should work, [which] may be consciously or unconsciously held, and guide one’s actions” (Richardson, 1994; Rokeach, 1968)
• **Practice**: specific instructional behaviors, whether in planning or executing classroom teaching, management, and other activities; may include “a teaching culture and environment, [efforts towards students’] academic achievement and consequences related to students’ classroom behavior,” as well as assessment and professional collaboration (Dos Santos, 2019, p. 11; Lopes & Oliveira, 2017)

• **Situational Motivation**: teachers’ motivation towards change, especially as it varies within social and professional contexts; “motives for learning in the [personal, social, and professional] contexts in which that knowledge is used” (Nolen et al., 2014)

In these interviews, *knowledge* might be what a teacher knows about her community’s socioeconomic status and needs, or whether or not she is aware of and understands Geneva Gay’s five dimensions of CRT. Sentences beginning with “I think the most important thing about CRT is . . .” would align clearly with *belief*. Descriptions of intentionally planned diverse racial representation in read-alouds or bilingual concert programs would fall under *practice*. Discussions of teachers’ own positionality or the specific needs of their schools and students would represent *situational motivation*. In combination, these facets interact richly: an English-speaking, Asian American teacher who knows her school to be majority Spanish-speaking Latinx students, for example, and who believes the curriculum should reflect student cultural backgrounds, might collaborate with a Mexican American visual arts colleague to create an interdisciplinary student arts evening in which students curate and present their work in the language of their choice, with multilingual signage. Referred to sometimes in this research as “the swirl,” these four elements clearly impact each other in complex, dynamic ways.

The contents of each teacher interview were reviewed multiple times, and teacher responses were sorted according to the four-pronged framework of belief, knowledge, practice,
and situational motivation. On re-reading each interview and sorting responses in accordance with this framework, I grouped together incidents of the four facets and emerging themes that were shared between and across participants, as well as distinct themes and outliers. Chapters 4 and 5 feature descriptions and discussions of results, and an emergent model of teacher belief is shared in Chapter 6.

**Trustworthiness of the Research Process**

Trustworthiness of the research process was achieved through member checking and researcher reflexivity. Member checking is “a qualitative process during which the researcher asks one or more of the participants in the study to check the accuracy of the account” (Creswell & Guetterman, p. 624); in this case, several participants did so after their interviews. Researcher reflexivity refers to the efforts I made to identify and counter any types of bias or assumptions which included daily journaling throughout the interview and analysis process, as well as field notes to supplement the audio recordings and verbal transcripts (Emerson et al., 2011). Regular meetings with my advisor, as well as a peer research partner, also facilitated discussion of findings and consideration of error. Participant quotes are reported word-for-word, with the exception of the removal of “filler speech,” such as “um,” “like,” or “well,” and any edits for clarity are indicated with brackets. Any such edits were also discussed with my advisor and my peer research partner.

**Researcher Lens**

Finally, researcher positionality is worth noting. I am personal friends with some of the participants, and as an elementary music educator in the Seattle area, I am colleagues with all participants. I am known locally for studying and presenting workshops on culturally responsive
teaching and have provided professional development in CRT to some of the participants. This may have affected their responses to me. Additionally, I am vocal about my third-generation Latina identity and how it impacts my work in music education and social justice efforts. Participants may have shaped their answers accordingly, in response to my own presentation of self and values.
CHAPTER FOUR: BEYOND “KNOWING YOUR KIDS”

This chapter addresses the perspectives of music teachers on an array of issues that encompass culturally responsive teaching. The responses of teachers to interview prompts based on the first half of the first research question (what are music educators’ beliefs regarding culturally responsive teaching?) are organized according to the four facets of what the literature generally refers to as “belief” (see Chapter Two): belief, knowledge, practice, and situational motivation. Noteworthy is the matter of overlapping and dynamic relationships between and among them, too, and even a sense that they may be artificially divided. Among the emergent understandings of teacher perspectives of culturally responsive teaching, perhaps most prominent is the matter of the shared belief by teachers that CRT is very important to their curricular planning and delivery and yet few of them understood CRT in full. Most teachers were knowledgeable to some degree of the dimensions of Geneva Gay’s CRT, even if they were unaware or unable to articulate an precise understanding of all five. Further, teachers’ practice of CRT is less substantial, with attention on issues of repertoire more than issues of pedagogy or instructional strategies. Most teachers were aware of this gap between belief and knowledge, and belief and practice, and shared why they believed it occurred and how they wished to cross it.

Participants also answered questions regarding their beliefs about the impact of CRT practices on students, the second half of research question one (what do music educators’ believe about how these practices impact students?). While the true effect of these practices can only be reported with integrity by the students themselves (or at least partly by observations of the students in their interactions with teachers and their instructional practices), participant-teachers in this research nevertheless expressed their desired results, outcomes they hoped to avoid, and observed, perceived impacts on students. The wide-open commentaries by teachers dovetail
significantly with teachers’ beliefs regarding CRT, often inextricably, so are interwoven here, as well as throughout Chapter 5. This chapter will focus on belief and all its aspects, however, with explicit attention to “impact” returning in Chapter Six.

Knowledge

Teachers’ Knowledge of Culture

“How would you define ‘culture’?” I purposely left this initial interview question open-ended and a little vague, drawing teachers into the topic of culturally responsive teaching by providing their own definitions of culture without me imposing my own interpretation of the word. Their self-made definitions would allow me to assess their theoretical knowledge of culture, and then I might then trace their definitions connected to their knowledge and personal unfolding of the characteristic features of CRT. Educational theorist Geneva Gay and music education scholars Vicki Lind and Constance McKoy offer views of “culture” relevant to this research, and it was against these I compared teachers’ knowledge:

- Gay: “A dynamic system of social values, cognitive codes, behavioral standards, worldviews, and beliefs used to give order and meaning to our own lives as well as the lives of others” (Gay, 2018, p. 8)
- Lind and McKoy: “the actions, attitudes, and formal organizational structures associated with groups of people,” including “concrete, behavioral, and symbolic” levels of culture (Lind & McKoy 2016, pg 8); implicit in educational applications of their definitions is attention to race and marginalization of BBIA students.

This opening question, “How do you define culture?” elicited a variety of answers. Most teachers shared moderately complex definitions of culture, based upon the popular models of the iceberg or tree (Hall 1976; Noel 2000). These models are referenced particularly in Zaretta
Hammond’s *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain* (Hammond, 2018), a text often used in the formal professional development sessions of teachers at large.

**Figure 4.1**

*Iceberg Model of Culture (Weaver, 1986)*
Understandings based on the iceberg or the tree, while somewhat complex, do not fully reflect the depth of the Gay, Lind, and McKoy definitions, particularly regarding knowledge construction and music-making. Daniel, a second-stage White teacher who teaches elementary and middle school general music at a majority-White private school, gave answer that typified this response by teachers who recalled the images of iceberg, tree, or related ideas:

It's all of the things either perceived or not perceived, visible or invisible that make a
community what it is. And that goes beyond the visible - most people think of visible things. Obviously, everyone has seen that iceberg picture with the tip of the iceberg and it's food and dance and wardrobe and language, but then there's all of the 90% that's below it, unperceived things . . . that to me is my definition of culture, it’s . . . the things that we see, . . . things that we don't see, the things that we're aware of or that we're not aware of that makes a group of people what it is.

Some teachers focused less on large-group values and beliefs, and instead addressed various family-level and individual definitions of culture. Juan, a second-stage Mexican-American teacher who had directed secondary instrumental ensembles in public schools in multiple U.S. states, told me, “I look at culture as a very individualistic thing. It’s where you believe you come from and what you hold dear to you in terms of family history.” Cindy, a White choral director with over 20 years of experience in public schools, seconded this understanding of culture as akin to the perspectives that individuals learn in their developmental years of growing up within a family unit: “I think culture is . . . like a family . . . it’s what a person grows up with or what their normal is . . . I mean it’s not necessarily ethnicity, but it can also be . . . economically and regionally . . . there’s lots of different . . . ways to define.”

A few teachers defined culture in ways that align more closely with in-depth understandings of the Gay, Lind & McKoy, and related definitions of culture, diving deeply into the complex layers of group, family, self, and the implied associations of race (in the contexts of CRT). Cassandra, an apprentice-level public school elementary music teacher, described these complexities using examples from her own life as a bi-racial Filipina-American:

I'm thinking specifically . . . of my mom . . . culturally, she is Filipino because she was born there. She was raised there . . . I was born in the Philippines, technically that's
supposed to be my culture. But really, culturally, because I wasn't raised with my mom, I'm American. That is my culture, [what] I celebrate what I do, how I live my life . . . is mostly influenced by American culture, whereas my mom would like to say that she's American but she has so much cultural influence from her being from the Philippines . . . She’s . . . bicultural almost . . . It's different for everybody.

In general, teachers’ definitions frequently reflected strong overlapping associations between culture, ethnicity, nationality, and race. A few teachers expanded their answers, thinking additionally about specific, cohesive classroom communities. Jack, a White band teacher with ten years experience in public school ensembles, wanted to understand the point of my question: “Are you asking about culture in terms of [the students’] experiences and beliefs, opinion, customs, all of that sort of stuff they bring into the room, or in terms of what I facilitate the development of once they’re in the room?” Jack talked about food and communication norms, but then transitioned to the idea of “classroom culture”:

So … I feel like that kind of encompasses the pre-classroom culture, what students bring to the table. Now the classroom culture is taking all of that as a teacher and … facilitating a climate so that [the students] are able to share, leverage, utilize, examine themselves and others.

Cindy seconded Jack’s view of classroom culture, referring to her particular students as comprising what she called a “choir family”: “We focus really hard on relationships with each other and having a family.” Cindy’s response moved the conversation from definitions of culture into discussions of practice, particularly regarding student identities and experiences. Most teachers followed a similar train of thought, transitioning their theoretically-informed
definitions of culture into overlapping discussions of belief and practice. It appeared that their attempts to produce an official definition of culture were flavored by their personal beliefs and practical experiences. Specific knowledge of CRT follows as to how it relates to an understanding of culture.

**Teachers’ Knowledge of Culturally Responsive Teaching**

Although Gloria Ladson Billings, James Banks, Geneva Gay, Constance McKoy, Django Paris, and others are the primary sources for definitions, explanations, and research in CRT in the academy, understandings and applications are often diluted by the time they reach practicing public and private school teachers (Aragona-Young & Sawyer, 2018; Bond, 2019; McKoy et al., 2017). This was the case with participants here - although some had significant research-informed knowledge of the theoretical underpinnings of CRT, most had moderately accurate or even misinformed views about CRT. The following section discusses participants’ theoretical knowledge of CRT and related elements.

To determine the extent of teachers’ theoretical knowledge about CRT, I asked two questions. Following the opening question about culture came this one: “Given your definition of culture, how would you define culturally responsive teaching?” Then, later in the interview, I also showed participants Geneva Gay’s five dimensions of CRT and asked them to describe their familiarity with each. Most participants extended their responses beyond the question asked, discussing what they thought each dimension meant and how they would, or do, apply it in practice.
Figure 4.3


1. Develop a cultural diversity knowledge base
2. Design culturally relevant curricula
3. Demonstrate cultural caring
4. Build community among diverse learners
5. [Engage in] effective cross-cultural communications

All teachers seemed to have some research-informed knowledge of CRT. Jodi, a White elementary music teacher with over twenty years experience, seemed uncertain about the concept, and offered the description of “not offending anyone” as a primary goal of building-wide CRT efforts. Her responses indicated a possibly limited understanding of CRT, rather than knowing it deeply as a pedagogical approach that centers the learning of BBIA students. Daniel, while exhibiting practical knowledge of CRT in his pedagogical approaches to students, defined it verbally as, “teaching in a respectful way towards the culture that you are trying to teach these students about, . . . and of course, we're obviously trying to teach respect.” This definition relates more closely to World Music Pedagogy (WMP), a contextualized approach to teaching music of global and local cultures” (Campbell, 2004, 2018; Roberts and Beegle, 2018; Campbell and Lum, 2019), more closely related to multicultural music education (Campbell, 2016), than to CRT. While there are overlaps between the two approaches, WMP is more focused on the repertoire and cultures of origin than a diversity of “onramps” and instructional strategies for the learners themselves.
Most teachers, however, indicated some familiarity with Geneva Gay’s five dimensions and gave responses which indicated a moderate knowledge regarding those dimensions of CRT. When asked to define CRT, Juan explained, “For me, it’s trying to find that meaningful connection to the students’ home life.” Rowena, a second-stage, White, elementary music educator in a public school, described CRT as “dynamic. It's not static . . . It has to be responsive to the students we teach.” LeAnne, an apprentice-level White teacher of a middle school program, summarized her views on CRT in another way: “I would venture to say that everything is culturally driven . . . My big thing is that everything is a window or a mirror”.

Responses by teacher-participants reflect their knowledge of 1) teaching and learning as culturally mediated, and 2) a somewhat vague awareness of Geneva Gay’s CRT dimensions. Of the five dimensions, it appeared that the best known of them were the first and second, regarding culturally diverse knowledge bases and culturally relevant curricula. For example, a teacher who knew to develop a culturally diverse knowledge base might take time to find out whether or not minoritized students had methods of communication or expression that were different from dominant culture, AngloAmerican norms, and adjust her expectations for behavior or evidence of learning according. A teacher who wanted to develop culturally relevant curricula would look for music that aligned to the interests and home musics of racially, ethnically, culturally, or linguistically minoritized students, potentially outside Western European Art Music. Juan’s idea of “connection” could relate to this second dimension, which stipulates the importance of a teacher’s thoughtful design of “a culturally relevant curricula” (Gay 2016). Rowena’s foundational element of flexible, personalized teaching was aligned with Gay’s attention to “developing a cultural diversity knowledge base”, which would then inform her approach to all the other dimensions. LeAnne’s comments about “windows and mirrors,” to provide students
with meaningful glimpses of themselves and others in the curricula (Style, 1988), also related to
Dimension Two, but her comment regarding everything being culturally driven reflects
knowledge of Dimension One and would enable her enactment of the more sophisticated,
epistemologically-driven Dimensions Three, Four, and Five: “demonstrating cultural caring and
building a learning community; cross-cultural communications; and cultural congruity in
classroom instruction” (Gay, 2016).

Two teachers, Lauren and Cassandra, exhibited fairly sophisticated knowledge of
culturally responsive teaching, demonstrating in-depth familiarity with all five CRT dimensions.
Lauren, a White elementary school educator barely out of the apprentice-level stage, spoke
assuredly and in great detail on each dimension, and defined CRT in such a way as to reflect her
in-depth knowledge:

[CRT is] the mindset that all students can and will succeed. And that your job is to be a
part of their community to make them . . . feel a part of that community. And to meet
them where they're at, understand who they are, what they value, and use that to teach
whatever you're trying to teach.

When asked to define CRT, Cassandra jumped into an explanation of not just the racial
and cultural backgrounds of students, but also their socioeconomic needs, the culture of the
military community in which her school is located, and the specific needs of children impacted
by various traumas. She also spoke about the many layers of her students’ racial and cultural
identities, referencing a significant number of mixed or bi-racial students and the
“whitewashing” (a colloquial term for conscious or unconscious assimilation by people of color
to AngloAmerican norms) that she attributed to the military presence in the area. All of these
characteristics added up to what she described as
Those . . . super basic . . . foundational things that can make a child who they are. That's what culturally responsive teaching has to be hyper aware of to be able to consider itself culturally responsive teaching. [If you] can't access the student, then what are you going to teach them, if you're not making that connection to them? So through your understanding of their culture, [it] helps you become a better teacher. And so it's . . . a holistic school experience.

Like Juan, Cassandra referenced “connection” as key to CRT, but also linked it to deep knowledge of students’ racial and cultural identities. Her knowledge of students must lead to sensitive, relevant instruction. As she continued speaking about the CRT dimensions, Cassandra described each one with nuance and precision: CRT’s Dimension One meant that she was “an explorer, being willing to find those pieces of information”; CRT’s Dimension Two required her to “really cater to what their needs are”; she knew CRT’s Dimension Three well enough to admit her practice of it was a work in progress; similarly, her knowledge of CRT’s Dimensions Four and Five, along with her knowledge of the multicultural elements of her community, led her to reflect that “it has been very challenging in general. Because I am extremely focused on just creating that baseline of cultural connection, like social emotional learning, within just the classroom.” Overall, Cassandra’s answers exemplify not just high-level knowledge of CRT, but of the “swirl” between knowledge, belief, practice, and situational motivation.

Sources of teachers’ knowledge of culturally responsive teaching

What did teachers cite as the sources of their knowledge about CRT? Younger teachers had experienced some theoretical exposure to culturally responsive teaching in their pre-service training and university studies. Most teachers had received some degree of training in CRT during in-service professional development, although they admitted that the attention to CRT
theory was often not particularly consistent or helpful. Notably, Lauren had undertaken research on CRT on her own by taking to reading Geneva Gay’s work as independent of any requirement for her teaching.

“It’s essential to name race”

Brown-Jeffy & Cooper (2011) cites critical race theory as an essential element of culturally responsive teaching. What do music teachers know about race and critical race theory, particularly relative to CRT? After all, their preparation for their professional work as teachers was steeped in performance studies on their instruments and in ensemble work, and was undergirded by their academic study of the history and theory of Western European Art Music. Later in their undergraduate degree programs, if they were music education majors, they came into the study of music methods and materials for teaching children and youth in K-12 school music programs. The study of culturally responsive teaching may have been minimal, and courses that paid tribute to critical race theory were unlikely to have been available to them in their over-crowded course schedules. Thus, an understanding of race may have come from postgraduate studies on the topic, informally through exposure to coverage in the media or independent reading, or through personal experience as BBIA educators. Perhaps, for some, race and racism may have arisen in their professional development experiences, as well.

Most participating teachers in this research addressed race explicitly. One teacher used outdated racial vocabulary such as “Caucasian” to refer to White teachers and students, which may reflect limited knowledge surrounding current conversations on race and critical race theory. However, other teachers showed moderate to sophisticated understanding of the role race plays in CRT. Jack noted that “my [band] students aren’t racially representative of our school district”, after which he offered examples of interactions with ethnically affiliated
students in the band room. Rowena emphatically stated, “It’s essential to name race,” whether with oneself, one’s colleagues, or one’s students. Cassandra took it a step further by discussing the “whitewashing”. These responses indicate that most participants understood that CRT is a pedagogy designed with BBIA students in mind.

**Teachers’ Knowledge of Student Demographics**

Teachers in the research project exhibited a remarkable extent of knowledge about their students, including their identities by race, ethnicity, home language, and even socioeconomic status (SES). Teachers also kept up to speed on community politics and concerns in general, even as they were also aware of their students’ music preferences and learning styles. Participants shared estimated percentages of racial/ethnic groups and specific languages spoken at home, which were generally aligned with data reported by the Office of the superintendent of Public Instruction. Rowena observed that “All students have their own unique culture and even students who might share a culture will have different relationships to that culture and different experiences in that culture.” Strikingly, though, Jodi admitted she had stopped paying attention to the racial/ethnic demographics of her school. An experienced teacher of more than twenty years and a White elementary teacher in a district with many BOPoC students, she ascribed her lack of knowledge to the constant shifts in the school’s make-up over the last two decades:

I know we've got over 40% ELL. The majority of our ELL kids are Hispanic . . . I have pretty much given up trying to keep track of the percentage because we've had years where it's been super, super small and . . . our population in the last 21 years has changed dramatically. When I started at the school, it was predominantly White and then I remember there being more of an influx of African Americans coming into the school.
And then all of a sudden that turned way Hispanic . . . So percentages, I've just lost track of it.

In general, however, participants were marked by remarkably in-depth knowledge of their students’ and communities’ identities. Discussion of how this impacted practice follows later in the chapter.

**Teachers’ Knowledge of Parents and Families**

Ann, another experienced White teacher of more than twenty years, remarked on the importance of talking with parents as an item of concern in applying the fuller meaning of culturally responsive teaching to the design and delivery of instruction to her students. She is particularly attuned to the specific needs of low-SES students in her elementary school community, and described how she is responsive to parents in order to give support to her students:

I know recently . . . there's been more talk around that poverty is not a culture. But there are some social norms that go with that. Especially around . . . communication with parents . . . And so I've learned over the years that I need to . . . be free to take five or 10 minutes just to chit chat. “[How’s] your day going, how are you doing?” . . .

Ann went on to describe additional knowledge of parents and families, such as what fees for events are manageable, whether to email or call them at home, and what times of the month were best to call. Regarding this last point, she was keen to consider the timing of pre-paid cell-phone use, knowing that families might have more or fewer minutes available during certain times of each month. Juan also spoke of his familiarity with the community in which he worked, particularly with knowledge of home and family life such as language use and notable holidays.
that are celebrated. He noted a significant presence of sci-fi fandom in the community, too, which he later addressed via sci-fi movie soundtrack concert programming.

Belief

When ascribing “belief” to teachers’ various interview responses, sometimes signal phrases, such as “I think that . . .” or “It’s really important to me that . . .” cued me in to their personally held attitudes and opinions regarding CRT. Other times, I relied on tone and context to distinguish a response as indicative of internally held beliefs, rather than externally-sourced knowledge. As stated previously in the literature review, there can be significant overlap between the two and divisions here are somewhat artificial. Overall, most teachers shared a strong belief that CRT was important, required effort, and was meaningful to students and families.

Teachers’ Beliefs Regarding Students

Every teacher focused heavily on students throughout their interviews. While this seems obvious, I purposefully did not often reference children in most of my initial prompts, so teachers’ inclusion of their students was self-directed and could be interpreted to reveal the underlying belief that CRT is for students. Rowena summarized her feelings on CRT this way: “Making sure that students want to engage with all parts of who they are and all parts of who the people around them are . . . and that we’re able to do that with empathy and kindness.” Broadly, there were two main ways this focus on students and their identities manifested across all interviews. The next two sections address these themes.
“It’s Essential to Name Race,” Continued

In the same way that many teachers were aware of their students’ and communities’ racial, ethnic, and cultural demographics, they also appeared to believe that addressing these directly through instruction is important. Rowena’s assertion that “it’s essential to name race” in conversations with and about students showed the significance of “letting my students know that I care about them and that I care about them with respect to issues of culture, race, and ethnicity.” Other teachers, such as Amy, did not make such an explicit statement, but rather referenced students’ race, cultures, and ethnicities throughout the interviews, especially regarding how they paid attention to those identities and considered them in their teaching.

Cassandra cautioned, however, to not just focus on “street race” (i.e. the race, culture, or ethnicity that students seem to hold based on physical appearance alone), instead tuning into students’ “actual cultural identity and experiences in the world.” Lauren, a fourth year White teacher in an elementary school, shared the belief that teachers should avoid essentializing their BBIA students, saying, “it's pushed on people to identify as a certain whatever, however they're perceived, and even if they don't necessarily do that . . . just because that person looks Japanese doesn't mean that they necessarily identify with Japanese culture, . . . maybe that's not how they were brought up.”

Some teachers did object to centering race primarily when thinking of students. As a high school ensemble director and district PD coordinator, Jack had other priorities for his students than concerning himself with their ethnic-racial identity and development, such as classroom culture, graduation rates, college preparation, and engaged music performance. Although attentive to students’ racial, cultural, and ethnic identities, he told me, “it’s more complex than just race,” and that, “it's creating a climate where they can share those experiences with each
other, but also so that they relate, they know . . . how to move about the world.” Jodi also prioritized classroom culture and musical engagement above attention to students’ racial backgrounds:

> Honestly, I think about the classroom culture. And I think about the music culture. Because you know, again, what is [the] definition of culture? It depends on [where you’re at], what you’re doing . . . Quite frankly, I think about what can I bring into the classroom that will engage the kids. So in that sense, I don’t think about the culture. I think about the personalities, their likes and dislikes . . . And each class that comes to me has a different culture as well.

Whether the more neutral approach to race embraced by Jack and Jodi, or the more explicit approach to race embraced by Rowena, Cassandra, and others, all teachers brought up race in their interviews. Regardless of how they interpreted it or applied their beliefs in the classroom, race seemed to be a significant element in teachers’ beliefs regarding culturally responsive teaching.

**“Knowing Your Kids”**

This quote resounded repeatedly from almost every interview. Daniel and others spoke at length about their belief that culturally responsive teaching centered around “trying to understand the kids that are in front of me” and “knowing your kids as kids.” He elaborated,

[Melodic dictation] doesn’t matter if my teaching can't connect with them as human beings. I know it sounds kind of cliche, . . . ”Don't teach the student, teach the human”, but . . . it's a gateway and the kid standing right in front of it and behind that gate is everything, it's their entire world, it's the actual learning and you have to get through that first.
Most of the other teachers also included this theme of knowledge of, relationships with, and care for students. When I asked Cindy, “Is there anything else you want me to know about you as a teacher?” she replied, “That I care about all my students and I think that's the biggest thing.” Juan reflected, “What makes music teachers effective, in my opinion, and one reason I love being a music teacher, is our ability to have consistency and build lots of relationships with the students.” Whether teaching at the elementary, middle, or high school level, each teacher touched on relationships in some way, indicating belief that positive, knowledgeable relationships with students facilitated knowledge of them and mutual trust that allowed teachers to better practice CRT (and instruction, in general).

Juan included the idea of connection, specifically, as essential to his beliefs around CRT and students. He believed connection was important to retention:

I think just strengthening that bond and strengthening that relationship with maybe some of the students who connect with . . . If we can connect with them in this way, we might have an ally, we might better retain the students from year to year . . . They might see us as, . . . “oh, yeah, I really want to be in band next year because because Mr. G. . . .get’s what’s goin’ on. He cares about me, he cares about who I am, not just the fact that I am carrying an instrument.”

Whether in secondary or elementary settings, Juan also wanted to prioritize “trying to find that meaningful connection to the students’ home life . . .”

If you could do that through a song, if we could do that through how we speak to them, if we could do that through just having a connection and speaking Spanish with their families at a concert or getting their parents to participate in some way, if we could make a meaningful connection to their home life through music, then we are doing and
achieving part of that.

The elements Juan listed will be discussed in greater detail in the “practice” section of this chapter. For now, his repeated use of the word “connection” is of note, since its repetition indicates his belief in the need to connect with students and their home cultures. The only other teacher to use this word was Cassandra, speaking about helping students connect through both CRT and SEL for improved student experience and instruction. It is significant that these were also the only two BBIA teachers in the participant group, indicating perhaps that this belief in the need to connect with students culturally was generated from their own school and life experiences. This will be explored further in “situational motivation.”

**Teachers’ Beliefs Regarding the Profession**

When analyzing teachers' beliefs regarding CRT, several emerging themes fell under the umbrella of “teachers.” Like with the themes associated with “students,” the teacher themes seem inherent to the nature of instruction, but I was surprised at the variety that emerged. From a belief in the need for more BBIA teachers in the workforce to honest and vulnerable descriptions of personal attitudes, strengths, and fears which informed their work, teachers held and communicated nuanced beliefs about themselves and others regarding CRT.

**Representation**

Several White participants, particularly the veteran teachers, spoke about their belief in the need for more BBIA teachers in the workforce to “inspire and connect” with BBIA students. Ann said, “. . . For me, culturally responsive teaching would mean that there are more people of color teaching . . . and there just aren’t. As an education system, we have not done a good job with that.” Jodi expressed a similar belief, thinking that seeing more BBIA teachers would motivate BBIA students to become teachers themselves, further diversifying the workforce. At
the same time, she held reservations about affirmative action in hiring practices: “I don’t care that color, you know, white, green, blue, purple, gold, whatever, they . . . shouldn’t be hired just because of their color, they should be hired for what they offer.” This is an example of what Green refers to as belief clusters (1971), in which teachers simultaneously hold conflicting beliefs, and illustrates the complexity of the belief-knowledge-practice interfaces in instruction. Interestingly, Juan and Cassandra did not communicate this belief regarding representation, but their extra-nuanced knowledge of students and cultural connectivity needs may support other teachers’ beliefs in the necessity for more music BBIA teachers.

**Personal Attitudes and Moral Obligations**

Teachers had a lot to say about the personal attitudes they felt were necessary for culturally responsive teaching, as well as the moral obligations that informed their work. Participants shared thoughts on everything from openness, empathy, and a willingness to grow to deeply held senses of personal vocation. With almost every participant, these beliefs were expressed strongly and consistently throughout their interviews, indicating the importance of these attitudes to their teaching practices.

“Are you an open-minded person and a loving person? And can you care for others?” LeAnne - a White, second-year, middle school choral director - described resonating with these words from a trainer in CRT, connecting them also to her personal beliefs about the attitudes it took to prioritize the tenets of CRT in instruction. She cautioned that, although “intuitive” for her, teachers in general needed to make sure they were knowledgeable about critical race elements, in addition to personal kindness. When I asked Ann to define CRT, her immediate response was about openness and understanding: “So that I can make sure that I'm open to [checking my privilege] and ask[-ing] questions and not assume[-ing] that I'm always right. And
they're always wrong. If there's a conflict with something, especially that might be a cultural thing . . .”

Ann also expressed a sense of vocation in her work with marginalized students. “[I] specifically chose to teach there. I've always worked in high poverty areas. I feel like it's kind of a calling for me . . .” (Ann acknowledged earlier that poverty is not a culture, but did discuss it alongside race and culture due to the high needs it creates among her students, which she addresses using CRT). For LeAnne, the personal drive to learn about and practice CRT was rooted not just in her attitudes, but in her upbringing in social justice communities, whether religious or educational. “. . . I pride myself in being a very compassionate and open person . . . [and] I was lucky to have life experience that took me outside of my own world.” These contexts will be discussed more specifically in the situational motivation section, but it is important to note here how she directly identified the elements as generative. Cassandra also talked about “knowing what [she] was getting herself into” when she started working in a Title 1 School, and wanting to serve the students well.

In addition to personal attitudes of empathy and senses of calling, teachers expressed the importance of flexibility and willingness to grow regarding CRT. “I wanted to do it right,” said Rowena of her own CRT practice, and “I ended up having to just go for it and allow it to be really messy and allow myself to feel uncomfortable in my classroom and recognize that I might not be the expert.” From her position as a district PD coordinator, she noted “for some of those younger teachers . . . I have a lot of reasons to be really optimistic and just believe that they'll get there . . . It's going to be sloppy at first and that's actually pretty normal for teaching . . .” “This takes personal work,” LeAnne agreed, and Lauren’s own experience of intense, independent personal reading in CRT seconded that sentiment. Ann had specific advice from her perspective
as a veteran teacher - she recommended “deferring to minorities” in instances of cultural conflict, as well as “not taking it personally” and being willing to learn from younger teachers.

Teachers also extended the conversation about personal empathy and a growth mindset to modeling those traits for students. When discussing live instruction, Daniel noted, “In the moment, I’m just trying to model openness and respect and honesty, really.” While most of Jack’s thoughts focused on classroom culture over CRT, he did note, “it’s creating a climate where they can share those experiences with each other, but also so that they relate, they know how to move around the world.” LeAnne concluded, “Ultimately, we’re educating people. It only makes sense that we educate them with a worldview in mind.” In approaching CRT in their own teaching and modeling cultural understanding and respect, these teachers hoped to foster the same mindsets in their own students.

Challenge and Fear Regarding Culturally Responsive Teaching

Alongside belief in attitudes of empathy, openness, and personal growth as essential to CRT, teachers were also deeply honest about the challenges and fears they faced in considering and implementing CRT. Jack believed limited time and resources, as well as content requirements, prevented him from prioritizing CRT. Juan seconded this, notably as the only other secondary band director in the participant group. Jack also noted that secondary contexts, into which students self-select, are unique from the “everybody” model of elementary classrooms. “You just teach the kids in front of you with the time and resources you have and they move on. You’ll go insane and burn out if you try to save every kid.”

Several participants felt that teachers themselves were an obstacle to CRT. Most of the Soundview participants, and some of the Lakeside participants, expressed a hope that attitudes towards CRT would shift as older teachers retired and younger ones took their places. Teachers
are “not already doing the right thing,” LeAnne noted, and hoped that more specific PD and a older workforce might help. Ann, one of the older teachers who was very committed to CRT and personal growth, also noted this need for more information, indicating she didn’t always know when materials were considered racist and was unsure about how to find out.

As teachers gained more information about CRT and related ideas, they were also concerned about essentializing BBIA students. Some of these concerns were noted previously in the “students” section. Cassandra added a dynamic example from live instruction:

When people define culturally responsive teaching as being like, “you're Black, and that person's White and that person's Brown and . . . I should make sure that I'm calling [on] the Black child.” . . . Maybe being [culturally responsive] in a social emotional situation [means that] kid doesn't want to be put in the open. So it's not about . . . how many times you . . . call on somebody. I mean, it is important to make sure that everybody's getting an opportunity to express their voice, but it's also just knowing . . . do they want their voice heard?

Cassandra’s example emphasized that essential theme of “knowing your kids,” and prioritizing more than just their racial appearance in classroom instruction, but also attending to other facets of their identities and learning styles.

Fear was also a prominent theme for some teachers. White participants, in particular, were worried about making mistakes that might harm their BBIA students or perpetuate systemic racism in education. Daniel confided, “I’m very fearful of doing something in an insensitive way … so I’m nervous to design culturally relevant curricula, even though I probably know how to do it . . . My biggest fear is that I’m just doing something insensitively.” Rowena expanded this idea:
When I . . . started to recognize that this was work that I needed to do, . . . I felt like I was walking on eggshells, not because anyone made me feel that way, but because I wanted to do it right. . . . And I was really afraid to meet with my students. And the reason I bring this up is because it's something that I see a lot in younger teachers who recognize that the work is really important and are really afraid of fucking it up.

By contrast, Ann told me she did not feel afraid, but confident in authenticity and growth mindset as she worked on CRT. “I guess I've always felt like if I'm honest and I try my best to understand . . . when the sincerity is there . . . people can see kind of where you're coming from.” Her confidence allowed her to keep trying new practices and collaborating with others as she embraced CRT.

**Teachers’ Beliefs Regarding Pedagogy and Repertoire**

When discussing teachers’ beliefs regarding CRT, most teachers’ answers regarding method fell into two camps - a focus on repertoire and a focus on pedagogy. Daniel sat squarely in the middle, as someone who discussed repertoire primarily as CRT, but demonstrated exemplary, responsive pedagogy in his discussed practices. Regarding repertoire, teachers like Rowena felt that classroom repertoire must be inclusive and expansive: “I hope my teachers think about what they’re including in how and who’s left out and who’s singled out.” This stance relates to Gay’s second dimension of CRT, on culturally relevant curricula. LeAnne’s insistence on “windows and mirrors” emphasized this, too, as did Jodi’s objections to “singing in a foreign language” (albeit inversely).

Although Cassandra expressed her belief in the importance of repertoire the students liked and related to, she felt a flexible, sensitive, student-centered pedagogy was ultimately more important to CRT.
Focusing on giving these students an opportunity to express themselves is really . . . what it all comes down to . . . expression of the soul. So if we're not creating that because we're caught up in all these Western philosophical ideas or a particular pedagogy, then we might be not supplying opportunities to be truly musical to deserve to have that opportunity.

Jack and Cindy seemed to agree, discussing their pedagogy much more than their repertoire, and efforts to cultivate a positive, empowering classroom culture. Ultimately, Cassandra concluded, “all efforts must also be musical,” firmly rooting her pedagogical understanding of CRT in the beauty of music-making itself.

“*It’s the most important thing . . . it’s just good teaching*”

Jodi’s view on CRT is that she wanted “everyone to feel valued,” but without prioritizing BBIA students, noting that student engagement in music and their respect for music, musicians, and one another took precedence over the particulars of CRT. Perhaps it was because of her incorrect knowledge of CRT as surface-level “political correctness”, but Jodi did not see engagement, respect, and CRT as deeply related and believed instead that “CRT made White people feel left out.” She described her feelings about school-wide CRT efforts honestly, saying, “It went a little too far, making others uncomfortable.” She recognized the schools’ positive intent, but admitted,

That’s where I say I have a little bit of an issue with being culturally responsive, because the harder I see people trying to really make sure we’re being sensitive to everybody, the more I’m seeing others being slighted . . . For example, just because I’m White, don’t make me feel like I don’t matter.
Jodi’s views were not shared by the other teachers, who almost universally felt that CRT in the music classroom was valuable and essential to both the education and experience of BBIA students and marginalized cultural identities. “In a perfect world, it’s not called culturally responsive teaching, it’s called teaching. And the tenets of [CRT] are just taught, but not as like some politically correct buzzword that gets you credits at a university,” LeAnne emphasized. Megan felt it was essential for both engagement and interest, as well as being more effective as an instructional approach to music learning. When I asked Cassandra for her overall thoughts on CRT, she responded, “[It’s] the most important thing in being a teacher. Because it should not be like a separate entity, it’s just what good teaching is.” Whether considering repertoire or pedagogy, challenge or empowerment, teachers or students, participants overall felt that CRT was deeply important and worth the effort. “If we could make a meaningful connection to their home life,” Juan said, “then we are doing and achieving part of that.”

**Practice**

As participating teachers discussed their beliefs, they naturally referred also to their instructional practices. In following the various rabbit trails that arose in interviews, teachers’ discussion of the various ways their practices, beliefs, and knowledge overlapped significantly. Participants seldom verbalized of their own accord their perceived relationships between knowledge, belief, and practice. In one interesting turn-of-events, Cassandra explained that knowledge of CRT through training leads to practice, while Lauren clarified that her successful practice, combined with her independent reading, helped her develop a strong CRT classroom practice. Following is further attention to the teaching practices, offered with the acknowledgment of the artificial distinction between all these elements.
Current Practices of Culturally Responsive Teaching

Teachers mentioned keeping CRT in mind as they planned their instructional moments and materials. “It’s multifaceted,” Juan said, telling me about how he balanced relevant concert programming with a caring classroom persona. For him and others, CRT in planning and curricula came back to “knowing your kids.” For example, he did a Día de los Muertos concert with his band students to honor their Mexican American heritages, and spoke Spanish at that concert for families in attendance. He also knew, however, that the school community loved Star Trek, so another concert featured sci-fi music. Both events (and the corresponding preparation in class) were highly responsive to his students and their families, and resulted in high engagement and enjoyment.

Other teachers developed CRT into practice, keeping in mind the cultural communities in the school neighborhood, the season of the year and its various festivals, and …. Rowena took a similar approach to concert programming, making sure to include from her community’s various cultural backgrounds, but also to foster a tense of celebration for all musics, in general. She used the example of a winter concert, which featured songs from beyond the Judeo-Christian holiday canon, and her desire to not just respond to those events with inclusivity, but to take it a step farther and attend to cultural events and holidays she and her school might have otherwise overlooked.

LeAnne, Lauren, and Cassandra spoke to tailoring materials to not just their students’ racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds, but also to their interests. “They don't necessarily care about Bach, Beethoven and Mozart,” Lauren confessed. Billie Eilish was very popular with students at the time of the interviews, and both Lauren and LeAnne were brainstorming ways to bring her music into class in meaningful and appropriate ways. LeAnne shared, “I think for my
students in particular, it’s about coming up with curriculum . . . with content that they’re going to encounter. So it’s not just about teaching music or theory concepts that are directly related to the music they listen to, or to the music like their culture . . . “

Teachers’ practice of CRT was sometimes overlapping, or even confused, with knowledge of World Music Pedagogy (Campbell, 2018). Incorporating “world music” in U.S. music classrooms is sometimes seen as a way to enact Gay’s second dimension of CRT--culturally relevant curriculum--as well as fostering multiculturalism and tolerance (Banks, 2016), but does not inherently include culturally responsive pedagogies or atmospheres. Nevertheless, several teachers felt that inclusion of “world music” was a significant part of their efforts towards CRT practice.

If I was in a high school program I would want a classroom that had a variety of music, a variety of musicians of the walls, spanning everything from our stereotypical Western classical art music to African American jazz and hip hop, to more traditional African music, based from Africa, more traditional Indian music, featuring music of like, Ravi Shankar and tabla drumming, talking about traditional Japanese and Chinese music, and their current obsession with Western art music and what’s going on from that. And just making it available.

Juan’s description of the inclusion of musical repertoire beyond the conventional American band repertoire was similar to how Daniel talked about the elementary curriculum and his efforts to incorporate Latin American and Caribbean children’s music in meaningful ways. He described making efforts each year to not simply include more “world music” repertoire, but also to facilitate contextualized conversations (discussed further in the next section). As Lauren noted, “It’s not just what we teach . . . [it’s] how we teach and how we approach it.”
**Pedagogy, Instruction, and Discourse**

When discussing CRT practice, the theme of “flexibility” emerged with regard to student-preferred repertoire and student learning styles. Rowena reflected, “I think one important thing about CRT is that it’s dynamic. It’s not static. It has to be responsive to the students that we teach. It looks very different for me this year at my current school versus last year . . .” She described selecting different repertoire for each context, but also handling discussions of race differently at each school, based on the racial and cultural demographics of the student body. Daniel seconded this, albeit hypothetically, noting that he would make significant shifts in his instruction were he at a school with a more racially and culturally diverse student body. Teachers described their fashioning of instruction particularly for BBIA students. Some even explicitly told me, “pedagogy over rep [repertoire],” indicating their belief and practice in Gay’s CRT dimensions as more than just “culturally relevant curriculum.”

One such pedagogical tool, commonly shared by teachers as appropriate to the play-out of CRT, was the development of contextualized materials and classroom discourse. Teachers also provided social contexts for the music they studied and engaged students in discourse around those contexts. Jack described how these discussions happen in band: “[My friend] has a piece called ‘Joy’ that he wrote for the birth of his second child, [so we discussed] ‘what does joy mean to you’?” LeAnne also used discourse and context in a secondary ensemble setting, facilitating extensive discussion around “We shall overcome” and students’ understanding of the meaning and application to their own lives. She explained that “Just because a piece of music was used for a different reason in a different time doesn’t mean it’s not relevant to them right now.”
In an elementary setting, Rowena utilized extensive discourse about race and culture, while Daniel encouraged his students to think deeply about the music they were experiencing.

This is the first year that I have really gone . . . deeper . . . that extra . . . reflective step . . . They take what they observe and that they’re hearing, and they ask a question based on that thing . . . [I tell them] “It’s not the first question that you ask, it’s the second question that you ask” . . . And then they were to look at all these questions - and most kids had about ten questions - and I said, “I want you to take a step back and look at all your questions. Is there a theme here? Is your curiosity taking you somewhere . . .?"

By promoting inquiry and self-directed learning, especially towards multiculturalism and tolerance via “world music,” Daniel explained as to how he engaged his students on a deeper level than just by including culturally relevant repertoire

**Classroom Management**

“If you hit somebody, there needs to be a consequence . . . just because you’re of a different culture doesn’t change what’s right and what’s wrong.” Jodi’s belief that CRT led to inadequate classroom management was not widely shared among the other teachers. Ann described her realization that school dress codes were sexist and potentially racist - instead of asking a student to remove his hoodie, she let him keep it on, regaining his trust so he could engage more deeply in music class. Other teachers described being mindful of students’ cultural behaviors, such as maintaining or avoiding eye contact with adults, and modifying school norms in their classrooms to avoid punishing students for these expressions. For example, LeAnne knew that various cultures interpreted the word “respect” differently, so she switched to “kind” as a behavioral expectation: “We can’t use ‘respect’ based on our own understanding of who our students are . . . it’s different for everybody,” directly linking it to Gay’s fourth dimension of
CRT. This approach to classroom management - cultural sensitivity in support of student engagement and learning - relates to Gay’s fourth dimension of CRT and is known as being a “warm demander” (Kleinfeld, 1975). According to Cindy, these efforts needed to be consistent not just within one’s own class, but also across entire school buildings and administrations.

**Connecting to Students**

In addition to programming culturally relevant repertoire, employing culturally responsive instructional strategies, and maintaining consistent, culturally-informed classroom management, teachers prioritized building trust and healthy relationships with students, towards improved experiences and achievement in the music classroom. Here again is the theme of “connection.” Teachers described various practices that supported their knowledge and connections to students. “Connecting through song,” was important, Juan noted, and dreamed about having student-generated Spotify playlists going as they entered and exited the classroom. Jack described asking students about their lunches as they ate in his room, saying “What’s that?” and trying to learn the culinary terms in students’ home languages, even tasting snacks when their moms sent him samples to try.

**Challenges and Obstacles to Practicing Culturally Responsive Teaching**

“It’s hard to think about culturally responsive teaching when your goal is just to hang on.” Juan’s reflection resounded throughout the other interviews. Limitations of time, resources, training, and more prevented teachers from enacting their beliefs and knowledge about CRT in practice. Several also shared a fear of messing up, making mistakes, and harming the very students and communities they wanted to better serve. This section addresses those challenges and obstacles teachers described.
**Time and Resources**

For secondary ensemble directors, class sizes and overloaded schedules kept them personalizing instruction towards student identities as much as they wanted. “My program . . . in California was a competitive program, 250 kids, 5 performance ensembles, . . . [with a ] very large Indian population . . . thinking back on it, I didn’t do much to connect to them, but I don’t know if I had the resources.” Juan described a hectic, pell-mell daily schedule of often double-booked ensemble rehearsals and after-school practices, with performances every five weeks and a rush to get through repertoire, even in an elementary setting: “We’re so caught up in trying to get them to play the instruments and understand the instruments that that methodology and that lesson planning takes paramount . . . Not that I don’t wanna play that music, but when you can only play five to six notes, you’re limited.” Leanne noted similarly that customizing instruction and materials, as well as that building meaningful relationships with students was extremely difficult in a choral program with hundreds of kids.

**Curriculum and Representation**

For many teachers, CRT means tailoring the curriculum to their school community, or even to each class. Teachers expressed enthusiasm for this and a desire to do so, but felt either inadequately informed or pressed for time in approaching this. Cassandra struggled with fully realizing her curricular goals; she knew that her students weren’t enthusiastic about the “traditional” children’s music education repertoire, but felt overwhelmed at reinventing the wheel in her teaching contexts. “That’s something that has been really, really challenging . . . on me to make this extremely relevant curriculum . . . it kind of sucks.” She wished for something pre-made that was a little closer to her students’ interests and needs, as well as for professional mentorship in further customization. Anne also discussed curriculum, noting the need to avoid
offense in various ways. She wanted to incorporate pop music and Native American traditions, for example, but hesitated to include lyrics that might not be age-appropriate or sacred music that shouldn’t be shared outside Native contexts. She also shared her struggle with getting up to speed on the conversation around minstrelsy in U.S. children’s music curriculum.

[The publisher] sent me an email that said, “It's come to our attention that several songs . . . in some of the books that we published don't have a great history.” So that's another thing for me to think about because I’m just really clueless . . . I totally understand not wanting to do like this really old children's folk song if it has this negative connotation for a certain population, but . . . you can't just Google that and find out, . . . so that's really tough. I really want to be sensitive to that . . .

In addition to avoiding offense, teachers struggled to be proactive in providing representations of musicians, music-learners, and music-making beyond the White images and traditions widely available. As noted previously, Rowena’s primary motivation in expanding the repertoire was, “Am I creating a place for all my students to feel connected?” but she struggled with “Am I leaving anyone out?”

I don't do winter holidays . . . I don't think that the right response is necessarily just singing a song from every religious tradition . . . Hanukkah is not the biggest Jewish holiday . . . Ramadan takes up [a] whole [month] of the school [year] . . . and music isn't necessarily a huge part of that. So I still feel like I'm leaving people out just by only acknowledging holidays at this time of the year.

She also noted struggles with celebrating Black History Month at the expense of leaving other groups out, but not wanting to ignore that season altogether. Other teachers noted similar
difficulties with representation and inclusion, usually doing some aspects of each but wishing they could do more.

**Teachers’ Fears Regarding Culturally Responsive Teaching**

Fear was a significant challenge for several teachers. In addition to Rowena’s concerns about “not leaving anyone out,” she was afraid of making harmful mistakes as she began discussing race and culture with students. Daniel expressed similar fears, deeply conscious of his positionality as a White man and extremely wary of saying something that would hurt marginalized groups or students. As he grappled with this fear, he understood that he needed “more diversity” not just in his teaching, but in his daily life, to build information, awareness, and confidence: “wrestling with that is a long-term thing that’s not just professional, but will be . . . personal and social and . . . multi-faceted.” Rowena expressed a similar need for self-efficacy-building experiences (CHu, 2011), while continuing to note her positionality as a White woman.

What I ended up having to do is just go for it and allow it to be really messy and allow myself to feel uncomfortable in my classroom and recognize that I might not be the expert. Giving students a place to talk about their own experiences with race was more important than my own comfort.

Teachers’ positionality, awareness of it, fears around it, and impacts on practice will be discussed further in “situational motivation.”

**Situational Motivation**

Culturally responsive teaching is a product of the best efforts of teachers to understand their students, their needs, and their interests, with attention to BBIA students, in particular. While music teachers might take to the notion that “all kids love music”, they are also wise in
their recognition that students are motivated by the particular music they are learning, the pedagogical pathways that are designed for their engagement, and the social circumstances of classroom, school-scape, and even their home and family life beyond school. Nolen, Ward, and Horn (2012) take a similar approach to teachers. Their situative perspective to teacher motivation considers how “individual cognitions are constructed through interaction with others in social contexts”. Who are these teachers in their social contexts, and what are the interactions that might affect whether or not their act on their beliefs and knowledge regarding culturally responsive teaching?

**Teachers’ Own Ethnic-Racial Identities**

Teachers gave demographic data at the start of the interview, but also referenced their ethnic, racialized, and cultural identities throughout the interview. Out of ten participants, eight identified as White, and sometimes related that identity to their teaching beliefs. Daniel noted his Whiteness, in particular, as a factor in his enactment of CRT:

> I would say a big question that I have is, for myself, is how do I build confidence - as a culturally responsive teacher, it's something that I lacked tremendously. Especially given that I'm a White male and I've been in a White male society . . . I mean, that was my elementary school, that was my high school, that was my middle school . . . I have very little diversity in my life, in my friend group. And it's something that I struggle with and in terms of music, I don't want to . . . bring in this unit that happens in February and then I go back.

Rowena echoed a similar sentiment, noting her Whiteness and need to be comfortable with that as a teacher pursuing CRT. “I think another piece that I've really come to over the last couple of
years is I can't do this work well if I don't kind of know who I am and who I am is like a nerdy white girl. And I'm always gonna stay [a] nerdy white girl.”

Notably, Juan and Cassandra shared distinctly nuanced perspectives on CRT from their own backgrounds as bicultural musicians and teachers. When I asked each of them to define culture, they went right away to their own family histories, rather than giving an abstract definition. Because of their experiences, they were especially sensitive to BBIA students’ own experiences, too, whether as Latinx or generally bicultural children. Cassandra, in particular, was highly concerned with “Whitewashing” in her community, which she had experienced significantly in childhood. When I asked Juan if a band director had ever applied principles of CRT to better relate to him, he thought for a minute, then said seriously, “No, I’m gonna say no.” He described the adequate, but impersonal, band training he had received, then shared instead about the role his Mexican father had played in his education. We were soon both laughing over our tightly-knit, part-Latinx families, a personal practical knowledge (Shaw, 2018) that Juan applied when programming concerts that catered to families’ home musics and languages.

Figure 4.4

A Note on Research Positionality

Having known Juan and Cassandra outside the study, they and I had already had extensive conversations about our complicated ethnic-racial identities and how they impacted our personal and professional lives. It’s worth wondering if they would have shared such open perspectives with a (non-Hispanic) White researcher who was not also a personal friend.
Current Teaching Contexts

Most teachers noted high sensitivity and flexibility in their specific schools, especially with awareness to and maneuvering within social contexts influenced by the varying racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic demographics of each school. Daniel spoke extensively about the need he felt to model empathy and openness to multiculturalism at his mostly White, wealthy private school. On the opposite end of the spectrum, Anne felt strongly about her commitments to resilience and generosity in a Title I school. Rowena talked about shifting her content and conversations based on each school, based on student racial demographics. Lauren did the same, even allowing students’ favorite music choices to guide the curriculum each year. Of particular interest was the cohesive community knowledge shared by the Soundview teachers (Jack, Cassandra, LeAnne, Cindy, and Anne). They knew their community deeply and all cited school- and student-specific efforts they were making, both as individual teachers and as a team, to better serve and collaborate with those children and families.

Personal Attitudes

Some teachers also cited their personal attitudes or life philosophies as motivating factors in their practice of CRT. Anne was hyper aware of her own racial and socioeconomic background, and strived to cede to colleagues and BBIA students in an effort to “check her privilege” regularly. Leanne, Rowena, and Lauren were also cognizant of their White privilege, and strove to actively honor their minoritized students’ experiences instead. Leanne also described a background of social justice participation, calling her CRT practice “intuitive.” Teacher did also share inhibiting personal attitudes - previous sections of this chapter deal strongly with Daniel’s fear of “getting it wrong,” and Jodi’s frustration with “cycles of education” may have kept her from implementing more CRT.
In general, music teachers’ situational motivation in general, but especially regarding culturally responsive teaching, seems an essential element of their CRT practice, and needs to be investigated further. Whether situationally motivated, evidenced by practice, or informed by knowledge, teachers’ beliefs regarding CRT are multifaceted and complex. These beliefs may or may not be shaped by professional development, which is the focus of the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND “OPENING OUR EARS”

Teachers construct professional knowledge and develop instructional skills in many ways. In this study of culturally responsive teaching as relevant to music education, some teachers noted the role their pre-service training played in developing their beliefs, knowledge, and practices. Other teachers described the impact of their in-service professional development in examining and developing their beliefs, knowledge, and practices. Some noted additional professional experiences that have guided their thoughts and actions, such as Rowena’s role as coordinator of professional development activities at her school and her desire to both model and support other teachers in CRT in that capacity. Others referenced their classroom teaching experience as influential of their current perspectives on CRT, either as young teachers just starting out or as veteran teachers of twenty or more years of experience. This chapter deals largely with the second research question, and calls to question in-service professional development and the views that teachers hold in CRT’s shaping of their beliefs and practices. Specific types of in-service training receive more attention here than others, as they were experienced and described by participating teachers.

Teachers reported professional development in a wide variety of forms. District-level trainings were regularly reported by teachers as occasions for professional development, as were independent workshops they attended for continuing education credits. They remarked as to their own directed learning through readings and research on their own personal time, and through book studies, mentoring relationships, formal and informal collaboration with peers, and continual self-assessment and reflection. While each teacher participant in this project provided a share of complaints, concerns, or suggestions about professional development in general, there
was agreement on its importance in developing knowledge, inspiring changes in belief, and motivating the improvement of their practice.

**Professional Development in Culturally Responsive Teaching**

Teachers described effective and ineffective professional development they had received in culturally responsive teaching, the PD they wished to receive, and the PD they wished to avoid. Their comments emanated from many varied experiences via many venues, settings, and delivery options. Ultimately, they saw a direct trickle-down effect from PD sessions on the topic of CRT to their changing of curricular-instructional practices. Of course, this is the intent of teachers’ pursuit of their continuing education through professional development. Teachers enumerated an array of professional development circumstances by which they developed understandings of culturally responsive teaching. These included district-level trainings, building-specific trainings, independent workshops, conferences and conventions, undergraduate and graduate coursework, webinars, mentor relationships, other collaborations, book studies, personal reading, and ongoing reflection and self-assessment.

As a second-year teacher, Leanne referenced her recent undergraduate studies as a critical part of her professional development. Of particular import in her preparation for a music education career was a January-term internship at a school with “a population of students I had literally never encountered before.” Although she felt she had developed cultural competence skills by working with a population of BBIA students with whom she’d previously been unfamiliar, ultimately she was concerned the experience had been “extractive,” commodifying the students themselves for her White benefit:

> It was hard, it was challenging, it was tiring. And I look back on it now and I’m still glad I had the experience, but I’m upset [at the tokenization] of a population for my education.
I see that as just one of the ultimate White privilege elitist ivory tower decisions . . . I mean, that’s putting the responsibility on the marginalized mind or on marginalized populations to educate me.

Her experience reflects current concerns around service-learning experiences, but solutions are still few and far between (Grain & Lund, 2016).

University coursework may sow the seeds to culturally responsive teaching. As a secondary and elementary ensemble director, Juan recalled his experiences in required and self-directed CRT learning. He described a graduate course in CRT that he had recently taken as the only PD in CRT he had ever received. In the course, he learned of Geneva Gay’s five dimensions of CRT and was given opportunities in lectures, discussions and assignments to reflect upon the importance of “making a connection” with racially, ethnically, and culturally minoritized students.

Daniel had experienced much more in-service PD in culturally responsive teaching. He referred to CRT sessions as a “mixed bag,” with some being more helpful than others. Rowena and Jack held the unique position of PD coordinators for their district and departments, so their thoughts on professional development reflected both their own experiences and desires, as well as what they understood as the desires and needs of their colleagues. As a secondary ensemble director, Jack tended to focus more on vertical curricular collaboration and alignment, as well as assessments, and less on CRT. Rowena, on the other hand, recognized the critical need for CRT based on her district’s student and family demographics, and armed with this information she planned training sessions for teachers accordingly. She emphasized foundational work in social justice in music education (an umbrella term which includes CRT), as well as collaborative efforts and inquiry directed to evaluating and implementing new curriculum.
Obviously [PD in CRT] hasn't been specific to elementary music, except for little tidbits that I'm able to sneak in here and there. But at both the school that I'm at currently and the school that I was at for the last six years, it's been a huge part of our staff meetings and our professional development Fridays and summer professional development days. And I can tell that it's something that's very important to Lakeside.

Cassandra also underwent district-level trainings, but preferred one-on-one mentoring relationships. “I was explaining to [my district-assigned mentor] that every time I come back from a convention or PD, I'm really, really, really excited because I've learned so many great things.” She described how her mentor helped her process and implement new information from these professional trainings, but she also depicted PD as a “fire hose” that provided an overload of information. Cassandra explained how important it was to her to acquire the insights of other professionals at these PD settings and to “put it through . . . a sieve, like a mental sieve, to try to understand what particular parts are going to work for my kids.” While she discussed general education and music education broadly with her mentor, they also spent time brainstorming ways of tailoring instructional practices to her BBIA students (and students with additional marginalized identities).

Anne emphasized the importance to her of “book studies”, a PD method similar to a book club but which involves colleague-teachers who read alone and discuss together issues relevant to schools, teachers, and their students. She described her own local experience with book studies:

Maybe say, “You know what, we're going to read this book, but we're not going to discuss it with 35 people. You're going to discuss it with your grade level team,” and that may be three to five teachers and that's people that you already have a trust usually built
I think it's really important to put people in a situation where they feel safe. As [race] is such a hard topic and because it's hard to reflect on your own personal practice. Most people don't . . . they don't want to be the teacher who's unfair. They don't necessarily feel like they're trying to do that. They just don't. They're just really ignorant of the information around them. So I definitely think being in a smaller group is helpful. And then to challenge each other to try one small change.

Anne’s own practice reflected the effectiveness of this book studies approach for her. She described the improved relationship she developed with a Black student who preferred wearing his hoodie up in class. As a result of her reading, discussion, and deliberation within the book club, she described the school dress code that had banned hoodies as “racist” and decided that she should allow the student to wear his hoodie anyways. She observed direct, positive impact through an improved relationship with the student and his newly enthusiastic engagement in music class after that.

Finally, teachers described the importance of their own intrinsic motivation, “a sense of volition or choice . . . [wit] inherent interest” (Roth, 2014, p. 37). This intrinsic motivation helped them enthusiastically enact practices from gleaned or developed from effective PD. Cassandra shared,

I get inspired and . . . uplifted. I think more than anything that big part of music PD for me is like, “Yeah, okay. I'm excited about teaching again, I'm excited about fighting the fight, you know, . . . [you haven't] got anything without motivation.
**Desired Changes in Professional Development**

Although most participants had received some professional development in culturally responsive teaching, and found it to be more or less effective, they also openly shared how their thoughts on the extent and nature of its content, and suggestions for its improvement. Juan named a need for specific strategies that could give focus to CRT issues, and suggested the need for recommended resources that would guide practical implementation of CRT principles in the classroom. Daniel felt he had received adequate training in CRT, but claimed the need in music education practice for a “middle ground” of CRT training that went beyond repertoire or curricular suggestions.

Sometimes I [do] need a session where it's like, "Yeah, let's just talk big picture here for an hour." But I feel like there's no middle ground. We get these small micro-level PD sessions that are, “here's five songs that you can implement tomorrow” and there's no talk of how to do it or why we do it or . . . of the core tenant of what we do . . . And then there's these sessions that are, like, “culturally responsive teaching is a practice that we all need.” I know that, I get that, . . . I understand why this works, but let's look at this middle ground for people like me.

Cassandra craved highly personalized, in-depth applications for her own specific teaching contexts. She dreamed of “every single teacher get[ting] the advanced form of themselves as their professional development instructor. Wouldn't that be perfect?” She wanted someone to say, “Cassandra. Let me take you under my wing and fix it all for you,” and hoped for “one-to-one [sessions] with a person who is extremely experienced in my particular situation, who has already created all these wonderful lesson plans.” This need made sense, since Cassandra was regularly re-creating her curriculum based on student interest and social needs, and would benefit
from a master teacher with deep understandings of CRT tenets who would mentor her in the
nuances of her everyday interactions with the students.

In addition to the requests for pedagogical strategies, CRT nuancing, and expert
supervision on the customization process of principles to practice, teachers wanted more
knowledge around CRT and social justice in music education, in general. “The time between
research and practice in education is long,” Anne noticed, meaning that what she noticed in the
academy took a long time to make its way into daily practice of teachers’ in the field. Leanne
admitted that, “[Current PD] assumes we are already doing the right thing … I think there is a
disconnect between practice and philosophy.”

The White teachers (who were 8 of the 10 participating teachers in this research) wanted
to build their knowledge of CRT by receiving PD instruction from BBIA providers. Participants
named two local Black clinicians whose PD sessions had been highly effective for them.

Every time I hear her speak, I feel like I have just gotten a better grasp on what I need to
do next . . . she's a motivational speaker . . . but she does a lot of PD surrounding
culturally responsive teaching and learning . . . She's a great storyteller who has . . . an
incredible life experience that she draws from to really nail or drive the point home about
why culturally responsive teaching is a good thing. And ultimately, why it makes you a
better person . . . She has been, I think, the only person I've seen speak on the matter
[who] has a way of changing people's minds.

Leanne's comments encompass elements of motivation, belief, and practice that work together to
forge a culturally responsive way forward for teachers.

Providing professional development that is consistently personalized, effective, and
inspiring is a tall order, but teachers seemed hopeful that it was doable. Cassandra summarized
what she felt were the challenges and why she felt they were worth overcoming, with particular concern for her BBIA students (as well as students with additional, marginalized identities):

As regards to PD generationally I think that there's a huge disjunct of what people think we need and what the newer generation of music educators are realizing is [what we actually need]. In our musical situation, why are we still defining music by these older terms and understanding of Western-focused music experience? Why isn't it that we're focusing on giving these students an opportunity to express themselves? Is really what it all comes down to *expression of the soul*. So if we're not creating that because we're caught up in all these Western philosophical ideas or a particular pedagogy, then we might be not supplying opportunities to be truly musical to [students who] deserve to have that opportunity.

Ultimately, teachers’ personal attitudes, opinions, and preferences regarding professional development were similar to their beliefs regarding their own teaching. Their responses regarding desired and undesired PD reflected their beliefs that culturally responsive teaching CRT was important, that they wanted to increase their knowledge of CRT, that they were aware of the gaps in their practices, and that their own identities played a role. Although teachers pursued a variety of options for developing their knowledge and improving their practice, most embraced formal professional development as a meaningful way forward.
CHAPTER SIX: IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The successful implementation of culturally responsive teaching by music educators depends upon a dynamic interaction between belief, knowledge, and practice, motivated in part by their ever-shifting places in social and professional contexts. Teachers grow in their professional knowledge through study and experience, and develop their beliefs and even a system of belief that undergirds and guides them in their practice in designing curriculum and delivering instruction. Knowledge-based beliefs drive classroom practice, which can vary widely due to the realities of teaching context and situational motivation. There are many components that enter into the situational motivation of teaching and learning, including school demographics, students’ needs, administrators’ support, years of experience, and teachers’ racial positionality, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation. Long-standing and enduring racial inequities in United States education, as well as the ever shifting demographics of students in schools, necessitates continued attention to culturally responsive teaching - and other social justice pedagogies - whether in music or in general education. Effective professional development in CRT might very well include sustained, teacher-specific supports to address the multi-faceted “swirl” that is teacher belief, in order to positively impact teachers’ implementation of CRT. Further research is needed to determine the effect of PD on long-term teacher practice of CRT and on student experience and achievement.

Teacher Belief, Knowledge, Practice, and Situational Motivation

Previous literature in teacher belief indicates a linear relationship from knowledge to belief to practice to student achievement (see Chapter 2), and thus the initial formation of research questions in this study was constructed in acknowledgement of this relationship. Upon further reading, however, as well as in conducting interviews, I noticed that teacher beliefs
regarding CRT (i.e. that they viewed it as “the most important thing” or that they were afraid of implementing it incorrectly) do not always directly align with their knowledge or practices. For example, Daniel remarked that “I know more than I think I do” regarding his understanding of various dimensions of Geneva Gay’s development of CRT principles. He sensed he practiced CRT with more nuance and effectiveness than he noticed or could verbalize, but believed himself to be lacking in confidence and limited in his applications. Conversations like this led me to question a linear conception of the belief-practice interface, and consider a more nuanced model.

Throughout the interviews, participants frequently described “swirls,” overlaps, and contradictions between their belief, knowledge, and practice, especially considering various teaching contexts. Similar findings occurred in Tam’s (2015) exploration of teacher belief and PD around standards based curricular design, for instance when participants reported a change in belief but no corresponding change in practice, or vice versa. Additionally, some teachers in this project were highly cognizant of how their practice of CRT and motivations to practice it were highly dependent on context. For example, Juan shared about taking on a part-time orchestra gig and having time to highly customize the music and instruction to the students’ interests and home cultures. In contrast, he had another teaching position which was more than full-time, of which is when he said “It’s hard to think about culturally responsive teaching when your goal is just to hang on”.

In noticing these patterns of “swirl” in both the literature and in teacher responses to interview questions, the grounded theory method of this research supported the development of a visual model (Figure 6.1). This model was designed to depict the differences between teacher beliefs, knowledge, and practice, and the various ways these three elements interact in classroom
practice. As well, the model acknowledges the overall pressure applied by complex teaching-learning contexts (situational motivation) and the desired positive impact on racially, culturally, and linguistically minoritized students’ experiences and achievements when each element was well-aligned to the others.

**Figure 6.1**

*Model for Multi-Faceted Teacher Belief*
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Anne’s example of the book club, or “book studies”, as she referred to it, in which she felt emotionally safe to learn about and then try practices newer to her, is an apt illustration of the function of each piece of the model. Her belief is that CRT is important, so she engaged in PD to improve her knowledge of CRT practices. The beliefs and knowledge interacted in a way to affect her in-class practices, which created a better academic and relationship experience for
the student in the hoodie. Her situational motivation was knowledge of herself as a White woman and her need to “check her privilege,” as well as deep knowledge of and care for the specific student needs at her Title I school. Further, the “safe space” of a small book club allowed her to feel confident to reflect on her teaching practice and to make necessary changes.

Jodi’s case may also be understood via the model. Her strongly stated belief that CRT is narrow and exclusive, preluded by her strongly stated announcement, “Here’s the problem with culturally responsive teaching,” belongs to the “belief” circle. Her incorrect knowledge of CRT as mere “political correctness,” as well as misunderstanding the incorporation of global music cultures in class as CRT, live in the “knowledge” circle. Limited, even resistance to, practice of CRT would interact with each of these to potentially create a less-than-positive experience and limited academic achievement for racially, ethnically, or culturally minoritized students in her music classes. Further, her deep connection to and even protection of her own Whiteness, particularly in a school with increasing numbers of BBIA students and highly involved BBIA families creating affinity spaces, might function as part of situational motivation, informing belief, knowledge, and practice without her even knowing it, but with less than healthy impacts on students.

Finally, the story of Cassandra, as one of only two bicultural teachers in the study, is a significant application of the model. She believed CRT was one of the most important pedagogical approaches, and had a significant level of knowledge around CRT due to her university coursework and professional training. Additionally, she held deep about the students’ communities, having grown up in the town where she taught. These each informed her practices towards more equitable teaching practices for her BBIA students, creating positive impacts such as students’ emotional safety and ability to learn in the classroom. Her personal knowledge of
both the community and the sometimes fraught nature of being a bicultural or biracial young person illustrate how situational motivation suffuses the entire interaction. Cassandra’s many social contexts, whether regarding her own identity and childhood or the empathy she held for those of her students, informed belief, knowledge, and practice, contributing to the desired positive impact on students at the center of it all.

Understandings of existing literature on teacher belief and professional development might be combined with applications of the model for improved PD in CRT for music educators, with the goal of more frequent and potent enactments of CRT practices by music educators. This could potentially lead towards more positive experiences and engagement for racially, ethnically, or culturally marginalized students. Upitis et al.’s (1999) three-level matrix, with its emphasis on “necessary conditions for transformation, . . . potential for sustained transformation . . . and operationalized long-term transformation,” resonates with the participating teachers in this research project. Examples include Anne’s need for emotional safety in a small book group, Daniel’s desire for confidence to improve in enacting CRT, and Rowena’s hope for long-term and continuous training in CRT for her staff. Additionally, the three-level matrix touches on aspects of beliefs about self and others, the role of social contexts, and that teacher change, or “transformation,” is the very goal of this undertaking.

The requisite voluntary nature of teacher change through professional development may also be emphasized (Barrett, 2006; Stanley et al., 2013). Teachers may experience greater internal motivation to change, along with observable adjustments to practice, when the PD is designed collaboratively and they engage willingly. This might resonate with Jodi, who resented attending PD’s focused on “cycles of education” she’d already experienced in previous trainings
or Cassandra, who wanted a more customized mentor model, rather than the district-mandated trainings in science or technology that were of little to no use in her classroom.

In conjunction with extant literature, an in-depth understanding of the model (see Figure 6.1) may develop from this research. Applications of the model alongside nuanced, detailed collaboration with teachers themselves, more customized and potentially more impactful PD in CRT may be developed. For example, scaffolded information delivery might result in increased knowledge in CRT, but personal narratives or expanded life experience might support the belief that CRT is important and worth implementing. Cross-observation and work with mentors might support more nuanced practices of CRT, while an acknowledgment of teachers as complex human beings and learners themselves, within shifting and compelling social contexts, might invite empathetic design to support or challenge teachers’ own identities and roles within racialized systems. Ultimately, teachers themselves, whether as individuals or as groups within a building or district, need to have a say in their PD design. Listening to teachers in the way we strive to listen to students is imperative.

**Limitations and Implications for Future Research**

This was a small and local sample size of practicing music educators, working in public and private schools. They came from a spectrum of familial and community experiences, and were teaching in schools that were likewise heterogeneous. They were of several generations of learning the teaching trade, growing their musical skills and repertoire alongside their pedagogical and procedural know-how in working with young learners in school music programs at the elementary and secondary school levels. Additionally research in this area must include a broader range of participants, ideally with more BBIA teachers and teachers of even more various student populations. Emerging themes were distinct to this group of participants, and
different teachers might share different beliefs, knowledge, practices, situational motivations and thoughts on professional development.

Future studies of music educators’ beliefs regarding culturally responsive teaching and professional development might provide further insights on the role of PD on their CRT practices. Further research is needed to determine the breadth of applications of this model, as well as its impact in PD and classroom practice. An extension of this research might be to design PD in CRT around this model and these music teachers’ requests, then evaluating the effectiveness of the PD via further interviews, observations, and assessment of student experience and achievement. Additionally, research in PD or even CRT often focuses on the teachers’ perspectives (Shaw, 2016). While some studies do emphasize students (Abril, 2006; Shaw, 2016), longitudinal studies determining the effectiveness of PD in CRT on positively impacting student experience are few and far between, especially when told in the voices of the students themselves. Longitudinal case studies are needed, with collaboration between PD providers, music educators, and their students, to determine the positive impact of such trainings for both teachers and students.

**Impact of Culturally Responsive Teaching**

During the interviews, participants also answered open-ended questions regarding their beliefs about the impact of CRT practices on students. While the true impact of these practices can only be reported with integrity by the students themselves, teachers nevertheless expressed their desired impacts, the impacts they hoped to avoid, and observed and perceived impacts on students. In general, teachers spoke at length about their desired impacts, with much less attention to discrete and detailed reporting of the perceived effects of their teaching on the musical, intellectual, and social-emotional development of their BBIA students. There were also
The primary desire most teachers expressed was for positive relationships with and care for their students. Juan hoped his CRT practices would cause students to say, “[Mr. V.] cares about me, he cares about who I am, not just the fact that I am carrying an instrument.” Teachers also hoped that their CRT practices would foster deep critical thinking for both minoritized and dominant culture students, inviting children to make connections with the musical content and the world around them. Daniel described this as “a deeper level of thinking . . . getting kids to follow their curiosity . . . connect[ing] them a little further.”

Teachers frequently mentioned musical achievement as a primary desire of the impact of their CRT practices. Whether engaging students in participation or hoping for them to grow and develop new skills, teachers like Daniel cultivated “immersive musical experiences” in the hopes of deep enjoyment and growth. Leanne summarized this desired impact as the belief in action that “all students can succeed.”

Ultimately, teachers hoped for racial equity in their music classrooms and schools through CRT. Whether by avoiding tokenizing and essentializing students from minoritized groups, or by going even further and actively supporting positive ethnic-racial identity development (Brown & Chu, 2012), teachers like Rowena hoped that their CRT practices would empower students to “want to engage with all parts of who they are.” Cassandra, who has openly struggled with her own ethnic-racial identity, put it most potently.

The impact can be huge . . . especially in a community like mine where the kids are not represented in the media and the things that they see at home and listening to the radio . . . to have other people besides your parents that care for you and
are willing to see eye to eye with you is extremely important because the opportunity that connection that helps a child develop into *somebody who makes changes in the world*.

**Conclusion**

Culturally responsive teaching matters. Students feel more comfortable and learn better when they are truly known, understood, and valued (Carter, 2006; Paris & Alim, 2017; Shaw, 2016). Culturally responsive teaching helps music teachers more broadly facilitate a collective joy of music and elevate the distinct musical voice of all students, particularly young BBIA musicians and others who have been marginalized. Meaningful professional development also matters. Just as thoughtful teachers pursue student-centered instruction for maximal learning, teacher educators can have this same mindset when approaching professional development.

Extended, collaborative, and relevant trainings help teachers truly internalize values and skills, in turn positively impacting the musical self-expression of every student. Through their attention to culturally responsive teaching, and with the help of relevant professional development, music teachers may seek to know themselves and their students, forging a collaborative path forward towards a real, musical difference in partnership with each and every child.
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APPENDIX A: Email Inquiry to Potential Participants

Dear teachers,

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Kaity Cassio Igari, a graduate student in the University of Washington music education program, under the supervision of Patricia Shehan Campbell, professor and director of the program.

The purpose of the study is to explore elementary music educators’ beliefs regarding Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT), their perceptions of its impact on students, and their perceptions of the role professional development plays regarding CRT. Participation is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate now, you can always change your mind later. There are no negative consequences, whatever you decide.

Participating teachers will share their thoughts about CRT in one to two individual interviews, approximately one hour per interview. There may also be opportunities to email further thoughts to the researcher, after the interviews. All experiences with CRT are welcome and desired (i.e., agree or disagree about the relevance and need for CRT; no experience, some experience, very experienced; etc.). Participant privacy will be protected and pseudonyms will be used to write up the research.

There are no physical risks to undertaking this research. Sometimes discussing race, culture, and ethnicity can be uncomfortable, though, which participants may experience as they speak openly about their teaching and philosophies regarding CRT. Benefits to teachers will include the opportunity to reflect on their teaching practices, to share successes and concerns, and to contribute to research which will potentially improve teachers’ and students’ experiences in music education.
Interviews will take place over Zoom, and participants will receive a small thank-you compensation of a $10 coffee/tea gift card.

Please contact Kaity at kigari@uw.edu by May 22nd if you wish to participate in the study. Interviews may be scheduled until the second week of June 2020.
APPENDIX B: Consent Form

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
CONSENT FORM
MA Thesis Research, Music Education

Researchers: Kaitlynn A. Cassio Igari (graduate student), Dr. Professor Shehan Campbell (faculty advisor)

Contact Information: kigari@uw.edu; 253-948-4443

We are asking you to be in a research study. This form gives you information to help you decide whether or not to be in the study. Being in the study is voluntary. Please read this carefully. You may ask any questions about the study. Then you can decide whether or not you want to be in the study.

KEY INFORMATION ABOUT THIS STUDY

- The purpose of this grounded theory study is to explore teacher belief regarding culturally CRT; teachers’ perceptions of the impact of these practices and frameworks on students; and the role teachers believe professional development plays in developing these understandings and practices.

- There are no physical risks to undertaking this research. Sometimes discussing race, culture, and ethnicity can be uncomfortable, which participants may experience as they speak openly about their teaching and philosophies.

- Benefits to teachers will include the opportunity to reflect on their teaching practices, to share “wins” and concerns, and to contribute to research which will potentially improve teachers’ and students’ experiences in music education.

- The following research questions guide this study: 1) What are elementary music educators’ foundational beliefs regarding culturally responsive teaching? 2) What do elementary music educators believe about how these practices impact students? 3) What role do elementary music educators believe that professional development plays in developing or influencing their beliefs and practices?

- Data collection will occur through semi-structured interviews, focused on general information about the participants and their teaching contexts; questions about culturally responsive education; and questions about professional development. You may refuse to answer any question at any time. Participants may elect to have additional conversations with the researcher via interview, phone, or email.

- Time investment will not exceed ninety minutes, unless participants elect to extend their interviews.

- Participation is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate now, you can always change your mind later. There are no negative consequences, whatever you decide.

- This study will hold implications for future professional development, enabling teacher educators to design in CRT training suited to their in-service teachers’ pre-existing beliefs and desired practices. For the field in general, this study will support ongoing work towards improved student experience and achievement for the growing number of children from non-dominant cultures.
CONFIDENTIALITY OF RESEARCH INFORMATION

Interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. Data will be confidential and participants may select a pseudonym for use in the report. Results of the study will be presented in a Master’s thesis defense committee at the University of Washington and may be shared with the music education community at large via conference posters, presentations, or articles. A final report will also be shared with the Renton School District, per their research requirements.

You may have access to your transcripts and may member-check for accuracy, as desired. A final copy of the thesis will be provided to you, at your request.

Data will be stored in a secure Cloud location and shared with the researcher and her faculty advisor. You may indicate at any time that you wish your data to be withdrawn from the secure Cloud location or for a copy to be sent to you. The information obtained from you for this study might be used for future studies. We may remove anything that might identify you from the information. If we do so, that information may then be used for future research studies without getting additional permission from you. If we do, a review board will decide whether or not we need to get additional permission from you.

Participants will receive coffee, tea, or snacks at the time of interview, per their preference. Additional compensation will include the choice between either a $10 gift card or baked goods of their choice.

Signing this consent form indicates your intent to participate in the study and gives your permission to be contacted by the researcher, to have your interview(s) audio recorded and transcribed, and for the results to be published at the researcher’s discretion. You may withdraw from the study at any time by notifying the researcher in writing.

Subject’s statement

This study has been explained to me. I volunteer to take part in this research. I have had a chance to ask questions. If I have questions later about the research, or if I have been harmed by participating in this study, I can contact one of the researchers listed on the first page of this consent form. If I have questions about my rights as a research subject, I can call the Human Subjects Division at (206) 543-0098 or call collect at (206) 221-5940. I will receive a copy of this consent form.

Printed name of subject       Signature of subject       Date
APPENDIX C: IRB Approval Letter

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
HUMAN SUBJECTS DIVISION

DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
April 30, 2020

Dear Kaity Cassio Igari:

On 4/30/2020, the University of Washington Human Subjects Division (HSU) reviewed the following application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review:</th>
<th>Initial Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of Study:</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>IRB ID:</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exempt Status
HSU determined that your proposed activity is human subjects research that qualifies for exempt status (Category 2).

- This determination is valid for the duration of your research.
- This means that your research is exempt from the federal human subjects regulations, including the requirement for IRB approval and continuing review.
- Depending on the nature of your study, you may need to obtain other approvals or permissions to conduct your research. For example, you might need to apply for access to data or specimens (e.g., to obtain UW student data). Or, you might need to obtain permission from facilities managers to approach possible subjects or conduct research procedures in the facilities (e.g., Seattle School District; the Harborview Emergency Department).

**NOTE:** While IRB approval for this project has been granted/renewed, the University is requiring a temporary halt of some research activities that involve in-person interaction with participants. This temporary halt is effective March 23rd through at least May 15th, 2020 and may be extended further. For additional information about the halt and the current effective date, see the HSU website: https://www.washington.edu/research/HSU/covid-19/.

If you consider changes to the activities in the future and know that the changes will require IRB review (or you are not certain), you may request a review or new determination by submitting a Modification to this application. For information about what changes require a Modification, refer to the GUIDANCE: Exempt Research.
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APPENDIX D: Questions for Individual Interviews

Elementary music educator beliefs regarding culturally responsive teaching
Semi-structured interview prompts

Interviewer: __________________________________________________________
Participant & desired pseudonym: ________________________________
Date: _______________________________________________________________________
Time: _______________________________________________________________________
Location: __________________________________________________________________
Preferred phone / email: ______________________________________________________
COmpensation offered/provided: _________________________________________________

Don’t forget to get two signed consent forms, to record audio, to take notes, and to say “thank you!”

1. Demographic information
   a. Type of school
   b. Name of school
   c. Birth year
   d. Gender
   e. Ethnic/racial affiliation
   f. Years teaching (in general)
   g. Years teaching elementary general music (specifically)
   h. Subjects currently taught
   i. Grades currently taught
   j. Education / degrees attained
   k. Primary instrument / voice
   l. Additional musical training

2. Culturally Responsive Teaching
   a. How would you define culture?
   b. How would you define Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT)?
   c. Please describe your familiarity with these five dimensions of CRT:
      i. Developing a cultural diversity knowledge base
      ii. Designing culturally relevant curricula
      iii. Demonstrating cultural caring and building a learning community
      iv. Cross-cultural communications
      v. Cultural congruity in classroom instruction
   d. Do you think CRT is important? Why or why not?
   e. What do you believe the impact of CRT is / could be on students?
   f. In what ways do you currently practice CRT?
      i. How do you think about CRT when you plan?
ii. How do you think about CRT when you’re in the moment of instruction?
g. In what ways do you wish to practice CRT?
h. What questions / concerns / objections do you have regarding CRT?

3. Professional Development
   a. What professional development do you normally receive or pursue?
b. What professional development have you received in CRT?
      i. General
      ii. Music ed
c. Did this PD influence your understanding of CRT? If so, how?
d. How do you believe the PD impacted your practice of CRT?
e. What kinds of PD in CRT would you like to receive?

4. General
   a. Is there anything you want me to know about you as a teacher?
b. Is there anything else you want to discuss regarding CRT or PD?
c. Would you like to be contacted after the study is concluded?
      i. To further discuss anything that came up today?
      ii. To member-check the research?