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ABSTRACT

Four music therapy educators participated in semi-structured, in-depth interviews as part of a qualitative study. The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomena of feminist pedagogy as experienced by music therapy educators using phenomenological inquiry. The study examined the following research questions: (a) do music therapy educators use feminist music therapy pedagogy in teaching music therapy, (b) if so, how do they use feminist music therapy pedagogy, (c) what is their experience in using feminist music therapy pedagogy, and (d) how do feminist music therapy educators define their use of feminist pedagogy in undergraduate and graduate music therapy education. Each interview lasted from 1 ½-3 hours. Data were analyzed according to Giorgi’s (1975) phenomenological method and feminist theory. The researcher used member checking, inter-rater reliability, and triangulation of data (interviews, analytic memos, and music lyrics) to address issues of trustworthiness and dependability. Five categories were identified from the meaning units: (a) philosophical framework, (b) goals, (c) teaching methods, (d) institutional and social issues, and (e) backlash and response. A composite summary, discussion of the implications of the findings, consistency and inconsistency with the literature, limitations, revisiting of assumptions, personal reflections, guidelines for using FMTP, and areas for future research are included.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

This study seeks to explore the phenomenon of feminist music therapy pedagogy (FMTP) in music therapy education. The purpose of this study is to explore the phenomena of FMTP as experienced by music therapy educators using phenomenological inquiry. It is anticipated that the knowledge generated from this study will inform music therapy pedagogy in higher education. This study involved using in-depth interviews, using both a phenomenological and feminist methodology, to encapsulate how FMTP is used, understood, and experienced by the study’s participants. The participants of this study were four music therapy educators that used feminist pedagogy in teaching music therapy at the undergraduate and/or graduate level.

This chapter begins with a description of the context of music therapy education in academe. A statement of the problem, the statement of purpose, and the study’s research questions follow this section. Additionally, this chapter includes the research approach employed by the author and a description of the study’s assumptions and limitations. The first chapter concludes with a description of the researcher, the rationale and significance for this study, and a description of terminology used in this study.

Background and Context

Despite a recent scholarly interest in feminist music therapy (Edwards & Hadley, 2007; Hadley, 2006; Hadley & Edwards, 2004), only one scholarly work (Hadley, 2006) exists on FMTP. Some literature does exist on music therapy education in general (Maranto & Bruscia, 1987; Maranto & Bruscia, 1988) and the movement of music therapy education towards a competency-based model (Braswell, 1987; Bruscia, Hesser,
& Boxill, 1981; Jensen & McKinney, 1990). What remains to be explored is the theoretical foundation for teaching and learning in music therapy—FMTP.

Within academe as a whole, much discussion on both teaching and pedagogy exists. The art and science of educating the educator has been explored from a variety of perspectives, including both the pragmatic and the philosophical (Eble, 1972, 1988; Katz & Henry, 1993; Magee, 1971; McKeachie, 2002; Passmore, 1980). In fact, teaching as a scholarly endeavor was created not that long ago (Boyer, 1990). Since Boyer’s historic work, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, a new field emerged—The Scholarship of Teaching (Major & Palmer, 2006; Weimer, 2006; Zamorski, 2004). Until recently, however, traditional pedagogies were not examined for their failure to assist oppressed peoples in transforming their learning environments and lives (Freire, 1970/2000; hooks, 1994).

While strides have been made towards scholarship and pedagogy, women continue to experience oppression and sexism in higher education (Abramson, 1975; American Association of University Women, 2004; Arnot, David, & Weiner, 1999; Berry & Mizelle, 2006; Churgin, 1978; Farello, 1970). In fact, the history of education in the United States (Thelin, 2004) tends to describe the history of men’s education. Women’s education, in the West, has historically been quite different that that of men’s (Anderson & Zinsser, 1988; Minnich, 2005; Newcomer, 1959; Touhton & Davis, 1991).

Additionally, a study on feminist music therapy found that 75% of respondents, who were music therapy educators, were women (Hahna, 2010), 76% of Directors of Music Therapy Programs were women (American Music Therapy Association, 2010), and the majority of music therapists are women (American Music Therapy Association, 2010). It only seems fitting, then, that music therapy education be based on a pedagogy that is
inclusive of women and seeks to promote change for equality in both academe and society for both women, men, and transgendered individuals. Therefore, this study seeks to shed light on the use of FMTP by music therapy educators, as a possible way to mitigate the oppression experienced by women students and educators in higher education and as a theoretical foundation upon which to base competency-based instruction used in music therapy education.

Problem Statement

A majority of music therapy educators, music therapists, and music therapy students are women and oppression of women in terms of gaining access to higher education as students and/or discrimination that occurs towards women faculty in higher education seeking promotion and tenure continues to occur. Additionally, music therapy literature on the scholarship of teaching and/or pedagogy is scant, creating a lack of theoretical foundation upon which to base teaching strategies and curriculum decisions. Finally, traditional methods of pedagogy in higher education have not clearly addressed oppression and/or discrimination. Hence, current music therapy education does not address the aforementioned problems of women in academe.

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomena of feminist pedagogy as experienced by music therapy educators using phenomenological inquiry. It is anticipated that with a better understanding of the use of FMTP in music therapy education, music therapy educators can make informed decisions about the theoretical foundations upon which they base their teaching strategies on and incorporate a pedagogy that seeks to
create egalitarianism in response to the historic oppression of women in academe. With this in mind, the following research questions will serve as the basis for this study:

1. Do music therapy educators use FMTP in teaching music therapy?
2. If so, how do they use FMTP?
3. What is their experience in using FMTP?
4. How do feminist music therapy educators define their use of FMTP in undergraduate and graduate music therapy education?

**Research Approach**

With the approval of the Institutional Review Board at Lesley University, this study examined the experiences of four music therapy educators with FMTP. Each participant could choose if they preferred to remain anonymous, and choose a pseudonym, or if they wanted to use their name in the study. This study used in-depth interviews to explore the phenomenon of feminist pedagogy. Each interview lasted between 1-3 hours, was recorded, and transcribed verbatim and took place over the course of a year. Using the lens of the feminist perspective, empathetic interviewing was used to create a more collaborative relationship and reflexive stance (Fontana & Frey, 2005).

Coding categories were developed on an on-going basis and served as the basis for the qualitative analysis (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Methods of inquiry included phenomenological reflection on the transcribed interviews and reflection on the researcher’s reflective journal, as described by Forinash and Grocke (2005). The transcripts were read and re-read repeatedly to determine meaning units. The researcher
employed member checking and peer review to determine inter-rater reliability with the categories used.

Assumptions and Limitations

Based on the researcher’s background as a feminist music therapist and feminist music therapy educator, four assumptions were made. The first assumption is that traditional pedagogies do not ameliorate the experience of women in academe or necessarily create an optimal environment for students to learn. Regardless of the pedagogical approach, some have argued that the current approach to higher education in the United States is not conducive to student learning (Graff, 2003). The history of higher education and that of traditional pedagogies has often included influences from either the church or state, or both, with biases regarding both truth and history (McClelland, 1992). Feminist pedagogy, therefore, is a viable approach to teaching that views “education as a vehicle for social change” (Villaverde, 2008, p. 121). The second assumption of this study is that music therapy’s movement towards competency-based instruction (Jensen & McKinney, 1990) was an important step, however it lacks theoretical basis. While feminist pedagogy may not be the pedagogical approach of choice for all music therapy educators, additional scholarly examination of a variety of pedagogical approaches is warranted to support the expansion of the Scholarship of Teaching in music therapy education. The third assumption of this study is that the Scholarship of Teaching is a field worthy of study in music therapy. Many helping professions have scholarly journals dedicated to higher education, such as nursing, psychology, social work (Weimer, 2006) and music therapy would be well served to explore the plethora of topics and issues related to music therapy education in a scholarly fashion. The fourth assumption of this
study is that a feminist-based qualitative research approach is the most viable means upon which to study the phenomena of FMTP. Feminist qualitative research is an active method of “research for women” that views knowledges as complex units (Olesen, 2005, p. 236). Feminist qualitative research challenges assumptions regarding objectivity of the researcher and works towards “dissolving the distance between the researcher and those with whom the research is done” (p. 250). Feminist qualitative research also takes an ethical stance that “relationships with participants lie at the heart of feminist ethical concerns” (p. 255). Feminist qualitative researchers take care to represent women’s words and voice ethically, are mindful of the power differentials present, and work towards creating an egalitarian relationship throughout the research process.

Additionally, several assumptions based on empathetic interviewing were used throughout this study. This approach to an interview emphasizes that “the interview cannot be a neutral tool” (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p. 695). It also encourages an egalitarian relationship where “the interviewer becomes an advocate and partner in the study, hoping to be able to use the results to advocate [for] social policies” (p. 696).

Limitations of this study, related to a feminist qualitative research stance and an empathetic interviewing stance, include a blurred line between the participant and researcher and the lack of clear or definitive “conclusions” due to the multiplicity of meaning and knowledges inherent in the work. Another limitation of this study is the adaptation of phenomenological interviewing to include a feminist lens. For instance, the three interview series for phenomenological interviews, proposed by Seidman, (2006), was used as a guide, but was not followed out as three separate interviews with three separate topics: (a) focused life history, (b) the details of the experience, and (c)
reflection on the meaning. This was done to allow each woman’s story to naturally unfold, and Seidman, as noted in the following passage, the possibility of such adaptations:

As long as a structure is maintained that allows participants to reconstruct and reflect upon their experience within the context of their lives, alterations to the three interview structure and the duration and spacing of interviews can certainly be explored. (pp. 21-22)

The adaptation of the structured phenomenological interview for feminist methodological reasons is also supported by feminist researchers (Reinharz, 1992; Reinharz & Chase, 2002) as well. These authors advocate for “open-ended interviewing” that is “a more spontaneous exchange between interviewer and interviewee” due to social pressures for “even well-educated women…[to] self-censor or silence” (Reinharz & Chase, p. 225). Allowing each woman to not only find her own voice, but her own pacing, in a manner that may or may not be as linear or as structured as Seidman’s model, was conducted in an attempt to blend feminist and phenomenological interview methods.

Finally, limitations to this study include the researcher’s own bias as a white, educated, hetrosexual, able-bodied woman. As a person that deeply connects to feminist theory and the use of feminist pedagogy in music therapy education, I may not have the ability to objectively probe the phenomenon of FMTP in a way that an “outsider” could. Feminist researchers challenge the assumption that being close to a phenomenon, or being an “insider,” makes one better or worse as a researcher. Olsen (2005) argued that “the hidden assumption that insider knowledge is unified, stable, and unchanging and the view that insider/outsider positions are fixed and unchanging” (p. 249) show inherent
bias of the patriarchal culture. With Olsen’s warning in mind, being a feminist pedagogue neither promotes my entry into the secret world of FMTP nor does it assume that there is one single knowledge or group that are considered “insider.” My role, as a researcher, is to portray the experiences of music therapy educators that use FMTP with as much fidelity and trustworthiness as possible, regardless of my roles in the research process.

The Researcher

At the time of this study, I have taught undergraduate music therapy students since 2002 and have used FMTP to inform my teaching since 2004. I bring to the research process my own values and biases as a feminist music therapist, as explored in the previous section. As part of phenomenological inquiry, I have used personal journaling throughout the research process as well as bracketing to allow myself to be open and flexible throughout the research process. I acknowledge that my closeness to the subject could potentially bias the results. As such, member checking and peer review are essential components to this study.

The lens through which I view music therapy education has affected my desire to conduct this study as well as how I have conducted it. Several beliefs I have regarding this study should be taken into consideration. First, I believe that women have historically been oppressed and that this oppression continues today. I also feel that the university setting can, often unintentionally, perpetuate this oppression. Second, I believe that music therapy education has evolved to meet the growing demands of the profession, however, music therapy pedagogy has not been thoroughly studied. I feel that the lack of scholarly attention on pedagogy has impaired our ability to grow as a profession. Third, I believe that the classroom is a place for transformation and I advocate for social action for both
my students and myself. Fourth, I believe that teaching music therapy involves much individual difference, and therefore, music therapy pedagogy should be studied in a way that allows for multiple truths and meanings.

**Rationale and Significance**

The rationale for this study comes from my own yearning to identify pedagogical frameworks upon which music therapy education can be based. It is hoped that this study will contribute to the scholarly study of pedagogy in music therapy in the hope that the field of music therapy will begin to examine theory-based education and not just competency-based education. Also, it is anticipated that this study will contribute to the emerging field of FMTP and will encourage additional scholarship and exploration of feminism and music therapy. Finally, it is hoped that this study will encourage social change to the often hierarchical classroom setting in higher education, which may eventually support changes to academe itself, making it an equitable place for scholarship for women, men, and transgendered individuals as both teachers and learners.

**Definitions of Key Terminology**

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions will be used in this study:

*Banking System*—a traditional concept of pedagogy based on the idea that the teacher deposits information and that students, a blank slate, store information. Some theorists (Freire 1970/2000) argue that this is an oppressive form of education.

*Curriculum*—the content, subject, or ideas taught including not only academic concepts, but oftentimes a “hidden” curriculum.
**Feminist Music Therapy**—an approach to music therapy, which emphasizes

“attention to the diversity of women’s personal and social identities,…a

consciousness-raising approach,…an egalitarian relationship between

client and therapist,…[and] a woman-valuing and self-validating process”

(Worell & Remer, 2003, p. 23).

**Feminist Pedagogy**—teaching methods that include “remaining a

learner/participant, safeguarding the initial learning environment,

awareness of power, deprogramming students’ banking system of

education, emotions and experience as sources of knowledge, reflexivity,

community empowerment and leadership, making learning fun, advocacy,

[and] content” (Hadley, 2006, pp. 399-408).

**Hidden Curriculum**—“the norms and values that are implicitly, but effectively,

taught in schools that are not usually talked about in the teacher’s

statements of end or goals” (Apple, 1990, p. 84).

**Pedagogy**—“a theory of teaching” from which various teaching strategies may

be based (J. R. Davis, 1993, p. 87).

**Scholarship of Teaching**—a scholarly field, developed by Boyer (1990), that

researches teaching and pedagogy.

**Teaching**—“involv[ing] a teacher and a student interacting over a subject in a

setting” (J. R. Davis, p. 6).
Teaching Strategies—the instructional methods an educator uses to assist students in learning concepts. Teaching methods include, but are not limited to, lecturing, small group work, the use of technology, class discussion, and/or experiential learning.

Traditional Pedagogy—a theoretical approach to teaching and learning that uses the banking system.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The age-old problem of the education of teachers in the art and science of teaching impacts not only perceptions of higher education, but also the actual process of teaching and learning itself (Katz & Henry, 1993). A long time critique of American universities has been the lack of attention to training teachers in pedagogy, as can be seen in the following passage:

The danger from the blunders of inexperience, or want of knowledge, or both sometimes, might be provided against by the employment of disciplined principles and masters, wise supervision, and a leadership schooled in the problems of educations and the machinery of its institutions. But, while some little provision has been made to fit teachers for the elementary schools, almost nothing has been done, until recently, to prepare for instruction in secondary and collegiate institutions. (Boone, 1889/1999, p. 142)

These same issues regarding a lack of preparation of teachers in higher education exist in music therapy education as well.

In order to understand the history, current trends, and needs of pedagogy, it is important to begin with a definition of teaching. According to J. R. Davis (1993), “teaching involves a teacher and a student interacting over a subject in a setting” (p. 6). For the purposes of this paper, pedagogy will be defined as “a theory of teaching”, from which various teaching strategies may be based (p. 87).

Music therapy, as a newer field of study, is no stranger to the same problem faced by other field in higher education—a lack of training of its educators in pedagogy. The
quality of music therapy educator’s teaching affects the quality of a student’s learning, impacting his or her work as a clinician. A clinician’s skills, or lack thereof, has an impact on clients’ wellbeing and progress towards their therapeutic goals and objectives. The connection, therefore, between quality education and quality clinical practice creates a need for scholarly attention to the education of music therapy educators.


Looking beyond the changes in curricular content and/or pedagogical approaches in music therapy, it is important to note that higher education itself is changing (Boning, 2007; Noftsinger & Newbold, 2007). The landscape of theories and practices that once supported collegial studies are not necessarily applicable in today’s classrooms. An understanding of both the history of higher education and current trends in higher education would be valuable for assisting music therapy educators in adapting to new approaches to teaching and learning in academe.
Review of the Literature

Is formal education a right or privilege? Who determines who can access higher education and on what basis? Does higher education have a “hidden” curriculum (Boning, 2007; Bowen & Hobson, 1974)? A growing number of educators and scholars are asking these questions and advocating for changes in the higher education system (Freire, 1970/2000; hooks, 1994). To better understand the reasoning behind these questions, an examination of the history of higher education in western civilization is in order.

Western History of Higher Education

Imperialist, keep off
the trees I said.
No use: you walk backwards,
Admiring your own footprints
Atwood (1971a, p. 15)

Antiquity. Education has not always been institutionalized nor has the majority of the population been able to access higher education. The first known schools were from ancient Mesopotamia. During antiquity, tablet houses, “éduba” in Sumerian, were established to teach aspiring scribes how to record information onto tablets (Lucas, 1994, p. 5). These schools had multiple teachers and a curriculum that covered “a diverse array of subjects: accounting, geometry, musical notation, law and legal phraseology, grammar, poetry, history, courtly and priestly etiquette, and much else besides” (Lucas, 1994, p. 6).

In Ancient Egypt, there was also evidence of schools for scribes during the period of 2700-1800 B.C. Lucas (1994) reported that three books on scribal schools have been
discovered from this time: *Hymn to the Nile*, *Instruction of Amenemhet*, and *Instruction of Duaauf*. The first reference to full-time teachers occurred in Plato’s *Protagoras*, which was written during the fifth-century B.C. (Lucas). Plato (428-348/7 B.C.) developed the first theory of education. He philosophized that “*noumena*, or ideas, are more than mental constructions—they have real and timeless existence” (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 24). In order to understand these concepts, he proposed that the idea had to be understood at its essence as well as understood amongst the cosmos. Plato emphasized the interaction between people and their environment in learning. His philosophy of education was also based on the idea that people have knowledge within them and knowing is about becoming conscious of this internal knowledge (Bowen & Hobson).

Plato’s theory of education supposed that although people had knowledge within them, they did not yet understand it. His theory, then, advocated for the use of a dialectic approach to education, whereby the teacher would ask questions in an attempt to stimulate the student’s thinking, so the student could understand. While his theory of “pre-existent knowledge” as well as a person living in balance with nature and/or the cosmos appears inclusive of all persons, it should be noted that Plato’s theories were based on a class system. Plato believed that “true education should be given only to those who can benefit from it and should be primarily a responsibility of the sate” to determine who receives education (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 28). While lofty, Plato’s educational theory supported higher education only for the elite.

Aristotle (385/4-322 B.C.) was highly influenced by Plato’s theories and was believed to have studied with him. Compared to Plato’s noble ideas regarding education, Aristotle tended to be more pragmatic. Aristotle did not differentiate between the real, or
natural world, and that of an ideal world of the intellect. He argued “every object is composed of both matter and form and we have no need to posit another order of reality to explain the one we perceive directly in everyday experience” (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 84). This idea of understanding concepts in terms of lived experiences of the natural world is combined with his hypothesis that “intuitive reason” is also needed to reach understanding (Bowen & Hobson, p. 84). Given this differing viewpoint, Aristotle did not believe that knowledge is innate. Instead, he concluded that people are born as blank slates and knowledge is built upon through experiences. Therefore, Aristotle supposed, the role of the teacher is to provide knowledge for the student’s mind. His concept of the role of the teacher is still in practice today with the banking system of education, which will be described in detail later in this manuscript (Bowen & Hobson).

Plato and Aristotle had a significant impact on models of education. During the Hellenistic Era (300 B.C.-100 B. C.), the Greeks solidified educational practice with “enkyklios paideia, literally translated as ‘general education’” which included what is commonly known today as “the three Rs: reading, writing and reckoning” (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 120). The concept of general education versus specialized learning is still being debated in institutions of higher education (Boning, 2007), with the influence of the Greek philosophers being felt in modern practices of education.

In their wartime conquests, the Romans also disseminated the ideas of Plato and Aristotle regarding education, however they did not equally stress all aspects of general education. The collapse of the Roman Empire coincided with a diminishment in education from (5 A.D.-10 A.D.). The Dark Ages also included the spread of Christianity, which emphasized literacy for the reading of the Bible, and not necessarily
for scholarly endeavors. The Byzantium continued to use the formalized education from Plato and Aristotle, however, now with “a Christian emphasis” (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 121).

**Medieval.** The universities during the Middle Ages were quite different from the modern university. Before the printing press was invented, books were rare and expensive. This meant that most students did not have books and took notes instead of reading information. Additionally, libraries did not have many books and students had limited access to them, again, due to the prohibitive cost of books prior to the invention of the printing press. Many students, especially those from a lower socioeconomic status, were not allowed to use the books and the students who were permitted had to take an oath (Lucas, 1994).

Pedagogy during the Middle Ages consisted of oral lectures and having student recite information. The typical day for a student in a university would involve the students attending Mass around 4 a.m. and then attending lectures until 9 a.m. Then review lectures would be held in the afternoon until 5 p.m. Next, the student would engage in debates until dinner and work on reviewing and reciting the information learned that day before going to bed. Most of the lecturing occurred in dark rooms without candles or notes. The content of a lecture often centered around a “central question under consideration” such as “whether or not it is to be permitted that priests should read secular literature” (Lucas, 1994, p. 56). The instructor would discuss two main points of view for the debated question and finish by lecturing the students on his own conclusion for the problem. Repetition and debate were key instructional techniques
used for lectures during the Middle Ages (Lucas). After an oral lecture, the teacher would orally quiz his students on the content of the lecture (Brockliss, 1996).

Another difference between universities in the Middle Ages and the modern university was location. In the Middle Ages, most universities did not have dedicated buildings for its campus and classrooms. Universities during this time would rent space and move frequently, with different cities bidding on “hosting a university” (Lucas, 1994, p. 63). Sometimes, scholars themselves joined together, leaving their current university, and created new institutions of higher learning. It was commonplace, during this time, as well for universities to be closed for a number of years and then re-open. Around the 12th Century, pressure was put on university officials to create student housing to keep a “watchful eye” on their behavior (Lucas, p. 65).

The next surge of activity, in terms of formal education, occurred during the 10th-15th Centuries. Schools to teach monks and clergy emerged, with an emphasis on translation as well as “the classical tradition” in Europe (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 121). It was in Europe that the first universities were established. Important scholars during this time included Boccaccio, Petrarch, and Dante. The Renaissance saw not only the reconnection to the ancient teachings and theories in education, but also a deepening connection of academia to religious study and influence.

**Modern.** The universities that had survived began to flourish during post-medieval times, and newer humanistic schools emerged across Europe, as a result of the Renaissance period of the previous era. During the modern period, the ideas of the humanism slowly began to take hold within universities, but not without resistance.
Lucas (1994) summarized the reasons for the reluctance of the universities to incorporate humanism in the following passage:

the basic problem so far as institutions of higher learning were concerned…was they had long functioned almost exclusively as preparatory schools for scholastic clerics. It appeared to follow that universities would not easily be transformed into places where society’s future secular leaders might obtain a liberal education.

(p. 82)

As the universities of the medieval period were slow to change during the modern period, new colleges began to emerge during this time. Inns of Court were an alternative to the Latin-based curriculum of the traditional university in England during the 15th and 16th centuries. Since not all of English law was written in Latin, this could not be taught at a traditional university, so the Inns of Court provided instruction for students wishing to study law. It should be noted that the Inns of Court were expensive, and so, were only accessible to the wealthy and privileged class (Lucas, 1994). In terms of teaching, the 16th Century also saw the creation of permanent teaching positions, which paved the way to the position now referred to as professor. University teachers in Europe during the 16th century also did not have the pressures to publish, as the lecture was seen as an art form in-and-of itself at a higher level than publication (Vandermeersch, 1996).

The slowness of universities to change during this time should be understood within the context of the events happening in Europe during the Post-Medieval period. Wars were occurring throughout Europe—the Thirty Year War, the Huguenot war, and the Glorious Revolution—which did not create a climate conducive to broadening and changing ideology. Lucus (1994) reported “that institutions of higher learning continued
to function at all, much less expand, between the late sixteenth century and the end of the eighteenth century in the midst of such unrelenting turmoil appears somewhat remarkable” (p. 93).

In addition, universities during the modern period were slow to incorporate an emphasis on the sciences as a focus of study. Instead, universities at this time were still mainly focused on theology and did not wish to incorporate secular topics into their curriculum or courses of study. The first university to allow the study of the sciences was the University of Halle, in Germany, in 1694, having courses in both math and science. Göttingen and then Erlangen followed the University of Halle in their openness to secular inquiries. As a result of their slowness to change, many universities declined in their level of instruction and academic rigor during this period. In fact, some wealthy families used tutors instead of sending their sons to college (Lucas, 1994).

In the 18th Century, many universities had found more permanent locations for their buildings during this time period, but the funding to upkeep their buildings had decreased due to the frequent wars in Europe, so many of the buildings were in need of repair. Written and oral assessments of learning began being used during this time period, as opposed to the Medieval requirements of attending specific number of lectures/debates. Professors at this time “had long since ceased to attend to their academic duties on a regular basis” (Lucas, 1994, p. 96). Classes were not held regularly and examinations were not difficult. A more detailed account of the foundations of the American university during the Modern Period can be found in the section called “A History of Higher Education in the United States.”
**Post-modern.** Many changes to university organization and pedagogy occurred in the post-modern period. As this paper focuses on the teaching of music therapy within the United States, a more detailed account of important educational and pedagogical milestones during the Post-modern period will be discussed in the section “A History of Higher Education in the United States.”

Overall, higher education in ancient civilizations and in Europe was generally reserved for the affluent and for men. The church was still highly influential in shaping universities, in terms of the content of curriculum, the texts used, and the language used in classes. Professors were not expected to provide difficult lectures or examinations for their students or to publish their own research during this time. In terms of pedagogy and teaching methods, the lectures used in classes were not at all like the lectures used in modern universities—they included either reading from an ancient text or the presentation of a question, often posed by the church, in which the teacher would discuss the debate and tell the students their conclusion. Students were only involved in participating in oral debates and reciting information back to their teacher during these times.

Overall, the history of higher education in the West showed a limited ability for women, people of color, and people of a low socioeconomic status to access higher education. The universities were historically reserved for educating potential clergy and thus were resistant to secular changes to the curriculum or courses offered. This resistance was especially noted in the resistance of universities to change their course of studies towards a liberal arts curriculum as well as to open the course of study to areas such as mathematics and science. The universities of the West were not only influenced
by the church, however, they were also influenced by various philosophers’ ideas of education, knowledge, truth, and pedagogy.

**Western theorists in higher education.** In addition to Plato and Aristotle, discussed previously, Comenius (1592-1670) was an influential scholar in educational theory during the 17th Century. He developed a model of education for people from childhood through adulthood. He argued for the inclusion of classic theories combined with the teaching of Christianity. His ideas were embraced by many Catholic and Protestant universities in Europe during this time.

Another major theorist was Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). Rousseau questioned many of the educational practices of academe as well as social constructs. Rousseau argued for equality for men and asserted that the government should represent the will of the people. His theories are credited with being pivotal for the people’s rebellion during the French Revolution. He is one of the first authors credited with disputing Plato’s and Aristotle’s emphasis on curriculum and instead arguing for a student-centered model of education. Rousseau’s radical viewpoint that education should be aimed at teaching the person impacted not only educational reform, but also governmental policy. He supported both a “national system of education” (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 129) as well as “education in the context of political reform” (Bowen & Hobson, p. 130), which has been criticized for being contradictory. He also emphasized the usefulness of lived experience in learning and downplaying the idea of the banking system of education that emerged with Aristotle, which is still an active debate in education (Bowen & Hobson).
In Germany, an intellectual revival was emerging from the University of Berlin. Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) was a teacher there who reintroduced the theories of Plato to the academic world. His philosophy was a metaphysical argument for the priority of pure Being (rather akin to Plato’s Idea of the Good) over physical existence, but with the added notion that this Being is not static but is itself developing by a dialectical process to ever higher stages. (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 165)

Hegel’s philosophy captured the idealism of Plato with the social awareness of government of Rousseau (Bowen & Hobson). There was also emerging interest in education occurring in the United States, as seen in the work of John Dewey.

An important educational philosopher from the United States was John Dewey (1859-1952). His studies at Johns Hopkins University have been noted as influential in his theories regarding American education, as this was the focus at Johns Hopkins. Dewey also studied the theories of Hegel, which he based his teaching on this early in his career, and later rejected Hegel’s theories (Bowen & Hobson, 1974) due to his philosophy of education that centered his ideas that education should be practical and based on the “real-world” (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 207). During Dewey’s lifetime, there was another resurgence in classical thought as well as new and provocative theories of education, science, and psychology. Darwin’s theory of evolution was transforming society’s viewpoints, the emergence of psychology was influencing thought, and philosophy was growing and changing. One philosopher in particular, was influential in Dewey’s development of his educational theories—Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914). Peirce focused on the act, instead of the mind or the psyche, seeing action as the basis for
knowledge. Pragmatism, as a result of Peirce’s theories, became popular in new theories of academe (Bowen & Hobson, 1974).

As a reaction against the classical practice of education at the time, Dewey created a new theory of education. The problem with education in the early 20th Century, Dewey reasoned

was its [education’s] total meaninglessness: it was the training of slaves. The aims of virtue and moral character were imposed from above and built out of a dubious, possibility empty metaphysics; the curriculum was an overwhelming corpus of information, and a corpus in the worst possible sense: totally lifeless.

(Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 168)

According to Bowen and Hobson, Dewey reasoned that American education should have values similar to democracy, and not of a dictatorship.

Dewey’s publication, *Democracy and Education* (1916/2004), was a pivotal moment in educational reform in the United States. In this book, Dewey argued against the traditional, authoritative model of education that uses the banking system of education, and for enabling students to question, think critically, take action, and use experiential learning. He also argued against the indoctrination of “predetermined viewpoints” and for the opportunities for students to utilize their natural curiosity to gain knowledge with curricular flexibility and experiential education (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 169). The memorization of materials, according to Dewey, was not an ideal pedagogical technique.

Action, or experiential learning, is a foundational element of Dewey’s theories, which clearly show the influence of Dewey’s study of Peirce’s theories on action. He also
theorized that “education should be consonant with society…education should be itself a
democratic process of conjoint activity, guided by the highest form of solving problems
yet devised: the scientific method” (Bowen & Hobson, 1974, p. 170). Dewey also saw the
role of the teacher as both a teacher and a learner, acknowledging the teacher’s years of
knowledge and experience as well. He also advocated for equality in education,
emphasizing the link between democracy and education (Bowen & Hobson).

Paulo Freire (1921-1997) was a Brazilian educator and theorist of pedagogy that
made an important mark on the practice of teaching. Similar to Rousseau and Dewey,
Freire advocated for students’ active involvement in learning, and discredited the banking
system, or traditional forms of education. The banking system “assumes that the teacher
has all the knowledge and the students have little or none, that the teacher must give and
the students must take, that the teacher sets all the standards and the students must
measure up” (Palmer, 2007, p. 118). An important book he wrote in support of his theory
to move towards a dialectic approach to education, to promote liberation, was Pedagogy

Carl Rogers (1902-1987) was an American psychologist that created person-
centered therapy (Raskin & Rogers, 1989). His person-centered philosophy was also
applied to education and pedagogy in his book Freedom to Learn (1969) where he
advocated for “significant, meaningful experiential learning” (p. 4). Of particular interest
to this study is Rogers’ examination of how to create freedom in a college classroom that
simultaneously has a significant amount of limits placed upon both the students and the
teacher from outside the classroom (Rogers, 1977, 1980). Rogers’ approach to education
highlights the importance of the relationship between the teacher and the students as well
as the responsibility for both the teacher and the students to be engaged. This pedagogical approach also stresses “choice and initiative” for all participants (Rogers, p. 52). Some of the methods Rogers discussed as possible ways to create more freedom within the learning environment included: (a) the use of contracts, for teachers to be “facilitators of learning” (p 134), (b) the use experiential learning opportunities especially for the sciences, (c) the use of in-class simulations, (d) using encounter groups, and (e) using self-evaluations for assess student learning. It is important to note the methods that Rogers did not consider to be part of his pedagogical approach. These included:

When the leader concentrates on creating a facilitative climate there are a number of traditional methods which he does not use and perhaps a very brief mention of these would be useful. He does not set lesson tasks. He does not assign readings. He does not lecture or expound (unless requested to). He does not evaluate and criticize unless a student wishes his judgment on a product. He does not give required examinations. He does not take sole responsibility for grades. (p. 144)

Another male theorist in education was Howard Gardner (b. 1943). Gardner is a cognitive psychologist at Harvard University and the developer of the theory of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1999; Gardner, 2006). He defined intelligence as “a biopsychosocial potential to process specific forms of information in certain kinds of ways” (Gardner, 2006, p. 29) and considered the following to be forms of human intelligence: (a) linguistic, (b) logical-mathematical, (c) musical, (d) bodily-kinesthetic, (e) spatial, (f) interpersonal, (g) intrapersonal, (h) naturalist, and (i) existential (Gardner 1999; 2006). The idea that there are diverse ways of learning lead to shifts in pedagogy for many educators. Gardner warned that there is “no royal road” to learning and
advocated for the use of various teaching methods to engage the minds of students with multiple intelligences (2006, p. 141).

Parker Palmer (b. 1939) is another American educational theorist that has been highly influential in the field of higher education. He argued against a student-centered model or a teacher-centered model, and towards a subject-centered model of education. Part of Palmer’s philosophy of education is that the teacher must be passionate for the subject they are teaching about. “Good teachers,” according to Palmer (2007), “do more than deliver the news from that community [of knowledge] to their students. Good teachers replicate the process of knowledge by engaging students in the dynamics of the community of truth” (p. 117). Parker’s contributions to educational theory has been the addition of spirituality in education—different from the historic influence of the church.

Overall, male theorists in education and pedagogy helped develop and reform curriculum and pedagogy used in both primary and secondary education. The reverberations of their ideas can still be felt in university classrooms in the United States. Some theorists also began to see the implications of pedagogical change with social change and the implications this had for higher education. A critique of many male theorists’ is their failure to include women in their theories and/or to discuss the oppression that women, both teachers and students, experience in higher education (Crabtree, Sapp, & Licona, 2009; Minnich, 2005).

History of higher education in the United States.

At this University many folks begin a sentence with “As I have said.”

If they can’t find an author,
They quote themselves.

All believe in equal rights,

but the best thing to do

is to get a business of your own,

if it’s nothing but a peanut stand.

One professor never speaks faster

than 33 1/3 revolutions per minute

even when he knocks

the defecation out of you.

The school spends a lot of money

to bring the best brains here:

Superintendent, Chancellor, Provost,

but Professors cost the most.

You have no idea how many professors

it takes to weigh a pound.

I don’t know what the chancellor chancels

and no one knows what the provost does.

They work “continuum” to death.

I think it’s a relative sort of thing.

It all adds up to play a hymn

and steal another dollar.
Let’s forget that cup of coffee
and cry on a hot line to heaven
split three ways from Sunday.

But that’s the way it is around here.

The chancellor chancels.

The professors profess, and
dragonflies are jet propelled by farts.

Tobin (2000, p. 28)

Colleges and universities in the United States were modeled after European universities (Boyer & Larson, 2005). Harvard, founded in 1636, was one of the first universities in the United States, and was composed of affluent men (Boyer & Larson, 2005; Thelin, 2004). In the early years of Harvard, male students studied classically-based curriculums that were highly influenced by the church (Boyer & Larson). The early universities in the United States were similar to the universities in Europe, as they were still highly influenced by the church:

Since the Church had saved all that could be saved of learning from the wreck of the Roman Empire, she naturally took charge of education in the middle ages; universities grew up under her patronage; all masters and scholars were clerici, potential priests. Moreover, the Church fostered the universities in order to provide herself with a learned clergy, and to reconcile philosophy with theology.

(Morison, 1935/1995, p. 7)

Morison reported that when Harvard was founded it could almost have been considered a “divinity school,” as the ties to the European tradition were still quite strong (p. 7). The
ties between the church and Harvard were so close that Boone (1889/1999) reported that students had to be able to read and translate the Bible into Latin to receive their first degree.

Some of the oldest surviving universities include Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Rutgers, and William and Mary (Thelin, 2004). Many broad sweeping changes have occurred both within and around the institutions of higher learning in the United States. The top three elite schools in the United States—Harvard, Princeton, and Yale—were known in the early 20th Century as “America’s most prominent colleges…[and were] widely viewed as training grounds for the nations leaders” (Karabel, 2005, p. 18). While these schools were considered to be prestigious, the students who attended the top three universities were not well known for the scholastic achievement. Karabel documented that both student grades, curricular content, and the admissions process were highly influenced by the protestant elite during this time. One such outcome of their influence was the concept of a “gentleman’s C” whereby a man’s socioeconomic status could allow them to pass a course even if their attendance and/or academic success did not warrant a passing grade (Karabel, p. 17).

_Precolonial and Colonial times._ The foundations of the modern American University have its roots in the European colonization of what is currently called the United States (Lucas, 1994). This is not to suggest that the colonists brought education to the Native Americans that lived there. On the contrary, education, based on skill development, spirituality, and culture were provided to both boys and girls in the Native American societies that were present. Most European settlers, however, viewed Native Americans as “savages” that were “lacking in the skills and sensibilities of ‘civilized’
people” (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 7). Instead of learning from Native Americans, the European settlers “assumed the role of master” with colonization (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 12).

While universities were not established initially in the colonies, the European settlers brought with them the traditions of the established educational model from Europe. Education in the colonial time, before universities, included beginnings of public education and eventually the university system that is used in the United States. These European thoughts were blended with the beginning ideals of the New World such as “individualism” and “a place in which free people could pursue their own individual happiness in safety and with a fair prospect of success” (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 15).

The historic universities that were founded during colonial times that have survived—Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton, Rutgers, and William and Mary—have been said to carry the spirit of America within them, as many of the classrooms were used during the Revolutionary War for meetings and discussions of the revolutionists (Thelin, 2004). Many colleges that were established during this time failed and there was little support for the establishment of such schools by England, so affluent families often sent their sons back to Europe for their higher education (Urban & Wagoner, 1996). The colonial-era universities that did flourish brought with them not only their ties to the classically-based European models of education (Boone, 1889/1999), but a sense these universities of prestige and history have sometimes been referred to as “The Ivy League” or “The Ancient Eight” (Thelin, p. 6). These universities began with a student-centered approach to teaching.
Pedagogy and teaching strategies in the colonial universities included the use of oral debates and speeches in which both the teacher and fellow students critiqued the student. Some of the students’ speeches had to be given in Latin, again showing a link to Europe and the church. Students during this time studied Latin, the Bible, and math. Some specialization courses were offered, such as law or medicine, but they were not part of the core curriculum offered. Textbooks were difficult to obtain, so most students learned through oral accounts and “daily recitation” (Thelin, 2004, p. 129). Interestingly, during this time, graduating from college was not a priority—being accepted to a university and attending classes was important. Students during this time protested universality policies regarding “matters ranging from bad food in the dining commons to restrictions on student activities and autonomy” (Thelin, p. 21).

1776-1785. Both the Revolutionary War and the Age of Enlightenment had significant impacts on education in the United States in both primary and secondary settings. In Europe and the United States, a resurgence of attention to the sciences, mathematics, medicine, reason, and logic occurred during this time period (Urban & Wagoner, 1996). Thomas Jefferson drafted an important bill for public education during this time that was called the “Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge” (1779) in which “all the free children, male and female, would be admitted without charge” (Urban & Wagoner, p. 72). This bill created both primary and secondary schools. While the United States was developing as a new country, and so its higher education system, Urban and Wagoner (1996) noted the exclusion of women (“outsiders”) as well as Native Americans and African Americans (“outcasts”) in receiving formal education in the United States, even with the public education bill (p. 87).
**1785-1860.** The “new national period” (1785-1860) saw many changes to universities in the United States (Thelin, 2004, p. 41). By 1860, 241 universities existed, and have survived, in the United States. The political climate in the United States was that of wariness towards the government and friction between the North and the South. This created an environment of minimal regulations on universities. Nostalgia based on each institution’s anniversaries was also prevalent.

During this time, a new type of university was created in the United States—the “diploma mill” (Thelin, 2004, p. 56). In some ways, the scholarly standards of the European universities had slowly degenerated to a point where degrees were issued in return for financial contributions. In fact, Yale “conferred upon one generous benefactor the honorary degree of M.D. This did not mean that Yale had yet established a medical college. Rather, the M.D. stood for ‘Multum donivat’—‘He gave much’” (Thelin, p. 58).

While some aspects of American universities during the period of 1785-1860 were deteriorating, other areas were growing. One such area was the development of new areas of study such as the sciences, engineering, and agriculture. Congress also created two military academies—West Point (1802) and the Naval Academy (1845). These more specialized institutions were unique to the American universities, however religiously-based universities and studies were still in use. Curricular changes and amendments were still highly influenced by donors and student enrollment (Boning, 2007; Thelin, 2004). For instance,

in 1827, Amherst instituted a ‘scientific’ program for students who did not wish to enter law, medicine or ministry. It failed after only two years, in part, because it
was so radically different from the traditional curriculum it was unable to attract enough students. (Boning, p. 2)

During the 19th and 20th Centuries, universities “shifted to providing individuals with the practical and economic skills necessary to build a developing nation in the midst of the industrial revolution” (Boyer & Larson, 2005, p. 164).

It was also during this time period that “feminization of teaching” occurred due to a variety of factors (Hoffman, 1981; Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 108). These included the social construct that women are “innately nurturing,” economic conditions present that did not monetarily compensate women equally for their work, and due to the fact that men were promoted to managerial positions within the education system while women taught classes (Urban & Wagoner).

1860-1890. The next period of growth and change for universities in the United States was from 1860-1890. Two major events occurred during this time period—The Civil War (1861-1865) and the Morrill Act (1862) (Urban & Wagoner, 1996). The Civil War impacted universities in a variety of ways. Many students and faculty left the universities to join the Confederacy or Union armies. Additionally, the universities themselves were often damaged from battles or shut down to be used as shelters or hospitals for the wounded. The Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862 was “an Act Donating public lands to the several States and [Territories] which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the Mechanic arts” (U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, 1862, para. 1). This act increased access to higher education to “women, African Americans, the working class, and immigrants” (Boning, 2007, p. 4). This act has been described as a hallmark of American democracy (Thelin, 2004). These two events
created a dramatic shift from classically based education to a practical or “useful education” for students from many backgrounds and not just a training ground for potential clergy (Thelin, p. 81).

Several new universities were established during this time, including Cornell University (1868) and Harvard (1869). The first graduate degree program was also established in 1876 at the Johns Hopkins University (Urban & Wagoner, 1996). The universities during the 1860s-1890s did not yet fully embrace the German model of hierarchy in faculty ranking and original research (Thelin, 2004), however some universities with doctoral programs were beginning to incorporate these ideas (Boyer & Larson, 2005). The Morrill Act did crystallize some concepts we new now hold today, such as the distinctions between bachelor’s degrees and certificates. It also allowed for diversity in subject area of the faculty hired, especially concerning the sciences, psychology, history, and business (Thelin). Another important event occurring during this time period was the beginning of Charles Eliot’s tenure as president of Harvard in 1869. Eliot supported the use of electives at Harvard, and other universities soon followed. The incorporation of the elective system marked a “shift from preparing future leaders to the advancement of knowledge…specialization dominated…the number of prescribed courses shrunk…as interest in general education faded” (Boning, 2007, p. 5). This change to include electives, and the teaching of these courses, marked a shift for faculty away from teaching and towards research (Boning, 2007).

1880-1910. The period from 1880-1910 showed further evidence of the move of American universities towards the elective system. This shift became problematic, however, due to lack of regulation both within institutions or between institutions
(Boning, 2007). Once credited with transforming higher education for the better, Eliot was now being “blamed for the problems of incoherent undergraduate curricula” (Boning, p. 6). Along with the classics, religion was also being left behind in many universities in pursuit of science (Thelin, 2004). This time period also showcased university presidents as “entrepreneurs…. [and] giants” responsible for securing political and financial alliances (Thelin, pp. 125-126). Professors were elevated to the status of “experts in a field” (Thelin, p. 127). This shift in the prestige of the university also coincided with the emergence of new pedagogical and instructional techniques of the lecture and the seminar. The first of three periods of reform in the 20th Century occurred in 1910 (Boning) arguing for “coherence and efficiency” in undergraduate curriculum (Thelin, p. 146). It has been theorized “that by 1910 the American university had hardened into set forms” (Thelin, p. 151), with a balance of required and elective coursework and the emergence of faculty specialization and research. No longer was teaching considered to be of greater value than publication, as before.

1890-1920. The Age of the University in the United States occurred from 1890-1920. Loyalty to universities amongst students took hold. Students also began to cultivate an extracurricular lifestyle as well as alumni pride. While the doors had been opened by the Morrill Act for a more diverse student body, “the ‘collegiate ideal’ was that it was almost wholly restricted to white males” (Thelin, 2004, p. 169). In terms of curriculum, universities during this time still lacked academic rigor. Admissions departments had problems of their own during this time. During the period preceding WWI, Harvard and Yale discussed the supposed “Jewish problem” at their universities, as growing anti-Semitism spread throughout the country and university system (Thelin, p. 197). Similar
to the Civil War, WWI caused a disruption in universities, with students enlisting in the service. Many campuses changed their focus to being “training campuses” for the armed services (Thelin, p. 200).

1920-1945. The time between WWI and WWII, 1920-1945, heralded growth for universities in the United States. Resurgence in collegial pride was marked with new construction of buildings on college campuses, often as memorial to soldiers from WWI and WWII. However, the “college man” of the early American universities had been replaced with “fraternity gatherings…alcohol…gambling…and…other stereotyped activities that characterized the roaring twenties” (Thelin, 2004, p. 211). The delivery of information, during this time period, changed from print media to use of the radio, connecting life in the institutions with the public a more immediate way. Such instant access to the universities also brought critique of the academy’s practices, such as Robert Maynard Hutchins’ call for a “New College” that promoted knowledge over athletics and extracurricular activities to be the focus of universities (Thelin, p. 235). Harvard’s new president, Abbott Lawrence Lowell also called for similar reforms (Boning, 2007; Thelin). Reform of universities on a system-wide basis was discussed, as the need for curricular unity was becoming more and more apparent (Boning). Finally, during the 1920s, the emergence of another American approach to higher education—the community college—took hold (Thelin).

Faculty, during the 1920s-1945, had a “tendency to ignore the world of scholarship” and instead to focus on new and emerging topics (Thelin, 2004, p. 256). Respect for faculty varied by institutions, with the university presidents holding most of the power. An important feat in mediating between the faculty’s needs and the president
was the development of the department chair during this time. A major turning point, in terms of scholarly focus and recognition of faculty members, was professors’ adaptations of their scholarly work for the war effort. Notoriety, especially in the sciences, was a result of a push from within the academy to “win-the-war” (Thelin, p. 257). This author wonders whether the link between the war effort and publication might have been the origins of the phrase “publish or perish.”

1945-1970. The next era for academe was between 1945-1970. This time period is often referred to as the “Gold Age” (Thelin, 2004, p. 260). As a result of the end of WWII, and the GI Bill, more students were able to access higher education than at any time before in America’s history (Thelin). A report in 1945, General Education in a Free Society emphasized the need for both general and specialized components in undergraduate education. This report sought to “protect American democracy from totalitarian systems of government like those that led to World War II” (Boning, 2007, p. 8). The following year, Harry Truman created the Commission on Higher Education. This commission looked into extending the GI Bill. Thelin (2004) contended that this commission was significant due to “the rationale that higher education was integral to the national interest” (p. 268). This report was controversial in its recommendations for desegregation and federally-funded universities, and was ultimately unable to create major shifts in the system of higher education at the time. The federal government was, however, investing in scientific research within universities (Thelin).

Reverberations of McCarthyism and the Cold War took hold on college campuses beginning in the 1950s. Many professors, especially in the sciences, were accused of being anti-American and/or to have communist sympathies. The link between federal
grant funding of research at universities and a faculty member’s political affiliations were the topic of congressional hearings. This brought the concept of academic freedom to a head. Ellen Shrecker’s report, *No Ivory Tower*, exposed the trend of university presidents requiring faculty members to take loyalty oaths. Some faculty members were fired, during this time, for failure to sign this oath (Thelin, 2004).

During the 1960s, a divide between universities was becoming more and more apparent—those who received large federal grants, primarily for the sciences, and those that did not. The universities’ movement toward external funding for operating costs changed the internal climates of the academy. A further chasm occurred between faculty who secured external funding for research and those that focused primarily on teaching. Eventually, the “concentration of research power in a relatively small circle of elite universities” further solidified the divisions between universities (Thelin, 2004, p. 279).

The period form 1945-1970 also contained a “Ph.D. shortage” where the expansion and growth of new programs in universities occurred a much faster pace than there were qualified faculty members to fill the positions (Thelin, 2004, p. 280). In addition to there being a limited number of qualified, incoming faculty members, current faculty members were requesting reductions in teaching loads due to the increased pressure to conduct research and other scholarly activities. In answer to this mounting pressure, many universities created “T.A.” positions, or teaching assistants (Thelin, p. 282).

Other American adaptations of higher education from 1945-1970 included the creation of many different forms of institutions for higher learning. Small liberal arts colleges were emerging that provided a small faculty-to-student ratio. Also, students
began to organize on college campuses, running programs such as the university newspapers or student unions. Students also protested for not only civil rights and peace, during this time, but also for improved conditions for students, especially undergraduate students, on-campus (Thelin, 2004). Two incidences, *Dixon v. Alabama* (1961) and *Higher Education Act of 1965* (The Harvard Law Review, 1962), brought changes for the student body, such as increased due process for students, flexibility in general education requirements, and increased diversity (Boning, 2007).

Faculty members, from 1945-1970, enjoyed increases in salaries during this time period, due to the shortage of faculty members in general, their scholarly research and specialized knowledge, and their ability to secure external funding. It was also during this time that promotion and tenure took hold as well as the formation of faculty unions in some universities (Thelin, 2004).

**1970-2000s.** Finally, the period from 1970 to 2000 was a time of “relaxation of central authority…[and] weakened institutional control” (Boning, 2007, p. 10). Budget crises were beginning to take their collective toll on campuses across the nation. Studies during this time concluded “that higher education was on the brink of a ‘new depression’” (Thelin, 2004, p. 318). The Newman Report (1971) brought further bad news, charging that higher education required significant reform. Diversity, or lack thereof, was a major concern during this time (Thelin). The Federal government stepped in, with its provision of financial aid for students through the Basic Educational Opportunities Grants (BEOG), which eventually became known as Pell Grants. The Pell Grant was designed to assist students from lower socioeconomic household to have increased access to higher education (Thelin, 2004).
Faculty members were experiencing difficulties during this time as well. The “Ph.D. Shortage” had dried up, and there were fewer tenure-track positions available for a large pool of Ph.D.s. The glut of applicants for a few prized positions also meant that faculty members had limited leveraging power, and “the balance of governance power shifted away from the faculty back to the administration” (Thelin, 2004, p. 332).

The curriculum also underwent changes from the 1970s-2000s. Frictions in liberal arts departments erupted over approaches, definitions, and general ideology of each major and course offered. The emergence of these “ideological debates with the liberal arts signaled the flourishing of new perspectives and multidisciplinary approaches in such thematic areas as women’s studies, African-American studies, and Hispanic studies” (Thelin, 2004, p. 352). Departments became divided amongst camps of liberal or conservative interpretations of curricular content. These debates led the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to urge universities to further examine curricular decisions for undergraduate students.

The universities at the end of the 20th Century had changed dramatically from the universities that existed during Colonial times. Colleges from 1970-2000 were often the central focus of communities—some cities were even called “college towns” (Thelin, 2004, p. 358). Beginning in the 1980s, partnerships between universities, the government, and private industry were being fostered as sites for the advancement in technology and research. Thelin (2004) cited such examples of these partnerships as “Silicon Valley” and the “Research Triangle” (p. 341). The latter part of the 20th Century also saw a call for the reform on doctoral enrollments that advocated for more women and minorities to enter.
into fields such as mathematics and sciences. Additional strides for women during this time included Title IX (Thelin).

**Segregation and gender bias.** The three elite universities were also well known for their reluctance to admit women and minority students to their campuses. It was not until 1969 that Yale and Princeton admitted women. Both Yale and Princeton admitted women fully into their universities far earlier than Harvard did. Harvard’s sister school, Radcliffe, which opened in 1879, admitted women. In 1942 Radcliffe students were allowed to attend classes at Harvard and in 1963 they were finally awarded Harvard degrees. In 1970, the Peterson Report argued that Harvard had an admissions dilemma regarding the unbiased admissions of male and female students due to the problems that would occur of raising the number of people admitted to Harvard. With a new president, Derek Bok, in 1971, Harvard began to change their policies on gender equalities regarding admission. Bok changed the ration of women-to-men at Harvard from “the traditional 4-1 ratio of men to women to 2.5 men for every woman” for the incoming class of 1972 (Karabel, 2005, p. 442). A pivotal article in Harvard’s student paper, the *Crimson*, arguing for a 50-50 split for male and female students, but instead the administration argued for a gender neutral admissions policy. Karabel asserted that Harvard’s gender neutral policy actually allowed Harvard to maintain their status quo of 75% of the student body being men. On July 1, 1975 Harvard and Radcliffe merged and the following year the admissions office at Harvard was “sex blind” (Karabel, p. 445).

Minority students for the top three schools in the United States noted similar admissions difficulties. During the 1960s, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale did not amend their admissions policies to reduce discrimination and bias, even admits the social change
occurring during the Civil Rights movement. Karabel (2005) reported that “blacks were barely visible on campus, constituting just 15 of the more than 3,000 students who entered Harvard, Yale, or Princeton in 1960” (p. 379). In the passing ten years, “over 280 African Americans were part of the freshman class—83 at Yale, 103 at Princeton, and 98 at Harvard” (Karabel, p. 379). The top three schools were not the only ones who were reluctant to admit minority students. Thelin (2004) wrote:

the desegregation efforts of state legislatures and state universities during the 1960s were largely a matter of halfhearted, token compliance….changes in admission policies at these institutions did not necessarily mean that black students were accepted in campus life, for segregation and exclusion often continued in dormitories, dining halls, and classroom seating arrangements. (p. 304)

A more detailed discussion of women’s education will be discussed in the next section of this manuscript.

In summary, the universities in the United States were highly influenced not only by European thought and philosophy of higher education, as America was once a colony of Great Britain, but also with the changing times and events of history. Ties between historical concepts of education and pedagogy, and the practice of pedagogy in the United States, can be seen in the historical use of the banking system, and then a slow shift towards more experiential and active methods of teaching, as new theories emerged.

Similar to the universities in Europe, wartime was especially hard on institutions of higher education. As the United States grew as a country itself, so did their ideas for higher education. Concepts such a ranking system for professors, tenure, promotion,
academic freedom, research and publication requirements, and the expansion of the
lecture beyond reading ancient texts were developments that occurred primarily within
the past 100 years. (It should be noted that other countries also developed similar
changes, however the focus of this paper is on higher education within the United States.)
American universities, until more recent times, carried on the tradition of only admitting
elite men, which did not allow women and persons of color an equal opportunity for
education. The implications of this will be discussed in the following section.

Herstory of Higher Education

Because we have no history
I construct one for you

making use of what
there is, parts of other people’s
lives, paragraphs
I invent, now and then
an object, a watch, a picture
you claim as yours

(What did go on in that red
brick building with the
fire escape? Which river?)
(You said you took
the boat, you forget too much.)

I locate you on streets, in cities
I've never seen, you walk
against a background crowded
with lifelike detail

which crumbles and turns grey
when I look too closely.

Why should I need
to explain you, perhaps
this is the right place for you

The mountains in this hard
clear vacancy are blue tin
edges, you appear
without prelude midway between
my eyes and the nearest trees,
your colours bright, your
outline flattened
suspended in the air with no more
reason for occurring
exactly here than this billboard,
this highway or that cloud.
(Atwood, 1971b, pp. 26-27)

It is difficult to document the history of educating women, as it covers many
topics. The history of women’s studies and feminism intertwine with a broader category
of the history of women. It also involves a reevaluation of what education means, formal
or informal, and an examination of potential biases in the recording of such a history.
This section will explore women’s experiences in higher education, making use of the
limited documents and recourses that exist on the subject, as compared to the history of
the education of men.

Examining traditional theories through the lens of feminism occurs in multiple
ways—reframing or renaming of male theories, critique of male theories, or the creation
of new feminist theories. This section will begin with an examination of attitudes towards
the education of women and will be followed by analysis of male theories from a feminist
perspective.

**Attitudes towards educated women.** Historically, “male attitudes toward the
schooling of women have historically been negative” (McClelland, 1992, p. 11). It is
important to address this fact in a straightforward manner at this point of the manuscript.
McClelland collected writings about women and education, and noted the language used
in the description of women. Women have been identified as “evil” (Pythagoras),
“inferior” (Socrates and Aristotle), and “unsuitable” for learning (Erasmus) (pp. 11-12).
Additionally, McClelland noted men’s reluctance to provide formal education for woman as a means to preserve traditional gender roles. McClelland stressed, however, that not all men felt this way and notes that many men advocated for women’s right to education. She stated that “Plato…set forth the notion that sex was a difference that made no difference in education” (p. 12).

Even when education was provided to women, it was usually done so in a segregated fashion. Many women received sub-standard education in these types of schools, as compared to their male counterparts. An example of this is the education women in Greece received. They were taught to read, however only men were taught to write (McClelland, 1992). In the Middle Ages, women who studied the sciences or medicine were burned at the stake, scorned, or given no credit for their work (“their work was attributed to fathers, brothers, or husbands”) (McClelland, p. 14). Such practices “created and recreated a separation between the sexes based on social roles and eventuated in a status hierarchy which placed and maintained women in a subordinated position” (McClelland, p. 14).

Examining the history of women’s education, then, does not follow major paradigms or events. McClelland (1992) described why women’s education has not progressed in a manner equal to that of men: “one result of this exclusion [from education] is that many of the major historical events which are often cited as improving the cultural and educational prospects for all people have, in fact, had correspondingly limiting consequences for women” (p. 14). Additionally, socioeconomic differences made access to higher education for wealthy women an easier endeavor that that of poor
Women. The privileged women who were able to access higher education were often limited to learning information related to the home.

**Women’s access to education: An overview.** In the Middle Ages, some privileged women, such as “Adalperga, daughter of the last Lombard monarch, Desiderius, in the eighth century…Irmintrude, spouse of Charles the Bald…and Adela, daughter of William the Conqueror” (Lucus, 1994, p. 39), were able to access higher education in greater numbers than their Greek and Roman counterparts. The few women during this time period that were permitted to receive some education were considered to be nobility (Lucus). The reasoning, at the time, was “that such an education would produce ‘better’ women who could more easily satisfy the requirements of marriage to successful and well-educated husbands” (McClelland, 1992, p. 18). These “learned women” had to endure social consequences for the pursuit of higher education and many women did not complete their studies, in part, due to such pressure. Some women, according to McClelland, “disguised themselves as men in order to obtain university educations” (p. 19).

Women’s lack of equal access to education during the Middle Ages was due to a variety of factors. Lucas (1994) stated that “[women’s] marginality, so to speak, stemmed from a number of social, economic, and cultural factors, foremost among them perhaps the fundamental misogyny of the early Church fathers themselves” (p. 40). Those women who were granted access to some education were not allowed to pursue a profession or attend universities. Other reason Lucas cited for why women were prevented from receiving formal education was the cultural construct that women’s purpose, at this time, was for procreation and not for education. Finally, women were excluded from attending
schools due to the belief “that a female student’s chastity would be at risk from a male teacher” as well as the sexual content of some of the art that was studied during this time period (Lucas).

A surprising comrade in helping women access higher education was the church. “From the 8th to 12th centuries, religious schools produced nearly all the powerful women who were an integral part of the social, political, and intellectual life of the period in Europe” (McClelland, 1992, p. 20). The church believed that women were well-suited in disseminating religious teachings and created convent schools to teach girls. Unfortunately, convent schools declined in the 12th century, as universities took hold, “and with that decline the availability of formal education for girls was nearly lost” (McClelland, p. 21).

The church was not the only way women were educated. Documentation exists of women’s quest to educate themselves. In ancient Greece, Sappho and Aspasia created schools for girls (McClelland, 1992). Later, in the Middle Ages, abbeys served as schools for women and girls. During the 12th and 13th Centuries, “the beguines lived in semi-monastic communities…they did not take the vows of nuns but maintained ties of service to urban communities” (McClelland, p. 23). It was in these communities that many women received an education. Salons, during the 18th century, were other means of community-based education for women. McClelland referred to the use of a salon for education as an “informal university” (p. 23). She reported that “the French salon…served as a kind of apprenticeship training for younger women” (p. 23). The use of communities of women who educated each other were monumental in their efforts to pursue higher education and “an effective stimulus to women’s rebellion against
misogyny that has fueled demands for still further education for women” (McClelland, p. 24).

The education of women in the United States. Although the new world was founded as a means for religious freedom, the early colonial settlers in North America brought with them the same ideas related to the education of women that they had learned in Europe (McClelland, 1992). Religion, again, played a role in the education of women:

One example of the mediation of religion on negative attitudes toward the education of girls can be found in the religious ethos of Puritan settlers in New England. Included in that ethos was a strong belief in salvation through knowledge of and adherence to Biblical scripture. In order to ensure salvation for all its children, the Massachusetts Bay theocracy placed an emphasis on the ability to read. Thus, although education for the role of wife, mother, and homemaker continued to be the basis of most instruction for girls, some kind of literacy instruction was also included. This did not, however, often include instruction in the ability to write, for writing was deemed largely unnecessary for women. (McClelland, p. 36)

Colonial era. During the colonial era, a majority of people “would have dismissed summarily the notion of women attaining, or even wanting, a college education” (Solomon, 1985, p. 1). Yet, universities were being established in the colonies—Harvard in 1636, William and Mary in 1693, and Yale in 1701. Why then had women been left out of the new world’s institutions for higher learning? One answer to this is the stereotyped gender roles that were in existence in the American colonies (Goodsell, 1931/1970). Additionally, most families weighed heavily the economic cost of higher
education, and provided only a basic form of education, enough to maintain the
prescribed roles of women and men in society (Farello, 1970).

Some women during this time questioned the status quo. One such woman was
Anne Hutchinson (1591-1643). Hutchinson held weekly meetings with women in her
community. In response to these meetings, the church disbanded these meetings and
excommunicated her. Other women, after Hutchinson, continued such prayer or
community meetings—Esther Edwards Stoddard (1672-1771) and Sarah Osborne (1643-
1692). Such small shifts in the roles of women in the religious establishments of the time
did not necessarily, however, create shifts in the abilities for women to obtain higher
education (Solomon, 1985).

Further shifts in science and religion did create educational opportunities for
select women. With Newton’s ideas of rationalism and John Locke’s “psychology found
no distinction in the mind by sex, and his psychology slowly undermined the assumption
of the immutability of female inferiority” (Solomon, 1985, p. 5), the idea of educating
women also shifted. Jane Colden (1724-1776) was taught by her father and became the
first female scientist. Such breakthroughs had their limitations though. Upon marriage,
Colden no longer worked as a scientist, and feminist scholars speculate if she had a
choice in the matter (Solomon). Educated women during this time were also warned to
remember their “place” (Boas, 1935/1971). Solomon cited Eliza Lucas Pinckney (1722-
1793) as an example such a practice. Pinckney had “studied freely in the arts and sciences
and made discoveries about indigo that served her father’s business well, [but] was
reminded of her ‘place’ as a female” prior to her marriage (p. 6).
As the Revolutionary War approached, women took part in the political sphere. Here, women had opportunities to organize and campaign. The role of women to assist the colonial armies was seen as important to the war efforts. During this period of discussion of the meaning of independence, many women in these groups wondered about the rights women had to such freedoms. Much of their thoughts regarding the equal rights of women were not recorded during this time (Farello, 1970; Solomon, 1985).

Two women who questioned gender roles during the Revolutionary War were Mercy Otis Warren (1728-1814) and Abigail Smith Adams (1744-1818) (Woody, 1966). Warren published her thoughts, using a pen name, during the Revolutionary War, and Adams petitioned her husband to remember the rights of women. Adams also pointed out the terrible deficiencies in female education at all levels, [and] she finally made that significant request to her husband, that the new constitution ‘be distinguished for Learning and Virtue’ and that ‘if we mean to have Heroes, Statesmen, and Philosophers, we should have learned women.’ This awareness of education’s value, rooted in the Enlightenment faith in human potentiality, had feminist implications before there was a feminist ideology. (Solomon, 1985, p. 8)

Another woman who advocated for women’s right to higher education was Judith Sargent Murray (1751-1820). Murray published essays and wrote plays, under a pseudonym. Her essays included Equality of the Sexes (1779) and Desultory Thoughts upon the Utility of Encouraging a Degree of Self-Complacency, Especially in Female Bosoms (1784). Warren felt that “education could provide independence for women in need” (Solomon, 1985, p. 9). While not American, Mary Wollstonecraft’s book, A Vindication of the
*Rights of Women*, published in America in 1792 and 1794, further strengthened American women’s cries for equal access to higher education (Solomon, 1985). It took a long time for people in the United States to embrace Wollstonecraft’s ideas—even some of the pioneers in women’s education (Boas, 1935/1971).

**Industrial revolution.** In the 1800s, the Industrial Revolution was taking hold in the United States. Women began to work in the factories, but did not earn equal pay as compared to men (Sochen, 1974). Men typically held professional jobs and women were discouraged from pursuing them. Some women, however, were able to become teachers (Hoffman, 1981), lawyers, and physicians (or self-taught doctors) (Solomon, 1985). Coeducational and single-sex schools were being created, especially between 1830-1850 (Solomon). As before, religious institutions supported the education for women. This time, the church advocated for women to become teachers. The pursuit of higher education for women still occurred on a case-by-case basis, as mass appeal of higher education for women was not yet in existence (Solomon). Coeducation did not create an equal playing field for boys (Howe, 1984). On the contrary—

traditional gender roles were reinforced rather than challenged within the coeducational classrooms. Girls were not taught to behave like boys, rather to conduct themselves as proper young ladies. Boys, in turn, were reinforced for exhibiting masculine qualities….thus, the potentially dangerous setting of a coeducational school turned into an effective prop for conventional, hierarchical gender relations. Much of the impetus for this came from the conservative, middle-class background of the young women who were entering the teaching force at this time. (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 169)
Many significant women assisted in the advancement for women to obtain higher education. An important figure in women’s education during this time was Emma Hart Willard (1787-1870). Willard claimed “that advanced education for women should not depend on individuals and chance circumstances” (Solomon, 1985, p. 18). She created The Willard Plan, a curriculum for women that was taught by women (Goodsell, 1930/1970). Another important figure was Catharine Beecher (1800-1878). Beecher created the first women’s seminary in Hardford, CT in 1832 (Edwards, 2002; Solomon). Beecher’s *Treatise on Domestic Economy* (1841) described gender roles present at the time. While Beecher did not advocate for gender equality, per se, her seminary and treatise paved the way for feminist exploration of education and gender roles by others (Urban & Wagoner, 1996). Other important figures were Mary Lyon (1797-1849) and Zilpath Grant (1794-1874) who were interested in establishing a women’s seminary for teachers in New England. Mary Lyon charted Mount Holyoke in 1836, with classes opening the following year (Goodsell; Solomon).

Women who wanted to study at universities in fields other than theology or education faced their own obstacles. In 1870, Myra Bradwell (1831-1894) was barred from practicing law in Illinois due to the thought that:

The civil law, as well as nature herself, has always recognized a wide difference in the respective spheres and destinies of man and woman. Man is, or should be, woman’s protector and defender. The natural and proper timidity and delicacy which belongs to the female sex evidently unfits it for many of the occupations of civil life. (as cited in Sochen, 1974, p. 103)
Another woman, Elizabeth Blackwell (1821-1910), became the first female physician in the United States in 1849 (Boas, 1935/1971; Solomon, 1985). The women who worked for the advancement of women’s education in the 1800s did so for reasons that are not necessarily congruent with those of feminist pedagogy or theory—

these educators [in the 1800s] would not have declared themselves feminists, although they defended women’s rights to education, even as they avoided the thorny political issue of slavery, and often opposed women’s suffrage. Nonetheless, they showed women students that they had both a right and an obligation to take themselves seriously. (Solomon, p. 26)

Many women took this responsibility seriously. For instance, Lucy Stone (1818-1893), who was received the first degree awarded to a woman from Oberlin in 1847, called for Harvard and Yale to allow women to attend their universities at a women’s rights conference in 1856 (Solomon, 1985). The demand for equal rights and access to higher education was receiving mounting support.

Additional events that aided women’s access to higher education included the Civil War, where women had additional employment opportunities, the public education system, and Reconstruction (Farello, 1970; Solomon, 1985). The political climate of the time also supported a movement for women’s rights to education: “Male abolitionists, having deserted the cause of women’s suffrage to pursue that of enfranchisement of black men, thereafter ardently backed the collegiate education of women” (Solomon, p. 46). The suffrage movement has been documented as being critical in the beginning movement towards social change and reform in the educational system for women in more recent history, in which many of the suffragettes experienced harsh backlash that
Woody (1966) documented as being more prominent than the suffrage movement itself. It was during this time that women linked their right to equal rights with political movement (Woody) in what feminist scholars refer to as the first wave of feminism (Villaverde, 2008).

Another influential woman in education and pedagogy during this time was Ella Flagg Young (1845-1918). Her teaching career involved teaching in the public schools in Chicago, being a principle at multiple public schools, becoming an assistant superintendent, and being a professor in the School of Education at the University of Chicago. She shared many pedagogical principles of Dewey, such as “his real-life curriculum and inquiry-based teaching methods” (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, p. 213). She differed from Dewey in terms of “her views about sharing authority with teachers” (Urban & Wagoner, p. 213). Her call for egalitarianism in the workplace was an important step towards feminist pedagogy.

**Late 1800s-1920s.** Towards the end of the 1800s and up until the roaring 20s, many upper-class women had access to higher education. The same curricular problems that plagued predominately male colleges during this time also affected women pursuing higher education. A lack of coherence in course requirements for general education and opening up an electives system made the early university experiences for women quite confusing (Farello, 1970; Solomon, 1985). Women’s colleges, such as Bryn Mawr, began using the electives system in 1884. By 1910, many women’s universities had adopted a curriculum similar to that of Johns Hopkins University (Solomon).

After WWI, women attended universities in increasing numbers at most universities (Solomon, 1985; Tead, 1985). Women’s universities, during this time,
modeled their curriculum after the men’s universities. The similarities to men’s education by women’s universities in the early 1900s was described by Tead:

The assumption was tacit, if not explicit, that in all respects the role of women in society was the same as the role of men and that therefore their education had to be the same. Any claim that the role of women might in any way be distinctive was too often taken as an allegation that the role of women was in some way inferior to the role of men. (p. 50)

1920s-1940s. From 1920-1940, women’s enrollment in universities peaked at 47% in 1920. During the Great Depression, college admissions dropped, for both men and women. This time period also saw increased diversity in the student body, however this was not taken well on most campuses. Solomon reported that “most educators believed that they must preserve the so-called Anglo-Saxon superiority of their colleges and used the popular scientific theory of inherent racial differences to justify their intent” (p. 143).

Curricular issues on college classes were coming to a head during the 1920s-1940s (Farello, 1970). Some felt that women would benefit from liberal arts programs. Others, such as Clara Brown, argued for the inclusion of homemaking as part of the curriculum. Some women’s colleges created courses that would assist women “who would go on to teach but also helped equip them as future mothers” with courses such as “psychology, family life, mental hygiene, and educational psychology” (Solomon, 1985, p. 150). It was also during this time that women could study the arts in universities.

In the 1920s, an interesting social phenomenon occurred on college campuses in the United States—flappers. Young women were beginning to re-define their roles in
society and this played out on college campuses as well. In addition to a distinctive dress
code, flappers began to question assumptions and assumed responsibilities society had for
women (Solomon, 1985).

From the 1920-1944, women who were able to access higher education had a
“seriousness of purpose and commitment to usefulness [of their education]” (Solomon,
1985, p. 172). A majority of women who graduated from universities at this time had
employment opportunities, a change perhaps due to WWII. The 1930s also saw women
combining work and families, perhaps due to economic need or perhaps due to a shifting
in societal views of gender roles (or both). This time period also saw the emergence of
“the new-style feminist” (Solomon, p. 175). “Although this new feminist professed no
loyalty to women en masse, she believed in individual women and cheered their
successes” (Solomon, p. 175).

1940s-1950s. Once WWII ended, the soldiers returned to both the workplace and
the universities. Women’s rights advocates “foresaw ‘the inevitable recoil’ from
women’s advances at all levels…some proposed that women’s history courses be
instituted in the curriculum to sustain the aspirations of younger women” (Solomon,
1985, p. 187). Paradoxically, more women than ever before in history received a college
education, however “their educators were upholding the primacy of women’s roles as
wife and homemaker” (Solomon, p. 188). In fact, the GI Bill hurt women’s abilities to
access higher education (Farello, 1970). Solomon reported that women’s colleges
accepted men after WWII, due to the large influx of soldiers attending universities. With
a limited number of applicants accepted each year, this influx of soldiers into academe
limited many women’s abilities to attend college (Solomon).
After WWII, universities began adapting curriculums for women. Faculty members made such changes based on Freudian psychology and of the changing workplace for women. Many liberal arts programs adapted courses for women to focus on “family life” (Solomon, 1985, p. 192). The use of equality in curriculum for men and women was now being challenged as men returned home from war. The President of Mills College, Lynn White, gave an interview with Time, stating: “educated women in the U.S…are not only a lost sex, but a wasted one—and their colleges have made them so” (“Education for Happier”, 1951, para. 3). His plan to help women become “successful housewives” included the revision of curriculum and coursework to include “family studies,…family law,…[and] community services” (“Education for Happier”, para. 4 & 5). A return to more stereotyped gender roles as well as a decrease in the percentage of women receiving college degrees, especially graduate degrees, took hold during this period (Farllo, 1970).

1960s-1970s. The Civil Rights movement and the Peace Movement during the Vietnam War affected the cultural climate of the United States during the 1960s (Eisenmann, 2006). This was the beginning of the second-wave of the women's movement. The feminist movement, federal legislation, such as Title IX, and affirmative action made access to education apparently more accessible, yet by the 1970s, significantly fewer all women’s universities existed as more women entered coeducational institutions (Churgin, 1978). Reviews of women’s universities found that these universities were inferior, educationally, as compared to all male or coeducational universities, which may have contributed to the decline in enrollment. Women’s attendance in universities also dropped below levels seen before WWII (Churgin). While
all male universities had previously declined to admit women, their change admissions policies during the later part of the 20th Century was not necessarily due to a change in heart. On the contrary, Churgin reported that:

when the male institutions decided to integrate [women], they did not view the potential benefits of each sex upon the other, but often saw women as a marketable commodity designed to increase the institution’s desirability to the male population. Women were rarely accorded the dignity of being considered as students in their own right. (p. 121)

Women were viewed as a problem, according to Churgin, that “can lead men to become anti-intellectual in order to prove their prowess as lovers and athletes” (pp. 122-123).

During this same time, women’s studies programs began to develop in the United States in 1970s, with the first women's studies program at San Diego State University (Boxer, 1998) and the second at Cornell University (McFadden, 2005). Women’s studies advocated for a multitude of social change, including change within the academy (Churgin, 1978). It was through women’s studies programs that critiques of the academy were made—regarding hidden curriculum and pedagogy in particular—that will be discussed in-depth later in this review of literature.

1980s-2000s. In the 1980s, more women than men were enrolled in higher education (Touchton & J. R. Davis, 1991). This decade also saw a continued decline in the number of women’s universities as well as “a lower overall level of self-concept [which] may be a real handicap, as one’s self-concept is intimately related to one’s sense of competence and performance in college” (Pearson, Shavlik, & Touchton, 1989, p. 42). Approximately half of the students that completed either a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree,
in the 1980s, were women, however only 35% of all Doctoral degrees were conferred upon women in 1986 (Touchton & Davis). The trend for women to make-up half of all college students continued into the 1990s and 2000s (Corbett, Hill, & St. Rose, 2008). By the early 2000s, 44% of Doctoral degrees were earned by women (American Association of University Women, 2004).

The rise in degrees earned by women in the past three decades, however, does not mean that women do not still battle significant barriers to equality in higher education. In terms of faculty representation at four-year universities, only 27% of full-time tenured faculty were women in 2001, with most of the tenured women being white (American Association of University Women, 2004). Discrimination based on gender, class, race, and sexual orientation continues to persist and impair women’s access to education and ability to teach in higher education (Berry & Mizelle, 2006).

Overall, the history of women’s education was markedly different that that of men’s education. Women were often denied access to general education, as well as higher education. When they were admitted to universities, curricular changes were often implemented which drastically changed the type of information women could learn in the classroom. If women were able to teach in academe, they were often denied tenure and/or discriminated against due to their gender, race, sexual orientation, or class. Given this history of limited access to formal education, women began to criticize the status quo, beginning with a critique of traditional theories of education, and later began to develop theories of education in an activist stance against the use of traditional pedagogy that were being used (Glazer, Bensimon, & Townsend, 1993; Howie & Tauchert, 2002).
**Feminist Response to Male Education Theorists**

*Feminist interpretations of Jean-Jacques Rousseau.* Rousseau’s idea that all men are equal, clearly left women out of the philosophical discourse on the education of people (Nye, 1988). In fact, the type of education Rousseau advocated for woman has been strongly critiqued by feminists, including Nye, due to Rousseau’s views that:

Women he argued, are naturally weaker, suited for reproduction but not for public life….Women are to be educated to please men and to be mothers. They are to be trained in the sexual restraint and chastity that ensures paternity. They must learn to stimulate male chastity that ensures paternity. Seductiveness suits their nature; they are desiring to please, modest, tolerant of injustice, manipulative, vain, and artistic in a minor way. In the family, men must rule these frivolous creatures. (pp. 6-7)

Mary Wollstonecraft’s (1759-1797) book, *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, also rejected many of the assumptions Rousseau had made regarding women. She challenged the idea that gender role constructs Rousseau had written about in his theory of education. Women, Wollstonecraft argued, had “virtue and reason” (Kerber, 1997, p. 35). Wollstonecraft also advocated that the education of woman could expand into areas such as law, medicine, and business. Kerber summarized Wollstonecraft’s thesis of her book in the following passage: women “should not be denied civil and political rights, they should not have to rely on marriage for assurance of economic support” (p. 35).

Wollstonecraft received significant critique for her ideas, both during her lifetime and after her death. A political satire, *Morpheus*, was one example of such ridicule. Timothy Dwight, author of *Morpheus*, discounted Wollstonecraft’s theories publically, implying
that if women followed Wollstonecraft’s ideas they would “cease their housewifely duties” (Kerber, p. 36).

**Feminist interpretations of John Dewey.** Dewey’s call for democratic education and student-focused learning seem quite congruent with feminist pedagogy. Maher (2001), however, argued that assuming that effective teaching and feminist pedagogy are the same does not call into account the limitations of “universalizing narratives” or the dangers of “another ‘regime of truth’ whose practices silence some students and teachers in the name of including everyone under a universalized rhetoric of social and educational progress” (p. 14). A closer look is indeed called for to better understand feminist critiques of Dewey’s theories of teaching and learning.

Maher (2001) theorized that a male model of democratic learning carries with it many of the power differentials and authority biases that do not occur when a woman is teaching. When men attempt to equalize the power differential in a classroom, they do so while still being male. Women, Maher argued, have different “problems with pedagogical authority” than men do (p. 15). Maher wondered, “Why have I often felt so powerless in my own teaching career, caught between things that I should be always ‘facilitative’ and ‘democratic?’” (p. 14). Additional critiques of Dewey’s theories include his lack of inclusion of gender in his theories of education. Maher viewed the absence of the discussion of gender “as a specific form of oppression and inequality” (p. 16). Dewey himself was a supporter of women’s rights while he was alive, however, his absence of inclusion of gender in his theories have been questions by some scholars (Maher). This is especially curious since a majority of teachers are women. A further critique of Dewey’s
theories include his emphasis on unity in the educational realm, without acknowledging
the oppression and power differentials within this system (Maher).

**Feminist interpretations of Paulo Freire.** Another theorist that feminists critique
is Paulo Freire. Weiler (2001) noted aspects of Freire’s theory of education that are not
necessarily congruent with feminist pedagogy. To begin, Freire did not include patriarchy
or the oppression of women in his writings. Also, Weiler cited Freire’s “view of history
as a kind of Manichaean struggle between good and evil” as being troublesome in
feminist interpretations of his viewpoints (p. 74). Additionally, Weiler described the
“dangers of this stance [one sweeping category for oppression/oppressed groups,
specifically women] in terms of racial and class privilege should be evident” (p. 75),
whereas feminist theory acknowledges multiplicities of truths and diversity.

Overall, women’s education in the United States has been significantly different
from that of men. It was only when the number of men attending universities dropped,
such as during wartime, that an increase in the number of women admitted to universities
occurred. Even when women were granted access to higher education, they often times
received poor quality instruction or changes to the curriculum to support traditional
gender roles, such as the modification of course content to the context of the home and/or
family life. It is from a feminist critique of male theorists that lead to both the field of
women’s studies as well as the emergence of feminist pedagogy.

**History of Pedagogy in Higher Education**

The emergence of formal preparation of teachers in pedagogy first began with S.
S. Green (1850). He was Professor of Didactics at Brown University. The next
universities to offered training in teaching was at Kalamazoo College (1860) with Dr.
Gregory and at the Illinois Industrial University (1867). Other universities to follow suit included Iowa University (1873), University of Wisconsin (1881), University of North Carolina (1884), Johns Hopkins University (1884), Ottawa University (1886), Indiana University (1886), New York University (1886), and the University of the City of New York (1887) (Boone, 1889/1999).

Boone (1889/1999) documented the existence of “Pedagogical Lecture Courses” and the “Harvard Lectures an [sic] Pedagogy” in the 1880s. The first course dedicated to pedagogy at the college level occurred in 1881 at Boston College, by Dr. Harris. Michigan University (1879) created a department in the “Science and Art of Teaching,” which eventually developed a lecture series that turned into seven elective courses. Johns Hopkins University also began giving lectures on pedagogy beginning in 1884. Dr. Stanley Hall taught these courses which covered the history of pedagogy, teaching elementary and secondary education, higher education, and special education. The University of the City of New York began its first course in pedagogy in 1887, which was reported by Boone (1889/1999) to be more extensive than other courses on the subject.

The need for coursework on pedagogy was increasingly evident by the emergence of new courses on the subject. Boone (1889/1999) wrote:

> it need scarcely be said that the work [on pedagogy] as a whole, and in this country, is yet only tentative. A few of the courses are painfully narrow and barren; others are subordinated—made to share both time and attention with unrelated subjects. Nevertheless, the movement is assuring and is, almost without exception, favorably regarded by educators. (p. 147)
In addition to a need for coursework on pedagogy was the need for textbooks on the subject. Early texts on the subject included the “Cyclopaedia of Education” (Kiddle & Schem, 1877/2003), the “Bibliography of Education” by Dr. Hall and the “Catalogue of the Pedagogical Library of the Philadelphia Schools” by Mac Alister (Boone, 1889/1999). These important foundations of pedagogy in the United States was the basis for much instruction, and reform, in higher education. The following section will review both the history in philosophies of pedagogy as well as the scholarship of teaching and learning.

To understand the history of pedagogy in the United States, it is important to reference changes in the function of the universities. The colonial universities were created to educate the elite and professors were evaluated primarily on their teaching. The next major shift in American education occurred when universities adapted to the industrial revolution by creating more technical schools. Instead of teaching as the main focus for faculty, “service was the central mission of higher education” (Boyer, 1995, p. 130). Later in the 19th Century, American universities adopted the German research model of research, with the first being the Johns Hopkins University, which evaluated professors on their scholarly work (Boyer).

Such dramatic shifts in the focus of universities in the United States influenced various theories of pedagogy used within academe. The earliest known pedagogical theory was humanism. In 481-411 B.C., Relativistic Humanism was the primary educational theory. This pedagogy viewed truth as “unattainable” and emphasized the use of reason (Power, 1982, p. 39). The next type of humanism began with Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, 469-322 B.C., and was called Scientific Humanism. In Scientific
Humanism, ethics was introduced in the pursuit of understanding and learning. The third type of humanism was called Literary Humanism, based on Isocrates, Cicero, and Quintilian. In Literary Humanism, oration was used to refine a person’s knowledge and understanding. These traditional pedagogies, such as Idealism, based on Plato, and Realism, based on Aristotle, emphasized the teacher’s “responsibility for creating the educational environment for students” (Power, p. 89).

Shifts in social and cultural values occurred with changes in religion, which lead to the next major pedagogical philosophy—Religious-Rational Humanism (150-1560). With Constantine’s conversion to Christianity, education philosophy shifted. It was also during the time of this religious influence on education, that liberal arts education was introduced. The emphasis of Religious-Rational Humanism was on screening information to build “character” (Power, 1982, p. 47). While the traditional pedagogies had placed the teacher in an authoritarian role, it was not until the introduction of Christianity that texts and teaching methods shifted from an exploration of truth and possibilities to a more limited access to and censored use of texts and information.

Religious Humanism continued for some time until it shifted to Religious Realism, which was based on John Amos Comenius (1592-1670). His book, *The Great Didactic*, emphasized the natural world in addition to Christian beliefs regarding this life and the afterlife. Comenius’ philosophy was followed by that of John Locke (1632-1704), with Empiricism. In Empiricism, Locke emphasized the use of reason for gaining knowledge as well as using the senses. Next, Rousseau (1712-1778) developed another philosophy of pedagogy, Naturalism, which emphasized that “the natural goodness of human beings may be protected by education from nature” (Power, 1982, p. 59). Later
Johann Herbart’s (1776-1841) Nationalism emphasized the importance of education, not for religious reasons, but “to serve the interests of the national state” (p. 59). Similar to changes that occurred when education philosophy was changed for religious reasons, feminists critique traditional pedagogies, such as Nationalism, for employing a hidden curriculum and/or censoring information. Even in more “modern” revolutions to change patriarchal and oppressive states, such as the communism, socialism, and democracy, women have historically either been excluded from equality in education, and other rights, or discriminated against when they are able to access education (Nye, 1988).

More contemporary philosophies of education include those of Dewey, Rogers, Gardstrom, and Palmer (see previous section), emphasized experiential learning and were designed to create learning without bias, as well as those based on psychological theory, such as cognitive psychology or person-centered models. It was not until 1990, however, that the field of pedagogy was first considered to be of scholarly importance—it had previously been left up to philosophers and theorists.

Over time, pedagogical practices have evolved and changed in higher education. These practices have been influenced by a variety of factors including the cultural norms of the time, the state, and the church. The first courses on pedagogy in the United States were elective courses that usually did not have significant depth, or even a textbook. The encouragement of educators to study the philosophical underpinnings of teaching laid the groundwork for a new field—The Scholarship of Teaching—which shall be explored in the next section.
Scholarship of Teaching

Scholarship of Teaching? This seems to be a contradiction of terms in the modern academic setting where teaching, scholarly activity, and service and three separate categories of required achievement for faculty to receive promotion and tenure. How can teaching be considered scholarship? How can scholarship include the research of teaching? The next section of this paper will discuss these very issues.

In his paper, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate*, Boyer (1990) made the case that teaching as a scholarly endeavor should be embraced by academe, which had fallen into a restrictive view of what scholarly research was considered in adopting the German system of original faculty research. Boyer chronicled the history of education—and how knowledge used to be passed through teaching and is now passed through research—and attempted to fuse the two into one. In fact, many contemporary universities are classified as being a “teaching” university or a “research” university. There are even tiers for the type of research institution a university is classified under, which has ramifications for funding through “research” grants. Even Moxley (1992), author of *Publish Don’t Perish: The Scholar’s Guide to Academic Writing and Publishing*, advocated that “we need to reassert teaching as a significant form of scholarship, as a way of synthesizing and extending knowledge” (p. 5). The latter part of the 20th Century was a time of re-examination of dichotomous thinking in terms of pedagogy.

Boyer (1990) warned that all too often, teaching has become neglected in academe. He stated that “teaching is often viewed as a routine function, tacked on, something almost anyone can do” (p. 23). Boyer advocated for the studying of pedagogy
and shifting from the viewpoint of teacher as an authority figure, as seen in traditional pedagogies, to the teacher as a learner. He also discussed the importance of transformation in education, an important issue in feminist pedagogy as well.

Interestingly, many of the concepts Boyer (1990) advocated for in the Scholarship of Teaching are congruent with feminist pedagogy. Remaining a learner-participant and advocating for transformation through knowledge (or consciousness raising) are values shared both of these theories. The Scholarship of Teaching is also compatible with feminist pedagogy in its questioning of what is knowledge, research, or scholarship.

The emerging field of the Scholarship of Teaching is not without critique. Boshier’s (2009) critique of this field begins with the sentence, “dead in the water” (p. 1). His analysis of Boyer’s ideas included his finding that the term Scholarship of Teaching was too vague. In fact, he presented over 25 variations of the phrase in scholarly writing. His strongest commentary on the Scholarship of Teaching is that it is “anti-intellectual and located in a narrow neoliberalism” (p. 8).

Boshier is not alone in his critique of the Scholarship of Teaching. Kinchin, Lygo-Baker, and Hay (2008) concluded that the Scholarship of Teaching model may, in some instances, actually lead to “non-learning” (p. 101). Others have critique Boyer’s model for not being fully integrated (Wilcox & Lackeyram, 2009). These notwithstanding, Boyer’s seminal work has created a place in scholarly writing for the examination of pedagogy, which continues to be discussed in scholarly writing on pedagogy in higher education (Elton, 2009; Hess, 2009; Major & Palmer, 2006; Zamorski, 2004).

Critiques of higher education (Graff, 2003) have analyzed the pitfalls of traditional pedagogies and advocated for new theories upon which to base teaching.
Walker (2003) provided an overview of many of the pitfalls of higher education in the United States, as it is currently practiced, such as the movement of the academy towards a business model of education, the dichotomy of research and teaching, a lack of discussion of the theoretical basis for teaching (pedagogy), a focus on teaching strategies instead of curriculum, and the focus of education on measureable outcomes. Walker challenged faculty to use more ethical forms of pedagogy instead of so-called “thinned out versions of pedagogy” the author previously listed (p. 6). In response to the call for a more ethical approach to pedagogy, various newer, or progressive, forms of pedagogy have developed such as learning-centered pedagogy (Weimer, 2002), learning communities (Smith, MacGregor, Matthews, & Gabelnick, 2004), the democratic classroom (Cahn, 1979), critical pedagogy (Livingstone, 1987), the pedagogy of the oppressed (Freire, 1970/2000) engaged pedagogy (hooks, 1994), and feminist pedagogy (Crabtree, Sapp, & Licona, 2009).

**Teaching Educators**

The role of the educator in higher education has shifted dramatically, with the changes in pedagogical theory. Teachers in the twenty-first century are considered to be “teacher scholars” that are more concerned with helping students “understand concepts” than memorize information (Cochran, 1992, p. 4). This shift of the modern professor, as both teacher and scholar, is a dramatic sea change from the early American universities that were solely concerned with teaching or the German-influenced universities concerned with research.
But how are educators prepared for their new role in the twenty-first century university? Some scholars believe that the typical university professor is quite unprepared for their role as a scholar teacher (Eble, 1972; Katz & Henry, 1993). It can be assumed that some students feel similarly, with popular websites such as “Rate My Professors” that chronicle students’ subjective rating and review of their professor’s teaching.

The lack of preparation for university teaching of professors in academe may be the result of faulty training. Katz and Henry (1993) described the use of “‘model’ ways of teaching” where professors view videotapes of their own teaching as well as “expert teachers” (p. 5). Other scholars advocate for a similar expert-based model, such as Shim and Roth’s (2009) qualitative study that interviewed “award winning professors” (p. 1). It is this author’s opinion that mentoring is an excellent way to develop teaching skills, however, it should not occur at the exclusion of a theoretical understanding of pedagogy and/or direction interaction with a mentor. The reduction of teaching to a set of skills, is to equate paint-by-numbers with learning from the “masters.” This author believes that a more comprehensive model is needed for teacher education. Such a model was also advocated by Parker Palmer.

Palmer (2007) advocated for teachers to teach with integrity using who their true identity. He also supported the idea of eliminating the dichotomy between teaching and learning, as proposed in traditional pedagogies and for teachers to embrace “paradox,” especially related to pedagogy. His model of “the principle of paradox” contained the following ideas: (a) “the space should be bounded and open,” (b) “the space should be hospitable and ‘charged,’” (c) “the space should invite the voice of the individual and the voice of the group,” (d) “the space should honor the ‘little’ stories of the students and the
‘big’ stories of the disciplines and tradition,” (e) “the space should support solitude and surround it with the resources of community,” and (f) “the space should welcome both silence and speech” (pp. 76-77).

Training in pedagogy in the United States is not consistent for teachers at the college and university level. Many teachers feel unprepared to teach courses and many students are critical of the instruction they receive. This author feels that a potential reason for this lack of preparation has been the reduction of pedagogy to a set of teaching skills, at the expense of theory. As a music therapy educator, I insist that my students both learn the theory behind music therapy as well as appropriate music therapy interventions. Just as I would not allow my students to use the empty chair technique without understanding Gestalt theory, I do feel that music therapy educators should employ teaching techniques without an understanding of pedagogy.

**History of music therapy education**

**Important events.** Music therapy has grown as a course of study in institutions of higher education across the United States and around the world. The formal study of music therapy has grown from a single class, to an undergraduate degree, and finally to graduate training in music therapy. According to the 2010 *American Music Therapy Association (AMTA) Member Sourcebook* (American Music Therapy Association, 2010), there are over 70 AMTA-approved colleges and universities that provide music therapy instruction in the United States and Canada. According to McNiff, “music [therapy] was the first of the creative arts therapies to offer university level training in the United States” (1986, p. 56). As the field of music therapy expands in terms of the type of training programs, so too does the pedagogical approaches used in teaching music
therapy. This manuscript will examine the extent to which music therapy educators use principles from feminist education in the classroom environment as the basis for their pedagogy in music therapy education.

The three founding teachers of music therapy education were Margaret Anderton, Isa Maud Ilsen, and Harriet Ayer Seymour (Davis & Gfeller, 2008). Prior to their work in the education of music therapy students, another woman, Eva Augusta Vescelius, was an instrumental figure in the establishment of music therapy as a course of study (W. B. Davis, 1993; Maranto, 1993). Vescelius advocated for the use of music therapy in a presentation she gave titled “Musical Vibration in the Healing of the Sick” that W. B. Davis (1993) documented as “well-received despite skepticism among some of the conference organizers—they granted Vescelius only 12 minutes to present her paper” (p. 35). Verscelius established the first organization for music therapy in the United States—the National Society for Musical Therapeutics—in 1903 (W. B. Davis, 1993). Margaret Anderton taught the first college-level music therapy course at Columbia University in New York City in 1919. This course focused on training musicians to use music in the medical setting. Isa Maud Ilsen, the founder of the National Association for Music in Hospitals (1926), worked as a clinician in the hospital setting and taught, with Margaret Anderton, at Columbia University. Finally, Harriet Ayer Seymour’s publications influenced both music therapy practice and music therapy education. Her first book, What Music Can Do For You (1920) served as a handbook for music therapy clinicians. Her second text, An Instructional Course in the Use and of Practice of Musical Therapy (1944) served as the first textbook for music therapy courses (Davis, 1996; Davis & Gfeller, 2008). Together, Anderton, Ilsen, and Seymour paved the way for the formal
development of the profession of music therapy and laid the foundation for higher education instruction in music therapy (Davis, 1996). Collectively, their work contributed to the development of formalized coursework in music therapy at the university-level (York, Wheeler, & Streeter, 2008). The grassroots movement of music therapy instruction in the United States, seen in the work of Anderton, Ilsen, and Seymour, has similarities in the grassroots development of feminist pedagogy and FMTP.

With the groundwork in place from the work of Aderton, Ilsen, Seymour, and Vescelius, the first undergraduate degree program in music therapy was established in 1944 at Michigan State University (de l’Etoile, 2000; Maranto, 1993). A half century after Vescelius’ lecture on music therapy, E. Thayor Gaston is credited with the establishment of the field of music therapy in the United States with the creation of the National Association for Music Therapy (Johnson, 1981).

Over time, the content of music therapy education has developed and expanded. In 1952, the National Association for Music Therapy developed “a set of educational requirements” for music therapists (Braswell, 1960, p. 35). Braswell discussed the importance of the “development of specific skills” for students in music therapy training programs, and described general musical and non-musical skills that should be addressed in music therapy curricula (p. 35). Gaston explored further exploration of required components of music therapy curriculum, across schools, to determine educational standards was sought in Gaston’s exploration of “the near-perfect [music therapy] program” (Gaston, 1964, p. 149).

Another major milestone in the history of music therapy education came in 1971 when the Urban Federation for Music Therapists, which later became the American
Association for Music Therapy—broke off from NAMT (McNiff, 1986). These two associations created separate education and clinical training standards which created further spread in the curriculums, competencies, and training of music therapists between universities (Maranto, 1993; Sandness, 1999). Other movements in the history of music therapy education was towards competency-based training. Maranto and Bruscia (1987; 1988) as well as Jensen and McKinney (1990) examined the importance of competency-based clinical and educational training for music therapists. In 1989 another important event in the development of music therapy education occurred—The California Symposium on Music Therapy Education and Training—which involved educators from both AAMT and NAMT (Goodman, 2011). Goodman synthesized the issues that this symposium examined in 1989:

1. Identification of entry level competencies.
2. Availability of clinical specialization for students.
3. Greater emphasis on music therapy methods and clinical applications, as opposed to theory and research, needed in the undergraduate curriculum.
4. Functional music examinations for prospective interns (voice, keyboard, guitar, improvisation, group ensemble, adapted methods).
5. Mechanisms for screening students at academic and clinical sites.
6. Consideration of student learning styles in designing education and training programs.
7. Encouraging students to experience personal therapy. (Goodman, 2011, pp. 9-10)
The unification of the AAMT and NAMT in 1998 created additional opportunities for the exploration and standardization of music therapy education and clinical training, with the development of the American Music Therapy Association (AMTA). In current standards of clinical training have been developed by AMTA further developed several documents delineating educational and training requirements for music therapists. These documents included the *AMTA Standards for Education and Clinical Training* (2009a), *AMTA Professional Competencies* (2008), *AMTA Advanced Competencies* (2009b), and *AMTA Education and Training Advisory Board Advisory on Levels of Practice in Music Therapy* (2005). Music therapy literature exists on the content or focus of educational programs, however, a limited amount of published information exists on how these skills/competencies should be taught or based upon which educational philosophy.

**Teaching methods, competency-based education, and pedagogy.** The literature on music therapy does not reveal a clear and consistent approach by the profession regarding teaching methods, curriculum, or pedagogy in music therapy education. Several authors have published their ideas on music therapy education on a variety of issues, ranging from teaching strategies to curriculum decisions.

*Teaching methods and competency-based education.* One of the first papers that discussed a possible teaching method for music therapy education was published by Michel and Madsen (1969). Although this paper was not an extensive review of how research can serve as a means for education, it was an important step in music therapy literature towards a scholarly examination of music therapy education.

The next series of articles on music therapy education centered towards identifying important skills for music therapy students to obtain during their education.
In 1980, Braswell, Decur, and Maranto surveyed 67 music therapists to rate entry-level music therapy skills. Later, Petrie (1993) studied music therapy curriculums and found “85 Intended Learning Outcomes” for music therapy students that contain a variety of musical and non-musical skills (p. 158). Next, Jensen and McKinney (1990) examined university curriculum and competencies of 66 universities. They found “substantial divergence between curricula and research findings related to competencies necessary for music therapy practice” (p. 174). They offer several suggestions in terms of areas for future consideration including the recommendation to study “groups of therapists who represent the highest level of clinical excellence in the profession” to better understand and develop competencies for the profession and training considerations (p. 176).

Two important books that came out during this time were *Perspectives on Music Therapy Education and Training* (Maranto & Bruscia, 1987) and *Methods of Teaching and Training the Music Therapist* (Maranto & Bruscia, 1988). These two foundational books on music therapy education provide a rich context of the issues and concerns facing music therapy educators during the last part of the 20th Century. Some issues discussed in these books, related to feminist pedagogy, include theoretical and curriculum-based questions such as specialization in the field of music therapy, trends in music therapy training and education, and competency-based training. Of particular interest to the field of feminist pedagogy is the final chapter of the *Method of Teaching and Training the Music Therapist* book, as it provides a subjective reflection on the field of music therapy education. In their reflections on their survey on music therapy education, Maranto and Bruscia found that individual differences of educators should be taken into consideration in any study on music therapy education. As previous literature
has indicated that many educators do not receive adequate training in teaching, so too did Maranto and Bruscia find that preparation to teach competencies varied amongst music therapy educators. These authors also discussed the issue of competency-based training, describing the difficulty of teaching all competencies effectively and equally. They question the basis of competency-based education as an objective measure of learning in the following passage: “we may very well be deluding ourselves in believing that music therapy students actually gain these competencies, or we may be diluting and distorting the competency itself to accommodate the level of learning that students do achieve” (p. 52).

Another important aspect of Maranto and Bruscia’s book, *Methods of Teaching and Training the Music Therapist* (1988), is the authors’ discussion of how competencies are taught. This is a crucial step in the scholarly examination of music therapy pedagogy. They ask, “are competencies being presented to students at an appropriate time in their training, and are they being presented in a meaningful sequence?” (p. 56). They go further to examine methods of teaching music therapy. Their examination of music therapy education at this level was unprecedented at the time and provides the foundation work for exploration of pedagogical frameworks for music therapy instruction, such as feminist pedagogy. The following passages highlights this important shift in music therapy instruction towards a pedagogical approach:

Effective methods of teaching and supervision are also necessary. In order to be Effective, one must be qualified by education, experience, and personality—not only as a clinician, but also as an educator and supervisor. It is not enough to be a
clinician with little or no knowledge of education and supervision, and similarly it is not enough to be an educator or supervisor with little or no clinical knowledge, skill, or experience. Knowing what to teach must be complemented by knowing how to teach it in both classroom and field settings. (p. 56)

In addition to skill-based recommendations in the literature, as seen in the articles advocating for a competency-based approach to education, some authors make note of topics and issues that should be addressed in music therapy education. In 2007, Bradt stated that “there is a need for much more attention to the multicultural practice in the [music therapy] training programs” (p. 142). Later, Edwards and McFerran (2004) highlighted the responsibility of the music therapy educator in terms of the topics they discuss in class. These authors discussed the importance of teaching about sexual abuse in music therapy classes, however this article can be seen in a much broader sense in terms of the ethical responsibility music therapy educators have to not simply teach to the board certification test. Instead, this article, along with Bradt’s article, highlights the importance of professors to conscious of all teaching choices they make in terms of pedagogy, teaching strategies, lecture notes, means of assessment, and the content of what they teach.

**Student perspectives.** Milgram-Luterman (2000) conducted a phenomenological study on senior music therapy students in a music therapy peer support group. She documented the students’ experiences of personal growth over 10 peer support groups, interviews, feedback from a clinical supervisor, and her personal research journal. The author used both focus groups as well as interviews to understand the personal growth of
the music therapy students that participated in the study. The results of this study found that the peer groups assisted music therapy students’ personal growth.

Another important scholarly paper on music therapy education was written by Luce (2008). He described the experience of the student in music therapy education—a missing component of the music therapy literature, and an important aspect of feminist pedagogy. His study examined the developmental and learning stages music therapy students experience, using the Perry Scheme (1970/1999) and Women’s Ways of Knowing, developed by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986/1997). Luce used “collaborative learning consensus groups” for this study (p. 27). As a result of the study, Luce noted a high number of participants that fell into the Silence category. The tendency for students to silence themselves, even in small groups, is yet another reason to advocate for pedagogies that incorporate student participation and egalitarianism in the classroom and beyond. Luce concluded that this tendency “should be of particular concern for educators and clinical trainers as movement from this position [of silence] is essential for active participation in clinical practice and interdisciplinary treatment” (p. 45).

Yet another article that examined the student experience in clinical training was conducted by Gooding and Standley (2010). This study examined pre-internship music therapy students’ level of self-confidence during live or recorded clinical supervision. This article demonstrates an interesting shift in music therapy literature examining not only what we teach in music therapy classrooms, but also the experience of students within these classrooms, perhaps signifying a broader trend in the movement from traditional forms of pedagogy that view the student as a passive learner and towards more
contemporary views of pedagogy that view the student as an active participant in the learning process. The authors also concluded that “further research is warranted to ascertain the best way to teach the awareness of the complex, multilayered skills that are viewed simultaneously during observation” of clinical sessions during supervision (p. 144).

**Music therapy pedagogy.** In 1997, Milgram-Luterman developed a theory of music therapy education and is the first documented theory of teaching and learning in the music therapy literature in the North America. She developed a theory of teaching music therapy where “the goal of undergraduate music therapy education is to produce graduates who can think like expert music therapists” (p. 93). Her theory is based upon a variety of theories including feminist theory and involves “expert music therapy thinking as [an] expansion of the self” (Milgram-Luterman, 1999, p. 33). She proposes a pedagogy of music therapy situated within a developmental approach to learning and based upon five stages of development: “(1) novice music therapy student, (2) immersion through observation, (3) immersion through experience, (4) immersion through reflection, (5) integration of experience into self” (Milgram-Luterman, 1997, p. 145).

Baker (2007) has also described a pedagogical approach to music therapy education based upon problem based learning. This approach to teaching music therapy is based upon the use of group work where students actively work together to solve clinical problems from the presentation of a clinical case study. Baker described this approach to teaching music therapy as “a shift in the pedagogical emphasis from discipline-based to problem-based and from disease-based to patient-centered learning” (p. 29). The results of her study, using student assessment via a Likert scale, instructor feedback, and student
group assessment found problem based learning to be a useful theory for music therapy instruction.

A recent book by Goodman (2011) explores non-music therapy based theories of teaching and learning, such as behaviorist theory, cognitive constructivism, and social constructivism, as well as ways in which these theories manifest in the music therapy classroom. Goodman covers a wide range of topics in this book, including various theories of teaching and learning such as: “behaviorist, cognitive constructivist, and social constructivist” theories (p. 136). This publication does explore the theoretical and philosophical framework of these theories in much depth and instead focuses on application of this theory through teaching and assessment strategies. It does, however, fill an important gap in music therapy literature related to the broader theories and philosophies of teaching and learning that we base our teaching methods and assessments of learning upon.

The history of music therapy education has evolved from a single course on the subject towards a competency-based approach to teaching the art and science of music therapy. Along this path, scholars in the field have written about specific concerns regarding music therapy education, such as the necessity for music therapy educators to have adequate training and for the curriculum to be enlarged to include new topics, such as multicultural issues and violence against women. It has also expanded to include the study of music therapy students’ experiences in the classroom. Honoring the lived experience of the students, making visible the invisible (such as with diversity issues and sexual abuse), and having a theoretical context for education are consistent with feminist pedagogy, which will be explored in the next section.
Herstory of feminist pedagogy

**Foundations of feminist pedagogy.** Feminist pedagogy developed from feminist philosophy, which was a result of the women’s movement (Villaverde, 2008). It challenged traditional notions of power, class, race, gender, socioeconomic status, and sexual orientation in an attempt to raise consciousness about injustices and change the status quo.

Much of the basis for current feminist pedagogy stems from the work of Friere (1998; 1970/2000) for challenging the banking system of education. The banking system of education operates under the idea that a teacher can transfer his or her knowledge to the student and the student will then learn and store that knowledge. The banking system requires a passive learner and an active teacher, and contains many patriarchal elements such as power differentials and oppression (Crabtree & Sapp, 2003). Freire discredited the banking system of education and stated that teaching cannot exist without both the student and the teacher being transformed. He summarized his pedagogical approach in the following passage:

> to know how to teach is to create possibilities for the construction and production of knowledge rather than to be engaged simply in a game of transferring knowledge. When I enter a classroom I should be someone who is open to new ideas, open to questions, and open to the curiosities of the students as well as their inhibitions. In other words, I ought to be aware of being a critical and inquiring subject in regard to the task entrusted to me, the task of teaching and not that of transferring knowledge. (p. 49)
Additionally, Freire challenged the notion of the traditional passive student and active teacher in long-established educational models. It should be noted that feminists have critiqued Freire’s sexist language and connection to patriarchy (McLaren and Leonard, 1993; Weiler, 1991; Weiler, 2001). While his lack of inclusion of women, and his sexist language must be considered in critiquing his theories, Freire’s ideas and innovations in pedagogy were highly influential on feminist theories of pedagogy.

Building upon Freire’s ideas, hooks (1994) developed a new approach to teaching called “engaged pedagogy” (p. 15). She saw engaged pedagogy as a means for further transforming teaching practices. Her approach to teaching incorporated feminist pedagogical principles (which will be described in the next section) and built upon them, including concepts such as self-actualization of the teacher, creating excitement in the classroom, and utilizing a holistic approach. hooks’ new approach to pedagogy has influenced both teaching and scholarship in women’s studies and feminist pedagogy. She theorized that teachers should share more of themselves, though self disclosure, and take chances in the classroom so that empowerment can occur for both the student and the teacher.

Additionally, some new approaches to teaching in higher education include critical pedagogy (Rossatto, Allen, & Pruyn, 2006; Wink, 2005), diversity pedagogy (Elenas, 2001; Sheets, 2005), the democratic classroom (Wolk, 1998), and queer pedagogy/Lesbian, Gay Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) sensitive teaching approaches (Sanlo, 1998; Winans, 2006), and feminist pedagogy, which is the main focus of this study.
Components of feminist pedagogy

Feminist pedagogy includes characteristics such as “participatory learning, validation of personal experience, encouragement of social understanding and activism, and development of critical thinking and open-mindedness” (Hoffmann & Stake, 1998, p. 80). It values all students, acknowledges the individuality and diversity among students, and recognizes the power differences that exist within the classroom. Additionally, feminist pedagogy emphasizes the need for sociopolitical change as well as the concept that both students and teachers are “learners and knowers” (Riley & Murphy, 2005, p. 93). Finally, it highlights the lived experiences of the students and teachers and provides opportunities for the students to share personal stories which can help them connect classroom content to their own lives (Riley & Murphy).

Feminist pedagogy, as defined by Crabtree and Sapp (2003) is “a set of classroom practices, teaching strategies, approaches to content, and relationships grounded in critical pedagogical and feminist theory” (p. 131). Another definition, provided by Worell and Oakley (2000) is “feminist pedagogy is aimed at uncovering, confronting, and transforming the connections among gender, knowledge, and power within academia” (p. 170). Its main goals include sociopolitical change, empowerment, self-actualization, consciousness raising, egalitarianism, reflexivity, and a rejection of oppressive or patriarchal practices (Crabtree & Sapp). The components of feminist pedagogy have been further delineated into four subscales by Stake and Hoffmann (2000): “participatory learning, validation of personal experience/development of confidence, development of political/social understanding and activism, and development of critical thinking/open-mindedness” (p. 33).
The feminist critique of traditional pedagogies is rooted in traditional pedagogies ties to patriarchy. Forrest and Rosenberg (1997) described the “legacy of patriarchy” in their article on feminist pedagogy and psychology. The legacies of patriarchy they identified included: (a) “classrooms as microcosms of oppression,” (b) “patriarchy creates inequalities,” (c) “the dominance of male-centered content and language,” (d) “teaching as a political act,” (e) “women denied status as meaning makers,” (f) “gendered relationships in families mirrored in classrooms,” and (g) “classrooms as multiple sites of oppression” (pp. 182-183). They proposed several ways in which teachers could use feminist pedagogy to transform their classrooms, including making visible the lived experience of students and deconstructing the approach taken to teaching in regards to dichotomies, power differentials, diversity, student engagement in the learning process, and social activism.

It should be noted that feminist pedagogy does not have one singular definition or meaning, as it is an approach to teaching that values the diversity and complexity of multiple voices. Due to the complexities of approaches, some feminist teachers may experience ethical dilemmas. Worell and Oakley (2000) conducted a study to examine responses to four ethical dilemmas presented to feminist faculty and graduate students. The study found that “the feminist professor is frequently confronted with situations in which the realities of traditional academic expectations must be negotiated within the values and principles of a feminist position” (p. 183).
**Feminist music therapy**

Feminist music therapy is an emerging philosophical approach to music therapy practice and education. The founding mother of feminist music therapy is Sandra Curtis (2000). For her dissertation, Curtis applied the concepts of feminism and feminist therapy to music therapy in her work with survivors of domestic violence. In her dissertation she wrote, “music therapy proves to be especially available for feminist transformation” (Curtis, 2006, p. 231). Additionally, Curtis (1990) surveyed music with a focus on women’s issues, which laid the groundwork for the field’s current examination of feminist perspectives in music therapy. Building on Curtis’ work, many other music therapists have utilized a feminist approach in terms of supervision (Forinash, 2006), music therapy clinical practice (York, 2006), guided imagery and music (GIM) (Goldberg, 2006; Hahna, 2004), and pedagogy (Hadley, 2006).

In their article, Edwards and Hadley (2007) discussed how feminism could be applied in the field of music therapy. They described the history of feminism and the need for the inclusion of a feminist frame in scholarly writing on music therapy. They also discussed power differentials and gender constructs in the field related to publication history, salaries, and academe. They found that while women outnumber men in the profession, a higher number of men publish in music therapy. They concluded that:

> It is not possible to draw irrefutable conclusions from this information women for any number of reasons have not communicated through writing to the proportional extent of their male counterparts. While the reasons for this may be multifaceted, this audit of ratio’s in publishing challenges editors, reviewers, and
writers to be more aware of the ways in which subverted norms might be operating to preclude women’s expertise and opinion and to place a greater value and importance on contributions by males within the profession….When combined with the information about salaries and academic appointments in the US, however, it is cause for concern that gender seems to correlate with salary, attainment of doctoral qualifications, and employment in an academic post. This raises a number of issues worthy of ongoing comment and discussion. (p. 205)

Feminist music therapists, such as Edwards and Hadley, have brought to the field’s attention the oppression that continues to exist for women in academia and the field as a whole.

For the purposes of this article, feminist music therapy will be defined as an approach to music therapy which emphasizes “attention to the diversity of women’s personal and social identities,…a consciousness-raising approach,…an egalitarian relationship between client and therapist,…[and] a woman-valuing and self-validating process” (Worell & Remer, 2003, p. 23).

**Expressive therapies and critical pedagogy**

Chávez (2009) described her use of critical pedagogy in expressive therapies education. She described her use of critical pedagogy as “the application of teaching strategies to change hierarchical relationships and establish healthy settings that fosters open exchange of ideas in the classroom” (p. 24). Chávez documented her use of critical pedagogy, citing that both herself and her students were changed as a result. She concludes by highlighting the social activist aspects of critical pedagogy in the following passage: “complimenting critical pedagogy with expressive arts is appealing because it
can create a positive and productive learning experience for the future public health workforce” (p. 24).

While Chávez (2009) was the first expressive arts therapist to describe her use of critical pedagogy in the field, many aspects of feminist pedagogy and critical pedagogy, which is a field highly influenced from feminist pedagogy, are present in expressive therapies literature. For example, McNiff (1986) studied educational issues and trends in creative arts therapy and found that many female faculty members reported to have lower salaries than their male counterparts. Additionally, McNiff interviewed creative arts therapies educators and found many themes consistent with feminist pedagogy including an openness to the learning environment, remaining a student-learner, and decreasing the authoritarian role of the teacher in the classroom setting. McNiff stated that “the master teacher is consistently the one who is able to learn from students and the context while acknowledging personal fallibility” (p. 277).

**Music therapy and feminist pedagogy**

One feminist music therapy educator has formulated a feminist pedagogical approach to music therapy education. Hadley (2006) described her use of feminist music therapy pedagogy (FMTP), based upon her experience teaching music therapy in the university setting. She reported that her “philosophy of education is that people learn by doing and that it has a longer-lasting impact if people enjoy it and it is meaningful” (p. 397). Important concepts she listed for FMTP include the teacher as learner, incorporating safety and support in the classroom, power analysis, shifting from the banking system of education, incorporating subjective experiences and feelings,
reflexivity, empowerment, enjoyment, advocacy, and incorporating feminist theory into the content of courses and curriculum.

In addition to incorporating feminist teaching methods, Hadley (2006) has also created changes within the actual curriculum in her music therapy courses based upon FMTP. For instance, her students now study feminist theories, assessments, supervision, and implementation of music therapy. She recommended that other educators utilize FMTP and promote critical thinking and analysis for both themselves and their students.

For the purposes of this study, FMTP will be defined as music therapy teaching methods that include “remaining a learner/participant, safeguarding the initial learning environment, awareness of power, deprogramming students’ banking system of education, emotions and experience as sources of knowledge, reflexivity, community empowerment and leadership, making learning fun, advocacy, [and] content” (Hadley, 2006, pp. 399-408).

Studies on feminist pedagogy

Several researchers have examined the use of feminist pedagogy in the university setting in a variety of classrooms (Duncan & Stasio, 2001; Hoffmann & Stake, 1998; Stake & Hoffmann, 2000). In the research conducted by Duncan and Stasio, faculty members \( N = 185 \) reported on their own use of feminist pedagogy in their teaching, using feminist pedagogy, as well as the behaviors of students in their classrooms. The results of this study indicated both positive and negative outcomes, as self-assessed by the participants, of using a feminist approach to teaching, regardless of the gender of the instructor. Some positive outcomes included validation and peer-feedback for students. Negative outcomes included negative student behavior, such as having the authority of
the instructor challenged in the classroom. The authors concluded that each faculty
member should carefully consider the benefits and costs of using feminist pedagogy.

Additionally, Hoffmann and Stake (1998) conducted a study of faculty members
who taught both women’s studies (WS) and non-women’s studies (NWS) courses ($N = 105$). Participants were asked to rate their teaching based on a scale of four areas of
feminist pedagogy: “participatory learning, personal experience, social
understanding/activism, and critical thinking/open-mindedness” (p. 86). The results of
this study indicated that participants focused on all four types of feminist pedagogy for
their WS courses, as measured by the author-derived scale, at a significantly higher level
than for their NWS courses. Additionally, the participants reported to have “a very high
commitment to promoting critical thinking and open-mindedness” in their WS courses
and emphasized different pedagogical techniques for the WS and NWS courses (p. 90).

Stake and Hoffmann (2000) surveyed both students ($N = 111$) and faculty
members ($N = 789$) regarding the use of feminist pedagogy in WS and NWS classes.
They distributed a survey using a 7-point scale adapted from Hoffmann and Stake (1998)
at the beginning and end of the semester for students enrolled in both WS and NWS
courses. The results indicated that both students and teachers felt that “critical
thinking/open-mindedness and participatory learning themes” were accentuated in WS
classrooms (p. 36). All four areas measured by the survey—participatory learning,
personal experience, activism, and critical-thinking—occurred at significantly higher
levels in the WS classroom than NWS and “student ratings were significantly higher for
WS than NWS classes for all themes except participatory learning” regarding the use of
feminist pedagogy by their teachers (p. 35).
Hahna (2010) surveyed music therapy educators \((N = 188)\) to determine (a) how many music therapy educators used FMTP and (b) if there was a relationship between the use of FMTP and academic rank of the participants. Seventy-two participants responded to this study, with 69 participants included for data analysis. Stake and Hoffman’s (2000) feminist pedagogy survey was adapted for this study, examining four subscales of feminist pedagogy: (a) participatory learning, (b) validation of personal experience/development of confidence, (c) political/social activism, and (d) critical thinking/open-mindedness. The results of the study revealed that 46\% \((n = 32)\) of participants identified as feminist music therapists and 67\% \((n = 46)\) of participants identified as using FMTP. Results of a mixed ANOVA revealed a statistically significant difference within the four survey subscales \((p < .0001)\), no significant difference \((p = .32)\) for academic rank, and no significant interaction \((p = .08)\) of academic rank the four survey subscales. A Tukey post hoc analysis of the data indicated that the survey subscale measuring political activism \((p < .0001)\) was significantly lower than the other three survey subscales.

Hahna (2010) also conducted qualitative analysis of the open-ended questions in her pilot study. Each respondents’ answers to the open-ended questions in the survey were transcribed and reviewed to determine meaning units. The researcher read and re-read the transcripts of the open-ended questions until she was familiar with them and then made broad categories for each theme. A reflective journal throughout the process of reading, coding, and re-reading responses was maintained. Two music therapy educators reviewed categories and subcategories to reach consensus. Next, the researcher further synthesized the meaning units for each broad category. Member checking was not used.
because the survey was conducted anonymously. Cross analysis of the categories and subcategories was also used after all of the responses had been characterized.

The study explored by Hahna (2010) reasons in which some respondents did not identify with feminist music therapy or FMTP, such as the fear of backlash, and made recommendations that the field of music therapy explore not only competency-based curriculum changes, but those grounded on a pedagogical framework. The pilot study concluded that FMTP was identified as a possible pedagogical theory upon which music therapy educators could use to form the basis of their teaching strategies, lessons plans, and curricular decisions.

A qualitative analysis of the open-ended responses from this pilot study found a variety of reasons why music therapists did or did not use feminist pedagogy as a basis for their instruction. Reasons some music therapists gave for using feminist pedagogy included that it was consistent with their teaching style and that they identified with the definition provided. Reasons some music therapists did not identify with using feminist pedagogy included the fact that it was inconsistent with their teaching approach, that they did not identify with the definition, and/or that they did not feel that feminist pedagogy equated effective teaching. Below are two representative responses from participants that both identified with FMTP (#35) and did not identify with FMTP (#20):

*Participant 20:* Feminists enter a slippery slope when they begin aligning themselves with qualities that may simply represent effective teaching.
Participant 35: Because all of those elements in the definition fit my core being as a teacher...the paraphrased definitions provided in this survey help me to better understand how I am different from some of my male colleagues and perhaps why there are those differences.

For a full description of the responses of participants, see Hahna (2010). As can be seen by the above responses, regardless of how music therapy educators identified with the label FMTP they did reflect on some of the more theoretical aspects of teaching—pedagogy. The varied nature of responses from this pilot study served as the basis for the semi-structured interview questions used for this study.

The changes in higher education philosophy, pedagogy, curriculum, and teaching strategies from Colonial times to the present has been extensive. Higher education has moved form a focus on recitation of facts (primarily because there were limited numbers of textbooks), to the teaching of skills (during the Industrial Revolution), to the teaching of ideas (current practice). The field of music therapy has grown as well, from a single course taught without a textbook in 1919 to a field that has educational possibilities from the undergraduate to the post-doctoral level. The broad variations in music therapy education became focused with the shift towards competency-based instruction, but at what cost? The reduction of skills, either for teaching or student learning, to define competence without the framework of sound pedagogy places the expansion and growth of music therapy at-risk. It would be wise for music therapy to join with many other helping professions in their expansion of the Scholarship of Teaching and to explore pedagogies that would support both the student and the teacher. As Hadley (2006) suggested, FMTP shows to be a promising pedagogical approach for music therapy and
will be the focus of this study. The purpose of this study is to explore the phenomenon of feminist pedagogy as experienced by music therapy educators using a phenomenological approach.
CHAPTER 3

Method

Participants

A purposive sampling procedure was used to select participants for this study on the use of feminist music therapy pedagogy (FMTP) by music therapy educators. Purposive sampling was used to find participants that would “best help the researcher understand the problem and the research question” (Creswell, 2009, p. 178). Additional participants were found using snowball sampling. Snowball sampling is defined as a technique for finding research subjects. One subject gives the researcher the name of another subject, who in turn provides the name of a third, and so on. This is an especially useful technique when the researcher wants to survey or interview people with unusual characteristics who are likely to know each other—vegetarians, for example. (Vogt, 1993, p. 213)

The criteria for selecting participants was (a) they had written a book chapter in Feminist Perspectives in Music Therapy (Hadley, 2006), (b) they teach music therapy courses, and (c) they incorporated feminist theories into their teaching methods.

Four individuals volunteered to participate in this study. Each participant signed an informed consent form (see Appendix A), a release audiotaping of the interviews (see Appendix B), and completed a demographic form (see Appendix C). All of the participants identified as white or Caucasian and as women (N = 4). The mean age for the participants was 53 years. The participants had been music therapists for anywhere from 23 years to 36 years (M = 29 years), had been teaching music therapy for anywhere from 13 years to 24 years (M = 20 years), and had been teaching music therapy using feminist
pedagogy from anywhere between 7.5-14 years \((M = 11.5\) years, \(n = 3\)). One participant did not provide an exact number of years that she had been using feminist pedagogy, stating that “it has been evolving from the beginning.”

**Procedure**

Semi-structured, in-depth interviews took place over the course of one year and consisted of face-to-face interviews. Each participant received, via email, a copy of the potential interview questions that the researcher might ask in an attempt to decrease the power differential between the researcher and the participants. See Appendix D for a list of the interview questions used as a basis for this study. The interviews lasted from 1 ½ hours to 3 hours each. Three of the interviews occurred in a nosier environment (i.e. in the courtyard of a music therapy conference) and one interview occurred in a quiet environment (i.e., in the participant’s house). Empathetic interviewing was used to create a more collaborative relationship and reflexive stance (Fontana & Frey, 2005). After the initial face-to-face interview, the researcher contacted participants via email, telephone, or in-person to discuss specific aspects of their interview as well as for member checking of both the transcript and the results section. The researcher used member checking throughout the study in a variety of ways such as (a) sending a verbatim transcript of the interview to the participants, (b) sending the results section of the study to the participants, (d) sending revised versions of the results section, with the participants’ feedback incorporated, to the participants, and (e) sending the discussion section of the study to participants for their feedback.

Each interview was recorded and transcribed verbatim by the researcher. The analysis of the data were conducted in accordance with Giorgi’s (1975)
phenomenological method. This method uses the following steps: (a) reading and re-reading the transcripts to “get a sense of the whole” (Giorgi, p. 74), (b) determining “meaning units” (p. 74), (c) “clarify[ing] or elaborat[ing] the meaning…by relating them to each other and to the sense of the whole” (p. 74), (d) transforming the meaning units where “each [meaning] unit is systematically interrogated for what it reveals about the learning process in that situation for that subject” (p. 75), and (e) “synthesiz[ing] and integrat[ing] the insights achieved into a consistent description of the structure of learning” (p. 75). A “phenomenological attitude” was used throughout this study in which I attempted to understand the phenomena of feminist pedagogy “as a phenomenon for the experiencer but not necessarily a reality in the world” (Giorgi & Giorgi, p. 2008, p. 170). The researcher worked with the data by hand, printing each transcript on a different color cardstock, reading and re-reading each transcript in its entirety, and taking notes in the margins of the paper. After several readings of the transcript, the researcher underlined meaning units in each transcript several times and began making notations of possible themes or categories for the meaning units. Before cutting meaning units of the transcripts and placing them into themes, the researcher shared samples of the transcripts with two music therapy educators to confirm the appropriateness of the categories and to cross-check categories.

Next, the researcher cut out meaning units from each transcript and placed them with the appropriate theme(s). Initially, there were 12 themes. As the researcher cross-checked categories, she narrowed down the themes to 7 categories and then finally to 5 categories. The researcher then compared meaning units within and between categories. The meaning units were linked together by categories by hole punching each meaning
unit and collecting them into a single book ring. This allowed the researcher to flip through the meaning units, as needed, as she worked on synthesizing the data. The final five categories were shared with a colleague that had over 20 years of teaching music therapy to allow for inter-rater reliability before the researcher analyzed and interpreted the data. Throughout this process, the researcher also kept analytic memos (Saldaña, 2009) as a means of bracketing. According to Forinash and Grocke (2005), bracketing is “the researcher’s ability to suspend or bracket his or her beliefs about the phenomenon being studied” (p. 321).

To address methodological validity, the researcher used triangulation to allow for multiple perspectives and sources of the data. The multiple sources of data included: (a) the transcripts and audiotapes of the interviews, (b) the researcher’s analytic memos, and (c) the song lyrics that participants mentioned and/or sung by participants during their interviews. Triangulation of the data were used to allow for a richer view of the phenomena of feminist pedagogy.
CHAPTER 4

Results

This study examined the phenomena of feminist music therapy pedagogy (FMTP), as experienced by four music therapy educators, using phenomenological inquiry. The researcher believed that a better understanding of the lived experience of music therapy educators that use FMTP could inform music therapy practice and education. The following research questions served as the basis for this study:

1. Do music therapy educators use FMTP in teaching music therapy?
2. If so, how do they use FMTP?
3. What is their experience in using FMTP?
4. How do feminist music therapy educators define their use of FMTP in undergraduate and graduate music therapy education?

It is important to note that my intention in conducting this study was not to glean a single definition of FMTP or to imply that there is a single way to teach music therapy from a feminist perspective as is consistent with feminist theory in general (Ballou, Hill, & West, 2008). On the contrary, I conducted this study to provide insight into thoughts, philosophies, and practices of music therapy educators that use FMTP to understand the complexities and multiple layers of practice. My own practice of using feminist pedagogy in the classroom has led me to incorporate intellectual flexibility in this qualitative study. Intellectual flexibility is “the ability to contend with various, sometimes opposing, ideas simultaneously for the sake of increasing agency and critical analysis” (Villaverde, 2008, p. 124).
This chapter presents the findings of 4 participants’ in-depth interviews that were reduced to 294 meaning units, over 40 analytic memos written by the researcher, and 10 song lyrics that were mentioned and/or sung by participants during their interviews. The data for this study were analyzed according to Giorgi’s (1975) phenomenological method (see Chapter 3 for additional information regarding Giorgi’s data analysis method). Five main categories emerged from the meaning units explored. These included: (a) the philosophical framework described by the participants, (b) the goals of FMTP, (c) teaching methods used in FMTP, (d) institutional and social barriers the participants experienced, and (e) the participants’ experiences of backlash and their responses to this.

This chapter begins with a summary of the results for each research question. This is followed by the presentation of the data by category using thick description. Thick description (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005) is an important component of qualitative research that includes detailed illustrations of the participants’ lived experience through the presentation of participant quotes regarding the phenomena being studied. Giorgi (1975) classified thick description as a way to show the participants’ world and understanding of phenomena. By frequently using participant quotes, Giorgi advocated that thick description could help to reduce the researcher’s bias by preserving the context and descriptions exactly as the participant stated them—without interpretation. Occasionally, the researcher’s memos and/or song lyrics described by the participants of this study are woven in with the participants’ quotations about the phenomena under investigation in this section to provide multiple viewpoints of the data.
Research Questions

Each semi-structured interview sought to understand the lived experiences of the participants in relation to the phenomena of FMTP. The data revealed unique aspects of each participant’s understanding of FMTP as well as some similarities in terms of practice.

Category 1: Philosophical Framework of FMTP

A total of 86 meaning units were grouped under the category of philosophical framework. In this category, participants described how FMTP provided a foundation for not only what they taught but how they taught. Seven subcategories were identified with this category. These included: (a) external vs. internal validation, (b) naming and labeling, (c) identity markers such as race, sexuality, gender, and disability, (d) the practice of both music therapy and music therapy education, (e) connections to community music therapy, (f) similarities between transformative education and/or critical pedagogy, and (g) the participants’ personal reasons for using FMTP as well as their personal definitions for FMTP. See Figure 1 for the distribution of meaning units in the first category—Philosophical Framework of FMTP.
Figure 1. Distribution of meaning units for category 1—Philosophical Framework.

**External vs. internal validation.** Four meaning units (5%) were placed in the subcategory of external vs. internal validation. In this subcategory, participants described their internal struggles with looking outward—in terms of music therapy as a profession, feminism, and personally—for validation and also realizing the limitations of this type of focus. Comments in this subcategory varied from looking for external validation from printed materials outside of music therapy, the medical model, the health care system, and as a reference point for gender constructs. Participants described their thoughts regarding internal and external validation in the following passages:

*Elizabeth:* “[Throughout my life, I have had] to question gender roles, our relationships, our work, and our choice of career. And with that [I have had] to question our value. How do we value other women and how to we value ourselves? And so, I think a lot about what I’ve written or questions [I’ve had] about valuing women. And, how does women’s values, or
valuing women, translate into all aspects of my life? [I’ve also realized] that it’s very hard to pigeonhole feminist pedagogy without including other aspects of my life. I have thought a lot about our profession, about music therapy as women’s work, and, [and about how] my choice of a career path [in music therapy] really lies within the realm of traditional gender roles as a helping profession. I [have] thought not only about how women are valued by society…[but about] how music therapy is valued by society…[what it means] to be valued. And often we look to external constituencies for that valuing that we… [are] operating from an external locus of control…[especially for] the recognition we so crave…we are so focused on outcome measures, you know. And this, to me, also parallels my journey as a feminist, to value myself as a woman. To value the work I do. To value the music I make. It’s good enough…we tend to undervalue ourselves…and…see the profession of music therapy as being undervalued.”

Sandra: “I think back to defining ourselves in relationship to men…the male gaze of looking at women and, you know, you are who you are only in…your relationship to men.”

**Naming and labeling.** Twenty-five meaning units (29%) were placed in the subcategory entitled naming and labeling. This subcategory contains descriptions of the participants’ experiences with labels including those coming from society and those coming from themselves. The participants described the significance of labeling, especially in terms of ways in which a label can cause bias and/or demonstrate that a
particular group is marginalized. See Figure 2 for the distribution of meaning units within the subcategory naming and labeling.

![Graph showing distribution of meaning units in naming and labeling subcategory.]

**Figure 2**: Distribution of meaning units in naming and labeling subcategory.

**Naming by dominant group.** Two responses reflected on the practice of the dominant group naming groups of people and the effects of such labels in terms of oppression and marginalization. The following quote from Susan provides an example of this understanding of the power of labels:

*Susan*: “If something’s not named, then it means it’s probably part of the dominant group…as soon as it’s labeled…as soon as the label’s there, you realize it’s less than the one that’s not labeled. So, I talk about naming practices [in my classes] and I say, maybe we should call Intro to Music, Intro to Dead White Man’s Music. Or perhaps we should call GIM
Misunderstanding of term “feminist.” Six meaning units were grouped together as related to a broader social misunderstanding of the term feminist. Participants described varying feelings ranging from disbelief that music therapists did not understand feminism to hopefulness that the general public will be open to broadening the current limited awareness of what feminism is. The participants summarized the stereotypical depiction of feminist as “bra burning to man hating…castrating…all the stereotypes” (Sandra). Two participants also made reference to the fact that feminism is often referred to as the “f-word” (Elizabeth & Sandra). And one participant described how claiming the label feminist, or being labeled feminist, could have repercussions:

Michele: “Growing up [pause] the label of feminism was an insult. It meant [pause] it was an insult. To really call yourself that and get away [with it?] You couldn’t get promoted. You couldn’t get a job. It closed a lot of doors. And I think people my age still carry some of that, some of that fear.”

Post-feminist society? Another topic depicted in four meaning units gleaned from the interviews was the emerging public notion that we live in a post-feminist society. While in the previous subsection discussed the pressures of the actual label of the term feminism, as experienced by the participants, this subsection depicts how society has attempted to disregard the current work of the feminist movement.
One participant (Elizabeth) described having tea with her university president [at Converse College in South Carolina] and the topic of feminist music therapy came up. She reported that the president replied, “oh, well, we don’t really use that term anymore, do we.” Elizabeth described the subtleties of that statement and reflected upon her own identification with feminist music therapy and social pressures and assumptions regarding this term.

Another participant compared the current tendency to dismiss the need for feminism with the oppression experienced by African Americans, in the following quote:

Susan: “Some people say we’re in a post-feminist society now, but I mean, if you still have to worry about whether you call yourself [a feminist] or not, are we post-feminist? It is like saying that now that Obama is President, we’re in a post-racial society. That doesn’t really make sense to me.”

Sandra described the tendency for people to dismiss feminism as unnecessary in the following statement:

Sandra: “Everyone is now [saying] ‘We’ve made it! Woohoo, happy day! It’s [feminist movement] all over.’ And when we can’t even get basic pay equity. I mean, it’s so obvious [that we do not have equity]—on paper.”

Telling students and administrators. Due to the connotations and misinterpretations of feminism in our culture, I explored ways in which the participants disclosed their use of feminist music therapy and FMTP, in the interviews, to both students and administrators. A variety of approaches were used, that were based on the context participants found themselves in. A total of five meaning units were placed in this subcategory.
For some respondents, the word “feminist” was too limiting—they see what they do as beyond feminism. For example, Elizabeth commented, “yes, I might tell my students that I’m informed by feminism, which is the way I like to language it because ‘a feminist’ is way too static for me.” For others, they thought about the consequences of including the word feminist during the job interview process. Sandra described her thoughts when looking for a job in the following passage:

*Sandra:* “To be honest, when I was applying not so far back for jobs, I hid the feminist from my CV…I thought about that very carefully…but once I was there [laughs]…but as my jarring thesis title is quite clear what that is. I took that off my CV and I put in the discipline of my thesis…of my doctorate. But you have to carefully think about that. Because it can have repercussions.”

**Not an academic feminist.** Two participants differentiated between their connections to being a feminist music therapist and being an academic feminist. Five meaning units were placed in this subcategory. All of the meaning units in this category referred to a hesitance to be associated with an academic understanding of feminist since the participants did not study feminism in a university course and/or because they did not study feminist pedagogy specifically. Here are two examples of participant responses for this subcategory:

*Elizabeth:* “I’ve been thinking about this and the first thing that came to my mind [was]…‘Oh my God, I’m not an academic feminist!’ I am not an academic feminist. I’ve not studied feminism. I have never taken a women’s studies course. Never. Where I’m coming from, or where I’m
situated is from lived experience.”

*Sandra:* “So, I was a feminist…[I] described myself as a feminist when I was in high school. It was during my own guided experiences [that I cam to understand feminism] and I think that is quite different than academic feminist circles sometimes.”

**Owning the title of feminist.** The final subsection of the naming and labeling theme includes the process of claiming the title of feminist in terms of personal understanding of the word and concept. Three meaning units were placed in this theme. The participants described how the transformation in thinking they experienced from using FMTP and/or being a feminist music therapist helped them view the word feminist in a personal way. Michele described this shift in thinking in the following quote:

*Michele:* “it’s an aspiration [pause]…it’s an aspiration to be a feminist.”

This quote encompasses both the continued need for work (personal and social) inherent in a feminist framework as well as the desire to continue that work. It also makes reference to the process involved in feminist perspectives, as opposed to a product.

**Identity markers.** Another foundational element of the lived experience of music therapy educators using feminist pedagogy was their description of identity markers and their connections between these markers and privilege and oppression. Thirty-four meaning units (39%) were placed in the identity markers category. The subcategories for this theme included gender, disability, race, and sexual orientation. Each subcategory will be examined, in connection to the participants’ depictions of them, in the following section. See Figure 3 for the distribution of meaning units in the subcategory of Identity Markers.
Figure 3. Distribution of meaning units in the subcategory identity markers.

Gender. While not the sole focus of feminist theory, the construct of gender was discussed by all four of the participants. A total of 14 meaning units were gathered in this subcategory. As there is a great variety and complexity of statements regarding this theme, several excerpts from the interview transcript will be used to provide a broader perspective and description of this phenomenon.

Susan: “You may have noticed [that] I haven’t said much about gender. I don’t see feminism as just about gender. I see it as about power and oppression. And I think that some people see it more narrowly than that, which is why I think it [ignorance] is scary.”

Sandra: “We had a smaller number of men in the program/class [women’s studies]…and yet, they felt like they had to represent all of “mankind.” It’s like, ‘no, you need to let that one go.’ And when we talk about, you know, male patriarchal culture, we’re not holding you personally responsible, nor could we, because women and men are in the mix all
together. But, that’s where it gets…it is easily misunderstood as male bashing and saying, ‘you personally as a man are responsible for all these things.’ Individual men aren’t responsible for—not all individual men are responsible for the sexism and oppression—but individual men should be as responsible for the change as women are as well.”

*Michele:* “When I was growing up, girls did ‘this.’ We didn’t play the trumpet. We couldn’t be patrol boys, we couldn’t be drum majors [pause] there were all these things you couldn’t do just because of your gender. Just because you’re born as a girl—these things are off limits to you. And probably for guys too…I was told as a girl ‘you may not play the trumpet.’ ‘You may not be a patrol boy.’ I wanted to be a patrol boy so bad. I remember saying, “why can’t I? All you do is step off the curb and stop traffic”…it made no sense to me. There’s nothing here that I can’t do.”

*Sandra:* “I was walking in downtown Montreal…I was walking alone and it was sort of a new area [of town]…and I hear some footsteps behind me. I’m like, ‘oh, okay.’ I put my hand on my purse and I walk more seriously like I know where I’m going. But this guy came up, and passed me [pause] I could hear his footsteps were overtaking me. And I didn’t want to look like I was running. Anyway, he passed me and he looked back and he could see that I was scared…and he looked at me and said, ‘I’m not going to hurt you.’ So men suffer because they are seen as potential perpetrators. You know?”
Another way in which gender constructs, and oppression, were communicated and shared were through the use of music. The song *Spirit Healer* (Bishop, 1992) was sung by Elizabeth during her interview to depict activism and the women’s movement. Below is an excerpt from this song:

*Spirit Healer* (Bishop, 1992, track 7)

*Song Lyrics*: “There’s a woman next to you, she’s got next to nothing.

Tell me where is the spirit healer.

At the end of her line, she’s so tired and lonely.

Where is the spirit healer?

It just does not seem right. It’s so hard to get over.

All these moments of suffering, just remind us to love.

To pull us straight ahead. You know it only seems natural.

Sometimes I feel like I’m dying instead.

Woman, don’t you know, you’ve got to change it.

Don’t you know you’re the spirit healer.”

“Spirit Healer” (Bishop, 1992, track 7)

*Sandra*: “Everybody thinks they’re an expert on men and women, because they are either a man or a woman [laughs]. And, yet, it’s amazing how our culture’s general public is so unaware of the impact of violence against women. And, so it makes it a little more challenging because…often you get a sense that they feel like they’re experts and have nothing to learn.

Whereas, if I give a talk on palliative care, they’re eager to learn because
“they don’t know”[about it]…even with or without training. [But,] even with or without training we all feel we’re experts on what it means to be a man and a woman [laughs].”

**Disability.** Five meaning units were placed in this subcategory. The participants described their thoughts about what is normal, how society defines normal, and the barriers (physical or not) that exist for people with disabilities in this culture.

_Susan:_ “You know, we appear to be good people because we do this thing for other people. But, then it becomes about us. About what makes us feel good about ourselves. And I’m worried about that in [music] therapists. I’m worried that it has become a parasitic relationship. We need people to be disabled so that we feel good about what we’re doing for them. So we don’t really want to re-define what society sees as disability, because then we’ve lost our place.”

_Michele:_ “We have [clinical] sites, you know, [where music therapy students] are really working with really marginalized people and really trying to create space for them to be…and that is very politically active because it’s sort of not taking people off into clinics and working with them behind closed doors. To do it that way, it’s more [like] trying to meet them in the community and saying, ‘this is our community. Our community is diverse. And we don’t shove people with disabilities off to the corner.’ And, the political action there is to work in front of people and say, ‘here we are, this is part of the community in which we live.’”
Both meaning units for the identity marker disability also capture the need for social change by the participants, either in how we think about disability or how we interact with people with disabilities in a social manner. The idea of social action as a goal of feminist pedagogy will be explored further in the second category of meaning units of the results section.

**Race.** All four participants engaged in the discussion of race as an identity marker. A total of 10 meaning units were gathered as part of this subcategory. Participants discussed their own lived experiences with the civil rights movement, having African American mentors and teachers, their personal understanding of what it means to be white, and their understanding of racism within society as a whole, within academe, and within music therapy. Below is a sample of the personal stories the participants shared regarding race:

*Michele:* “Yeah, I’ve run into this [racism]. My kids—their dad is Lebanese, Arab American. So, we’ve encountered a lot of hostility about their heritage and when to call that into question and when is that going to help them? Am I helping in that moment or am I just making it worse for her [daughter] by stirring things up? That’s a hard one. That’s a hard one. Yeah. And that invisibility thing of, oh, people are always thinking they are free to tell me anti-Arab jokes [pause] and you know I always receive this and go, ‘Oh. By the way, you just insulted my kids.’ The times I’ve called people on that kind of stuff, has been [pause] that’s been a real process for me, too [silence]. Good stuff you’re doing. It really is.”
Sandra: “When I’m working with women survivors of violence, and [some] women of color may not want to report [the violence] to the police because they genuinely put their partners at risk of another form of discrimination. But they are indeed [at] risk of losing their children because of their not meeting the ‘the ideal white woman’ standard of motherhood, which of course, even white women can’t meet. But, it’s because the game is rigged for other women.”

Both Michele’s and Sandra’s descriptions of how they have encountered the white standard of race on a personal and professional level are full of layers of nuance and innuendo. Susan also discussed her concerns regarding race in the following passage:

Susan: [describing the work that some music therapists share about their [clinical] work with African American youth] It is as if they are saying, ‘I’m such a wonderful person.’ I have said to some people before who work with poor African-American kids, or [who are] using code words—at-risk youth or urban youth which both mean poor, people of color—I have said, ‘the work that you do, all these wonderful things that happen does that make you feel like the great white savior?’ People hate it when you say that. But we have so many examples [of this] in our films, you know, of white people going into schools and saving all these kids and making them achieve all of these wonderful things.”

Susan also described times when she is reflexive about her own race and racism with her students in the next passage:
Susan: “And I say in my classes, ‘I’m racist.’ And they [students] look at me. So I say, ‘well, I participate in the system that is used to oppress people who aren’t white, and I’m white, and I benefit just purely because I’m white.’ And they [students] go, ‘well, that doesn’t make you racist!’ And I say, ‘well, I’m not changing the system. Right. I’m benefiting from the system, which means I’m benefiting from racism. So that makes me racist.’ And that’s a hard thing for people to take on.”

Susan’s comments regarding owning her own participation in racism left me wondering a lot about my own thoughts about race and racism. Below is an excerpt from an analytic memo I wrote after reading Susan’s transcript:

Memo: “I can’t believe she said, ‘I’m a racist’ to her students. I don’t want to believe it’s true. Because, if it’s true for her, then it’s true for me. I want to hold onto this belief that I am ‘okay’ because I understand about oppression. I found a website called, Things [sic] White People Like (Lander, 2008). Is this true? Have I ever really stopped to think about my own whiteness? I worry about the consequences of Sue’s statement with her students. What if they tell their parents or the Dean? I worry for her and for me. What if we are all found out?”

Another aspect of the interviews that captured the phenomena of race was a participant’s discussion of the song lyrics to a song, “Oh, Freedom” (Baez, 2009, track 6). During part of her interview, Elizabeth sang “Oh, Freedom” when she was recalling memories related to growing up in Spartanburg, South Carolina during the Civil Rights Movement. Elizabeth described the importance of the Civil Rights Movement, and freedom songs, in
terms of her own movement towards activism. After she sang the song, she described memories of the segregated South, Black music, and ways in which music served as a “bridge” towards change. An excerpt of this song is shared below:

Song Lyric: “No more crying, no more crying, no more crying over me.
And before I’d be a slave, I’ll be buried in my grave.
And go home to my Lord and be free.”

Sexual orientation. The final subsection on identity markers contains meaning units pertaining to sexual orientation. Five meaning units were identified as pertaining to this topic from the interviews. Participants discussed their thoughts and feelings on being either a lesbian or a heterosexual woman and the implications this had for their professional lives. Some participants discussed not wanting to disclose their sexual orientation to students while others felt it was important to do so. The wide variety of reflections on this topic are captured in the quotations below:

Michele: “There was no space for it [pause] there was no space to be anything but straight. There is no space to be anything but what I was supposed to be in this particular society [and in my family].” [reflecting on her lived experience before coming out.]

Susan: “I think it is important, with music, to consider how someone else could have interpreted the song if they were in a same-sex relationship [pause] or how would someone have taken this song if they had been abused [pause] or if they’re not Christian” [describing issues she discusses with her students when examining song lyrics].
The song, “Dear Mr. President” (P!nk, 2006) also depicts constructs related to both gender and sexual orientation, in addition to many other social issues such as homelessness, poverty, and war. This song was also brought up by Elizabeth during her interview when she was describing women artists/composers/musicians that wrote music in a “political, socially-conscious” manner. In the following excerpt, P!nk asks several rhetorical questions regarding gender and sexual orientation:

_Song Lyrics:_ “What kind of father would take his own daughters’ rights away?

And what kind of father might hate his own daughter if she were gay?

I can only imagine what the first lady has to say

You’ve come a long way from whiskey cocaine.

How do you sleep while the rest of us cry?

How do you dream when a mother has no chance to say goodbye?

How do you walk with your head held high?

Can you even look me in the eye?”

“Dear Mr. President” (P!nk, 2006, track 5)

_Memo:_ “[I’m] listening to ‘Dear Mr. President’…[and] crying while writing. [I] wonder about my own activism—or lack of—for oppressed people. [I’m] thinking about women in the world, in my own community—that had their rights taken away, or regulated, or banned for the circumstances [sic] that are bravely surviving everyday. Why do we elect men into power positions and not question their decisions—‘What kind of father would take his own daughter’s rights away? And what kind of father might hate
is own daughter if she were gay?’ I need to do more for LGBT rights. It is
time to use music for activism for women, as we saw from the community
of musicians and artists in the 60s. Questioning people in authority is the
highest form of…patriotism—it means you care enough about the
oppressed in our country and beyond to demand accountability.”

**Practice of music therapy and education.** In addition to describing the
philosophical foundations of FMTP, the participants also described their ideas regarding
the broader philosophy of how music therapy and education is either currently practiced
or should be practiced. These ideas appeared foundational to the participants’ use and
practice of FMTP and will be discussed in this section. Six meaning units (7%) were
included in this theme.

*Susan:* “They [students] say to me, ‘What is your aim? Is it to make us feminist?’
And of course I say, ‘Yes.’ And then I laugh and say, ‘No.’ That would
be wrong of me to try to make you into something you don’t want to be.
My aim is to have you open your minds up enough to at least look at
things and decide whether it’s something you would like to incorporate or
not.’ So I really make them [students] think about ways in which—even
if they don’t call themselves feminist—how they could employ some of
these ideas. And how the principles in feminism could enhance their
work.”

**Community music therapy.** Three participants discussed their thoughts
regarding the similarities and differences between feminist music therapy and community
music therapy during their interviews on FMTP. A total of four meaning units (5%) were
categorized under this theme. Below are two examples of participant responses on this topic:

*Susan:* “You know, in some ways community music therapy is the only way a feminist therapist can go.”

*Sandra:* “Community music therapy and feminist music therapy dovetail, maybe just a little. They [community music therapists] don’t take it to great lengths. They do understand that their client [is not only a client] in a therapy room, but also a client in a community. But, I believe that you don’t only prepare the client for the community, you have to transform the community. Even if it’s not a feminist thing—if it’s looking at discrimination against people with disabilities—you have to change the community to have a better understanding, and knowledge, and acceptance—not only acceptance or tolerance, but appreciation for, a valuing of people with disabilities. But, community music therapy, obviously, doesn’t look at ourselves and our clients’ selves in a community as men and women in a community; so you absolutely cannot say you’re a feminist music therapist unless you’re actually, my own definition, unless you’re actively out there making efforts to change society.”

**Transformative education.** Another area of overlap described by the participants, as with community music therapy, was transformative pedagogy. Five meaning units (6%) were collected that captured the participants’ ideas regarding this topic and a sample of this is provided below:
Susan: “I think of it [FMTP] more in terms of personal transformation. So, I think transformation [is an important element]. I guess that should be part of my definition [of FMTP] that there should be some sense of personal transformation. I think [Paulo] Friere would say that, even though he’s not feminist. A lot of critical pedagogues would say that it [transformation] is an important element [in FMTP and/or critical pedagogy].”

**Personal reasons and definition.** Each participant had very individual and personal reasons for using FMTP as well as personal and individual definitions of FMTP. A total of eight meaning units (9%) were placed in this category. Some participants reported that they used FMTP due to the congruence of the theory with their teaching style and personal philosophies, while others talked about their hesitancy to define FMTP. Readers are referred to Table 3 for the individual definitions of FMTP provided by each participant. This section will focus on a more detailed understanding of the philosophies and reasons each participant had for using feminist FMTP.

Sandra: “There’s so much pressure, you know, because the spotlight is put on one person to represent and define feminist whatever feminist music therapy might be. And I think that this struck me when I read some of the responses to the book, you know, the [contributors] didn’t all agree—‘yeah, that’s the whole point. Yeah! Thank you very much. I’m so happy you saw that’ [laughs]. Because, it is a grassroots movement and there is no single definition, but that makes it challenging for every…for some who say ‘this is my approach and this is the way I do it so this is the way
the world should do it.’ But there’s such plasticity…in feminist thought and also in our own experiences.”

Elizabeth: “But it [feminism] is further than yourself. It becomes what everything you understood about the world becomes.”

Michele: “What I had to do was go back and look at what my core values were…about teaching, about research, and a lot of those things. When I looked at what my core values were, they lined up very nicely with what I see feminism to be. And so, I was able to say, ‘well so [while] I haven’t been talking about it in those terms, I have been talking about it.’ And, that’s why I think Sue’s [Hadley and Jane Edwards] title, Sorry for the Silence (Hadley & Edwards, 2004) is so interesting because so many of us were living it out, um, in ways without articulating it. And that just gave us the framework to say, ‘Oh yeah, it is feminist…what we do. This is our theoretical perspective that we’re coming from.”

Overview of category 1. The foundational ideas for the participants regarding the phenomena of FMTP were diverse and varied. They examined the tendency for music therapists to look outside of themselves for validation in their interviews. The participants linked this tendency for music therapy/music therapists to look for external locus of control to the patriarchal society in which we live. They also explored the use of naming and labeling in our culture and the ramifications of this practice. Some participants reflected on the different meanings between labels provided by the dominant group and labels claimed by a marginalized group. Additional labels, such as identity markers, were also explored in detail in the interviews. The participants discussed their own lived
experience with gender, disability, sexuality, and race. They described the limitations of
cultural constructs of these markers as well as the necessity for consciousness raising to
transform society. Next, the participants discussed their views of the limitations of the
current practice of music therapy, or music therapy education, as well as their hopes for
how this practice can expand as it becomes informed by feminist theories and
applications. The participants described FMTP’s similarities to two other approaches—
community music therapy and transformative education. While not widely practiced
currently, they describe an interest in how collaborations between these two models
might help the development of various music therapy approaches. This section concluded
with the participants’ personal descriptions for reasons they use FMTP as well as how
they define it. Each participant emphasized how they came to their own definition of
FMTP through their lived experience and stressed the importance of not trying to narrow
down a single definition as this would not be congruent with a feminist philosophy. For
this study, I collected their personal definitions in an attempt to show the wide variety of
ways of using FMTP, and not to try to create a single definition of feminist pedagogy
honoring the fluidity and diversity within FMTP. As this section described the
foundational aspects of FMTP, the next section will explore the goals of FMTP.

Category 2: Goals of FMTP

The first category of meaning units converged around the theme of the
philosophical foundations of using FMTP as an approach for teaching music therapy.
The second grouping of meaning units builds upon this theme and consists of goals of
FMTP for both the teacher and the student. A total of five goals, or subcategories, were
determined for this category. These are: (a) critical thinking, (b) giving voice, (c)
egalitarianism, (d) reflexivity, and (e) activism. Each of these five subcategories will be examined in detail in the following section. See Figure 4 for the distribution of meaning units for the category goals of FMTP.

Figure 4. Distribution of meaning units for category 2—Goals of FMTP.

**Critical thinking.** Five meaning units (7%) were grouped in the subcategory critical thinking from two of the participants in this study. The participants discussed encouraging students to think critically about theories they were learning in music therapy as well as of themselves. The participants also described misconceptions people have about the word critical and how it is used in feminist pedagogy. Below are some excerpts of the interviews on this subject:

*Elizabeth:* “Going back to questioning authority and questioning me, [pause] I hope that I convey to my students that theories are not sacrosanct…

that theories are meant to be questioned…that music therapy theory is
constantly in process and that they [students] can be part of that process. That they [students] can add to, they can subtract from, they can throw away theory altogether, if the theories seem to be outdated. That absolutism is not a workable premise in our field. That it’s permissible to try something new to see if it works.”

Susan: “If I use the term critical at all, they [students] think that means tearing something down. It’s a lack of understanding of that term. So, they [students] think to be critical means to be rude about something, and that’s of course not what I’m meaning by the term at all. But, I think to question is not something that they are comfortable with. So, [my emphasis on critical thinking is] to teach them that it [critique] is an okay thing to do.”

Critical thinking is something I reflected on as a researcher in this study as well during this study. I was constantly thinking critically about my own biases and stance, in an attempt to bracket my own personal biases. I was also questioning my own decisions regarding placing meaning units into specific categories as well as whether or not to collapse categories. I even began to question my use of grammar when transcribing the interviews, and realized how doing something as simple as adding a comment could dramatically change the meaning of a sentence. I decided to use verbatim transcripts with frequent member checking to help diminish my personal biases in writing up the Results Section. Below is an excerpt of my own personal process when trying to decide how to best capture the essence of the interviews:
Memo: “[I] reviewed Sue’s transcript [again]. Heavy concentration on race and sexuality. Perhaps I should have a category on constructs [eventually called this ‘identity markers’]. Perhaps I should evaluate these separately. The intersection of race, gender, and sexuality is so interesting. I wonder if other MTs I interview will highlight the same areas. She is so strong in her ideas and views. She has such a big vision for the field and profession. Her questions are deep and critical of the field and our need to be helpers. Am I a white savior? Is that why I’m studying feminism—to “free the oppressed?”

Giving voice. Seventeen meaning units (24%) were placed in the subcategory of giving voice. This theme described the feminist goal of giving voice to those whose voices may have been marginalized or absent from discourse, valuing women, empowering students and teachers, and honoring the lived experiences of both the student and teacher in and out of the classroom. All four participants discussed this topic at length. See Figure 5 for the distribution of meaning units in the subcategory of Giving Voice.
Empowering and valuing women. Three meaning units described the participants’ ideas regarding how FMTP aims to include women’s voices in various aspects of education, including curriculum and teaching strategies. Participants carefully discussed the importance of including women’s voices and emphasized that this was not to be at the expense of including men’s voices in the dialogue/classroom. Participants described the eventual goal of valuing women in FMTP as part of a broader goal of empowering students. Below is one participant’s comment on this topic:

Elizabeth: “So a question that I asked myself about our curriculum is how do we incorporate the value of women’s work into the curriculum? How do we value women as theorists? As performing artists? As composers and creators? As poets? How do we value the entire creative process [and share that with] our female students? I will say here too, that, it was comfortable for me to become an academic also knowing that…approximately 80% of our profession is composed
of women. Of course, again, [this brings me back to the ideas of] women’s work. And so a question that I ask myself throughout our coursework [at Converse College] is, ‘how do I bring the voices of other women artists, theorists, poets creators, creative women into the mix?’ Because I believe that still is a challenge for many women, [especially] young women, to think of themselves as creators.’

**Honoring lived experience.** Yet another aspiration of FMTP, according to the participants’ descriptions, is to better understand, incorporate, and honor the lived experiences of both students and teachers. Honoring lived experience is explained by hooks in the following passage: “including personal experience…sharing personal narratives yet linking that knowledge with academic information [can] really enhance our capacity to know” (1994, p. 148). This purposeful attempt to make connections between the student’s own history and the content of the class was also discussed in six meaning units. The first excerpt below features Sandra’s discussion of the difference between her own learning from books and from life experience:

*Sandra:* “My first thoughts…about feminist pedagogy began when I started teaching in the women’s studies program in Georgia. And, so only then I…began to read in and learn in that way instead of a personal experience.”

Susan also discussed the different forms of knowledge that come from living and feeling in the passage below:
Susan: “I think that we need to know [as teachers and music therapists is]…that [what] comes from emotions is just as important as this other [academic] knowledge that is talked about. Which is why I think that with critical [pedagogy] where we are becoming more aware of certain things, like the ways that we are informed, [and how that] ends up being [learned] through experience and emotions. And that we need to honor this kind of knowledge. I think that a lot of non-feminists…I mean, people who are qualitative will say that standpoint epistemology is the same thing. But, really, standpoint is a feminist method. That’s where it came from.

Knowledge from one’s own standpoint. From one’s own experience. I feel we need to look into that more. This ties into the experiential approach that I use [in teaching music therapy]. But even apart from that, it’s bringing our own experiences, and the experiences of others [to the classroom and/or music therapy setting]. This is why I love stories from other people…case studies, or whatever.”

**Diversity of voices.** Another aspect of the theme giving voice is the goal for the inclusion of a diversity of voices. Eight meaning units, from two participants, described the importance of having multiple voices in the classroom as well as music therapy discourse. Below are some quotes that are representative of this subcategory:

Michele: “[FMTP] has to do with equality [pause] it has to do with recognition of the smaller voices [pause] of different voices [pause] of the diversity of voices. And of trying not to push forward one agenda or one way of seeing the world—although that’s so much easier to grapple with. You
know, I grew up [pause] as an army brat, so I grew up in that mentality of, ‘this is the way you do things. There’s not an alternative way.’ You know, and I guess in the army you’re gonna lead people into battle, you can’t really have a diversity of voices [laughs]. You have to have, you know, people believing what we’re doing because they’re gonna give their life away. So, I kind of come from this very black-and-white upbringing.”

Sandra: “When we came and discussed the issue, when we were doing the book (Hadley, 2006), about whether men should be included…that was such a controversial topic. Such a controversial topic. Amongst us, some felt very hotly one way and some hotly the other, so there is a great diversity. And I felt a little bit of both, but it’s back to the old…When you mention women, people say the guys say, ‘what about us men?’…It’d be like asking…it seems so obvious in other areas. I’ll look at a book on black oppression and [I can’t imagine] some white guy or woman saying, ‘wait a minute I need to write a chapter on that.’ But, it becomes not so obvious when we talk about men and women. But again, it was quite a diversity and a lot of chat and discussion. And, that is great. The minute we sort of fall into the trap of having to have one way of doing it…that’s a problem.”

Egalitarian. Another goal of FMTP is to examine power differentials inside and outside of the classroom and to find ways to make the teacher-student relationship more egalitarian. All four participants discussed examining ways in which power is used, misused, and distributed. Below is one sample response discussing the need to analyze power differentials:
Susan: “There has to be an analysis of power on all levels. So, in the classroom student-teacher [pause] and in the therapy setting therapist-client, therapist-supervisor, student-supervisor, parent-child, you know. All those ways in which male-female, Christian-Other, heterosexual-non-heterosexual, white-non-white, able-disabled, those who have money-those who don’t, [etc. contribute to power differentials in the classroom and in the clinical setting]. We need to examine all kinds of ways power impacts relationships. So it’s not just about comparing women to men. Also, what happens when you get a woman who is disabled, or a woman who is black, or a disabled person who is gay or what’s the relationship between a black male and a white female? Or a disabled male and a white-able bodied female? Because that makes a difference. Geographically too, there are power relationships. I think people in the US [United States] don’t get to see so much as people outside of it [United States]. And, I think that causes me problems sometimes in class when I’m not very patriotic [about the United States]. They [students] are very quick to feel defensive about that.”

Elizabeth: “I hope that I work towards consensus building and shared leadership [in my classes], even with my [laughs] strength and dominance and understood power difference. [I hope] that I use my power wisely. I must accept the fact that I am in a powerful role [pause] that there is a power differential, just based on the hierarchical structure of teaching and academia. But I hope that I’m working within a framework that is
inclusive and that I equally listen to students. I think the other powerful way that we can work [using feminist pedagogy] within the curriculum—to provide that sense of egalitarian participation—is through improvisation.”

In addition to realizing that there are power imbalances, the participants discussed the importance of taking appropriate action and to monitor personal bias. Michele described her own feelings and concerns regarding the inherent power of a teacher in the classroom, especially regarding grading.

*Michele*: “I think the power imbalances in the classroom are [pause]…It’s one thing as an instructor to say, ‘I’m a feminist and I value diversity in voices.’ I even put that in my syllabus. I have a quote in my syllabus that says, ‘I have respect for diversity. If there are other ways that I can make this a more open classroom please let me know.’ But I state that in my syllabus. That said, I have to grade these people [students] you know. And I have to make choices about how, you know, what grade they get. Did they pass? Did they fail? So, as much as I try to be open and try to say, ‘yes I embrace all these voices,’ the bottom line is, you know, I get to pass or fail them. And that is a power imbalance I can’t do anything about….um, I never think you can actually be fair in grading. I know [another teacher] has these little grids of how many points for this, but to me, it’s just not that black and white. And I have a hard time with it. So, I don’t know how you get around that power imbalance…and in the end I have to make a judgment call…but I will truly do that in a context of
understanding, you know, your [student] perspective and your
voice….you can do that with an awareness and an openness and a respect
and you know, not assuming, ‘well I’m the therapist, I know
everything.’ ….You have to recognize that [power and] not pretend that
you don’t have it, cause, that’s incredibly dangerous for you and your
student if you pretend, as a teacher, that you don’t have power. But, to
acknowledge what you do have [regarding power]. To try to open up and
let go of what you don’t need to have power over and try to use the power
you have in the [pause] for the benefit of your student. That’s important.”

Reflexivity. All four participants discussed the goal of authenticity and reflexivity
during their interviews, with a total of 15 meaning units (21%) categorized for this theme.
Michele describes, in the quote below, the importance of reflexivity and listening to her
students:

_Michele_: “My goal is to pay close attention to how students are reacting in my
class and [to] see if I can get cues from them about where I am where my
biases are. Because that’s usually where I see it [my own biases]—in
reflection of somebody else. It’s not [pause], I mean, I know that they
exist, but what are they? I don’t know that I can always say exactly what
they are. So, it’s that awareness…and teaching and trying to listen—
trying to listen, you know, no only to what they’re [students] saying but
what they’re not saying. And, um, that’s sort of, yeah, how they respond
to what I’m saying is often where I kind of think, ‘oh, I’ve got an edge
here. But what is it?’ And it varies from class to class. It’s not like you
can figure it all out and have it and not have those issues again. It’s with every new class [pause] you put it out there and you have to wait to see what happens. Because you have different blind spots… and students [pause] some classes are just easier to embrace the diversity of voices and sometimes it’s harder. Sometimes you’re feeling a little insecure and you get a little block. A little stop. And it’s, I guess for me, it’s about listening…[pause] to what’s said and what’s not said.”

Elizabeth also addressed questioning all aspects of the teaching process and the teacher herself in the following quote:

*Elizabeth:* “And that’s part of [the] feminist process… self-critique and critiquing our languaging [sic] and our terminology… and consciousness raising.

[Using a feminist stance of reflexivity, I find myself saying] ‘Oh my gosh, I never questioned that. I never even thought about that.’ I never thought about the way the classroom is setup—that I’m at the lectern and the students are sitting down there. I never thought about that.”

Self-critique was discussed by Susan as something necessary not only as teachers but for the profession of music therapy.

*Susan:* “Unlike what you were saying before, in terms of ‘we’re always looking outside ourselves for validation.’ This is different. What I want to do is look outside ourselves [profession of MT] to help us be critical of ourselves so we can be more aware, so that we can be better [music therapists and music therapy educators].”
**Activism.** A total of 24 meaning units (34%) were grouped together in the subcategory activism. The essence of these quotes are described in three mean areas—(a) social action, (b) the personal is political, and (c) the potential perils of advocacy. The goal of political action in the classroom is another aspect of FMTP that is different from traditional pedagogies and will be explored in detail in this section. Crabtree, Sapp, and Licona (2009) described the importance of such concepts in the following passage:

consciousness-raising, social action, and social transformation are explicit goals of feminist pedagogy that are rooted in the desire to transform thought into action. Based in the principles of feminism and the material history of feminist organizing and consciousness-raising, then, feminist teaching is predicated on ideas about empowering individuals within a larger project of social change. (p. 4)

See Figure 6 for the distribution of responses in the subcategory, activism.

*Figure 6. Distribution of meaning units for activism.*
**Social action.** Twelve meaning units were placed in the subcategory social action. For this goal of FMTP, the participants discussed their own use of social activism as well as their encouragement of their students to take action in their community for positive change. Below is a sample of responses provided for this theme:

*Sandra:* “I do social activism with my clients…I encourage them to not only look at what they’re changing in their lives, in changing their roles and their experiences in the community, but [what they are] changing [in] the community, so—going to a Take Back the Night March as part of the therapeutic process [would be one example of social action that I have used].”

*Michele:* “Yeah, I mean, I do [notice changes in students’ learning from social action]. I get a wide range of reactions. There are students who embrace that [social action] and that is an important part of their identity as a music therapist. And I have others [students] who just, you know, that’s just [pause] I guess I’m thinking more [about] my master’s students right now. Um, because they’re younger. They’re in their 20s, some of them, and they’re not sure who they want to be and, you know, we become politically active [pause], you’re in people’s faces, and not everybody likes it. And not everybody can do that. But that’s why I feel like it’s so important for those of us who are older and have been around for a while to just take these stands because we can…Does that mean I was a chicken for the early part of my career? I don’t know. I’m going to try to do that
[social action]. But, being where I am now is probably [pause] ‘yeah, of course I should do this, I’m in a position to.’”

Listening to the participants’ discussion of the necessity of social action for transformation led me to think about my own social activism. Below is an excerpt from my research journal:

Memo: “Reading these transcripts] it has me thinking about the importance of speaking up. And, I think about the importance of community action and my own silence. If I did speak up each time something was wrong, how much more change could I create? Why do I tend to be safe and calculating? What does courageous mean to me? What would it look like in my daily practice? Perhaps knowing when and how to speak my truth is the most important lesson.”

It was, in fact, social action that brought many of the participants in this study to FMTP. Sandra reflects on this idea in her statement below:

Sandra: “And I do a lot of that [social action], actually. And that’s because that was informed from my feminist music therapy…If you only help women in their lives, within…a room with a closed door…then, you’ve not really helped them much at all. It’d be like re-arranging chairs on the Titanic. Because then you send them back out to a world that is sexist but also condones and encourages violence against women and blames women for the violence they experience. So, I do [engage in social action]. And sometimes, when I’m with students who may not have such a feminist [framework], I definitely promote political activism and social activism.
But it’s absolutely critical. And also, I just can’t “be.” I have “to do.” And so I encourage my students. It doesn’t have to be the particular issue of violence against women, there’s a myriad of things you can do for social activism. You can’t do them all, but you have to do something.”

**The personal is political.** The concept that the personal is political has been a central part of the women’s movement in the United States. The goal of understanding the connections between various identity markers and lived experience and then using these to inform social activism was described by three of the participants in nine meaning units. Here is an example of this concept, as described by Susan:

*Susan:* “So, what I’m saying is I think feminists are more honest and open about naming the political and talking about it, and realizing that everything personal is political. Because, if you think about what is personal…Okay, my identity is personal. Now, what’s in my identity? There’s my gender. Well, that’s very political. Let’s just look at gender. My gender says something about my position in society. Okay, what else is part of my identity? Well, in this particular society, race is an important identity marker. Again, that tells you your place in society, which is very political. What you gain and don’t gain in society is based on that. My ability. My physical look. Whether I’m attractive or not. Whether I’m thin or not. Whether I’m able-bodied or not. Whether I can hear. Whether I can see. Whether I can think well. All of those are part of my identity and it all is political in terms of my position in society. My religion, my class, my sexuality [are all personal and political]. And so, when people say that [the
political nature of identity markers] is not brought into the classroom [I think to myself], “It is, every single time.” It’s just not always made obvious, right? I think in a feminist classroom it [the personal is political] is.”

The potential perils of advocacy. Two participants discussed the potential perils of advocacy in their interviews, which were distilled to three meaning units. While all participants advocated for social activism as a goal of feminist pedagogy, two participants also warned against potential pitfalls that may come with advocacy if reflexivity is not also used. Sandra described her concerns in the following statement:

Sandra: “[One potential peril of advocacy comes] at the point [of] being an advocate for change for your clients, but then also knowing you have to watch for the egalitarian relationship to not just do [the work] for [them]. To allow them [students and/or clients] to be advocates for themselves. Because that’s truly then their own voices. But, it’s really the same [potential for peril] in the classroom with students and [wanting] their own voices to be heard. It’s a lot harder work and it requires more of the student than simply memorizing some facts on a piece of paper. It has to be an informed practice. But it goes so much further. It has to go beyond that [silence]. That therapeutic relationship is as much [about] who you are as your skills.”

Overview of category 2. Category one described the foundational elements the participants described as part of their understanding of FMTP. The second category—goals of FMTP—described aspirations mentioned by the participants in terms of their
own growth as well as the growth of their students in using FMTP. The goals of FMTP include elements such as critical thinking, in which both the students and the teachers are asked to question previously held assumptions regarding theory, dichotomies, and traditional roles. In doing so, the participants hoped that additional opportunities for a diversity of voices and approaches would be provided within the classroom. Participants described the need to include, and value, women’s voices and lived experiences as these have traditionally been excluded in a traditional classroom based on the banking-system. By allowing for a diversity of voices and thoughts, it was hoped that students and teachers would become empowered both within and outside of the classroom. Another goal of FMTP, as mentioned by the participants, was to examine power differentials and work towards egalitarian relationships. The participants did not deny that there were inherent differences in the relationship between teachers and students, however they discussed the importance in knowing and understanding how they use power in the classroom. In fact, some participants reported that it would be dangerous not to examine such power differentials. Yet another goal of FMTP was reflexivity. The participants discussed the importance of critiquing themselves and examining their own motives and biases as a way of being more authentic in the classroom. Many of the participants described this goal as difficult, yet necessary. The final goal of FMTP in music therapy, as described by the participants, was activism. The participants stated that activism was essential in a feminist classroom and also warned of the potential perils of using activism without also incorporating reflexivity and egalitarianism. The goals, according to the participants, must be used together—not hand-picked—to have the full understanding and lived experience of FMTP.
Category 3: Teaching Methods in FMTP

In addition to discussing the philosophies and goals of FMTP, the participants in this study also described ways in which they implement FMTP in the classroom. The participants examined aspects such as the content of classes, the method of instruction, as well as ways in which assessment and evaluation of student learning took place. A total of 8 subcategories were determined from the 75 meaning units collected for Category 3. These were: (a) classroom adaptations, (b) taking risks, (c) non-hierarchal learning models, (d) de-centering, (e) analysis of curriculum, (f) examination of teaching methods, (g) evaluations and grading, and (h) the use of music in the classroom. See Figure 7 for the distribution of meaning units in Category 3.

Figure 7. Distribution of meaning units for teaching methods.
**Classroom adaptations.** Ten meaning units (14%) discovered from the interview transcripts discussed various classroom adaptations three participants used as a means of implementing feminist principles into the classroom. The participants emphasized that practicing any of these classroom adaptations alone did not constitute using FMTP, and that music therapy educators should study feminist pedagogy and/or feminist theory in-depth to have a richer understanding of what it means to have feminism inform the practice of teaching music therapy. The responses for classroom adaptations were further categorized into three themes: (a) the use of circles, (b) the use of first names, and (c) creating a safe place. See Figure 8 for a breakdown of classroom adaptations.
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*Figure 8. Distribution of meaning units for classroom adaptations.*

**Forming circles.** Two participants described how they intentionally adapted the physical classroom environment by moving the chairs into a circle as opposed to a traditional lecture format of chairs in a row and the teacher at the front of the class. While many teachers use this adaptation, it was the way in which the participants
examined their use of sitting in a circle that highlighted the connection of this classroom adaptation to FMTP. Below is an excerpt from Susan’s interview regarding this topic:

Susan: “So, one way of doing it [equalizing the space in the classroom] is having everyone in a circle, instead of the teacher in front and everyone in rows. Right? Some people would say, ‘we do that anyway because we’re therapists and we like to have circles.’ At Temple [University] we always had [our classes held in circles] whether they [the teachers] think they’re feminist or not. And another thing is that even within that [having a class in a circle] I still have that spot near the board. I’m still at the front of the room and that’s my spot, you know? And I’m now thinking that I should just start sitting in other places. Also, instead of a circle, it becomes this slightly curved line until I tell them [students] to close it up.”

Using first names. Two participants, in three meaning units, discussed the idea of the teacher using their first name as a possible teaching method within FMTP. In her interview, Susan discussed the complications that exist for women in academia, especially those that use FMTP. She also described the difficulty both she and her students underwent regarding the practice of addressing teachers in higher education. Below is an excerpt of her interview on this topic:

Susan: “Another way [to incorporate feminist pedagogy into the classroom] would be in terms of address. Now, this has been a tricky issue for me. I started off with everyone calling me Sue, and I changed it. I may go back to it. Now, here’s the complicated part in being a woman in academia, right, is that people are more likely to call you by your first name because
you’re a woman and because they respect you less, right? So, therefore, you become less in their eyes. Now, that’s fine if you understand that and if you know why you’re doing this stuff. But….it became confusing. At the same time, what was happening was that they were calling one of my colleagues Dr…‘Smith’…and he didn’t have a Ph.D. And they were calling me Sue, right, or Mrs. Hadley. But when I asked one of my students, ‘why do you think that is?’ because we were talking about feminism [in-class]. She says, ‘it’s because we respect him.’ [laughs] I said, ‘do you know what you just said to me?’ and she had no idea that what she just said to me was a complete insult. I said, ‘I have a Ph.D. and he doesn’t, but you’re going to call him Dr. and you’re going to call me by my first name or Mrs. Hadley?”

**Safe place.** Because of many of the goals of FMTP, such as critical thinking, reflexivity, and giving voice, three of the participants described the need for teachers using this method to create a safe space for both the students and the teacher to be, think, and dialogue. This need to create a safe space is also important due to another teaching method within FMTP, de-centering, which will be explored later in this section. Below, Susan discussed her reasoning for creating a safe place in the learning environment:

*Susan:* “We need to start thinking [as feminist teachers about], well, how can we do all of this [de-centering]…and keep people safe…? Because sometimes I think that I become so passionate about being able to see the effects of it [patriarchy], the effects that these assumptions and biases and ways of being have on others that are oppressed, that I almost neglect
[pause] that vulnerability. Sometimes I want to say, ‘it’s not about you at the moment. You just need to get over yourself so that you can see this other stuff.’ But at the same time, I need to not do that. But, it’s sort of like this balance between how do you do both? Because if you spend all this time protecting them [students] and enabling them to be in that space, they’re never going to…they’re never going to feel that dissonance [pause]. They really need to look at those things that do shatter your very being. I don’t know. It’s important to have it shattered and at the same time I realize that they’re young and that they need nurturing. So I think that’s something we need to look at. How do we do both of those things and get through a curriculum?”

**Take risks.** Three participants discussed their personal use of risk taking in the classroom as ways in which they implement FMTP. Seven meaning units (9%) were gathered under this theme. Elizabeth described a new way in which she began using improvisation in music therapy sessions that she was co-leading with a student, to create an egalitarian relationship, and the results that this created in the supervisory relationship with that student. In the quote below, she describes how this style and approach to co-leading and supervision was in alignment with her philosophy of FMTP.

*Elizabeth:* “[Thinking about] my supervision style….I had never supervised a student quite like this before and it allowed me so much more freedom when I decided to do an improvisational approach. Because I could happily tell [the student] I had no idea of what was going to happen. Yes, we had our tools in front of us, and the children [clients] would choose
their instruments and play accordingly, but I really didn’t know how these sessions would evolve. And she [student] was willing to take that risk.”

In addition to using risk taking within the classroom, to show your own flexibility, openness, and willingness to hear multiple perspectives, some participants also described risk taking that they were undergoing professionally as part of their incorporation of feminist theory into their practice of music therapy and pedagogy. Michele reflected on a time when she took risks professionally in terms of her research paradigm in the following vignette:

*Michele:* “She [Barbara Wheeler] invited me to come and talk on qualitative research. And I did. And in the back of the room four of the NAMT [National Association for Music Therapy] top researchers—white men in suits—stood. They did not sit down at my presentation. They stood in the back of the room. Against the wall, with their arms crossed. You know, totally [gestures with arms crossed]…And, I was just like, ‘okay, that’s alright. You are welcome to have your set of opinions and I am gonna talk about QUALITATIVE RESEARCH and make it REALLY EXCITING.’ And I did. And now, years later, we’re friends. And they’ve moved on and I’ve moved on. And, we’ve moved through that. But, that sense of, you know, putting yourself out there. And realizing [that] there are people who are going to be very threatened by this [qualitative research and FMTP] and are going to react not well. And react hostilely.”

Many of the participants described risk taking as part of the broader understanding of reflexivity and social action, and not as a separate entity itself. Perhaps, it can be
considered an extension of these concepts, both within the classroom and outside of the classroom. It may also serve as an opportunity for the teacher to be a role model for students as part of their lived experience and “aspirations” as Michele described earlier in the manuscript.

**Non-hierarchical learning models.** All four participants discussed alternative models for teaching and learning in a feminist classroom. A total of 14 meaning units (19%) were collected on this topic after reading and re-reading the interview transcripts. Participants described this in a variety of ways, including a leaderless model, participatory learning, role modeling, and seeing the teacher as a student. Here are some quotes that represent the variety of thoughts described by the participants on the subject of nontraditional learning models:

*Sandra:* “Within a classroom setting, with my students and my teaching, I may…[place] the emphasis on such things as understanding…the necessity of egalitarian relationships as much as possible. In a setting where traditional patriarchal [methods of teaching] where the teacher has the vast majority of the power [and] students don’t. So I try to empower my students…[and] have them have an understanding, as well as myself, of the power differentials and the need for them [students] to see themselves as music therapists instead of music therapy students. Just getting them to think about the power differential and not the teacher as purveyor of information. The students then, they are active learners and teachers, as I am a learner and a teacher—in a community of learners.”
*Michele:* “[I use] a lot more prompting [as a feminist teacher]. A lot more prompting [pause] and modeling, you know, as a teacher, sort of modeling an openness and a not knowing…I don’t feel like I always have to know the answers to something that students ask. But sometimes I’ll just say, ‘you know that’s a good question. I’ve never thought of it that way.’ And, allowing that openness of, I’m not necessarily the expert…I know this amount of stuff [pause] but there’s plenty of stuff that I don’t know. Plenty of that I don’t know. And I just model that and say, ‘well, I’m not going to pretend that I know everything. I’m going to be open to those ah-hah moments myself in class because that’s what I want them [students] to be open to. That, ‘ah-hah, I never thought of it that way. Well, that’s a new perspective to have on that.’”

*Elizabeth:* “I feel very much like, ‘we’re all in this together. We are co-investigating this question.’ [When we are discussing music therapy theories in class, I encourage my students to view the theories as] amazingly, multi-faceted. I tell my students, ‘I don’t have all the answers. I do not pretend to have all the answers.’ I depend on all of us [students and teachers] to work together, to come to at least some of the answers together.”

**De-centering.** Another teaching method mentioned by the participants was de-centering. De-centering, also referred to as cracking by some participants, involves the “dislocation, displacement, and shifting away from certainty” that can be employed in a feminist classroom to help participants identify constructs, power differentials, etc. and
begin to develop a personal understanding and interpretation of lived experience (Villaverde, 2008, p. 10). Five meaning units (6%) were identified from the interview transcripts within this area. Two participants discussed ways in which they use de-centering in their teaching methods, including the use of questions and the challenging of assumptions. Here are two quotes regarding this subject from participants:

Susan: “I think that cracking that vulnerability can maybe discourage a lot of people from thinking of going in that direction [feminism]. But, I think it’s so important. Where we are in [a point in] history, at the moment, when this is really, really important.”

Michele: “[describing a teaching moment] I was just so much more out there in a way I’ve never been, and I could kind of see the students going, ‘who is this woman? What is she doing?’ Because I was just challenging all kinds of things in the moment, in a much bigger way that I would have done it—even last year….I’m putting it on the table. We’re just putting [pause] put on your seat belts, here we go’ [laughs].”

**Analysis of curriculum.** Another aspect of FMTP discussed by the participants was an awareness and analysis of the curriculum used in the classroom. This theme of meaning units focused on the content of what was taught, and not just on the process of teaching. Sixteen meaning units were extracted from the interviews with all four participants providing descriptions of their lived experience with structuring and critiquing the content of music therapy courses. The participants described a wide variety of thoughts on this subject, including the need for increased flexibility in the curriculum and class content to allow for student input, the need to increase the amount of feminist
content in the curriculum, the need to teach about specific issues of importance in feminist theory (i.e., child abuse or violence against women), and a discussion of the difficulty of attempting to fit additional content into an already full curriculum. In the following passage, Sandra described a frequently stated idea from many of the participants of already feeling overloaded in terms of the current required course content in music therapy programs:

*Sandra:* “It’s hard to fit it [feminist content] into the curriculum.”

With this in mind, several people discussed whether feminist theory should be discussed in a single class or slowly introduced over several courses:

*Elizabeth:* “I began to integrate a specific content area on feminist therapy in my senior class, and brought [the students] onboard with my research proposal [Finding Voice (York, 2006)]. And so, there was that lovely connection between feminist [therapy] with using [Gerald] Corey’s chapter…and sharing my research proposal with the students. I was able to integrate the results of this study into my senior class…in conjunction with the content area on feminist therapy and feminist research. [I would help the students to see] what [feminist research] looks like. [I could help them to see] how this [Finding Voice] evolved? I was also able to integrate [Finding Voice] into the section on qualitative research into the research class because then we could talk about ethnographic research [and] we could talk about grounded theory. I could demonstrate what the process was for me in the Finding Voice research.”
Susan: “I think that we [as feminist educators] need to look at how to bring in feminist theory into the content, not just the process, throughout the curriculum…in terms of feminist therapy. We’ve tried to do that [at Slippery Rock University]…more. So if they’re [students] doing ethics we bring feminist ethics into [the class]. If they’re doing assessment, we bring feminist assessment into [the class]. If they’re doing research, then feminist research methods get brought into [the class]. If we’re looking at how to analyze song lyrics, we bring in concepts from feminism.”

Other participants described their purposeful inclusion of specific content, based on feminist theory, such as child abuse or violence against women, as part of their curricular decisions. Elizabeth described the importance of her use of a particular song, “Take Back the Night” (Ester & York, 2003) in the following passage:

Elizabeth: “One song in particular [I’ve used with students is] called ‘Take Back the Night.’ [The song] is about child abuse. [The lyrics] are not graphic, but the words are difficult to sing. [We used this song in a production of Finding Voice at Conference College] and in the first production [in Utah], the song] had been sung by a woman who had experienced [child abuse]. We were flexible in how that song was performed in this production [at Converse College] and what ensued was that two of my students sang the song together, alternating verses. And, offering support to each other [pause] physical support to each other as they sang the song. It was so deeply moving. And I had never thought about having the song sung differently, than just a soloist, but the expanding [of the song]…to include
a duet [pause] it put a whole different light on that song. The purpose of
the song was not only to tell the story [of child abuse] but to support the
women’s experiences. And to have that on the stage—the two young
girls, holding each other [pause] talking about child abuse—singing
about child abuse [pause] holding each other, was just an incredibly
profound expansion of that song and beautifully, beautifully rendered.”

The lyrics of the song, “Take Back the Night” are shared below to provide a fuller
context of the quote above:

Song Lyrics: “Take back the night. This is why I’m here.

To speak out against this madness, move through my fear.

Sharing my story, trusting in my strength.

Listening to my voice now, moving through my pain.

I have some memories of my father’s hand.

Hatred coming from his eyes, I’ll never understand.

The cursin’, the cursin’, the beatings on my face.

Going on to school next day with feelings of disgrace.

He had no right to hurt me. I was just a child.

I was being threatened and my fear was running wild.

I had to go inside myself and love my little child.

She was going to survive this crime; she was screaming out loud.
I’m taking back my nights; I’m going to live my dreams.
Feel the peace surrounding me, embracing songs I sing.
Sharing my story, trusting in my strength.
Listening to my voice now, moving through my pain.

There was no one I could talk to, no one to hold me close.
No one to give me comfort when I was needing it the most.
I hid my fear in silence, with shame impossible to bear.
For years I searched for shelter. Was there anyone who cared?

He tried to take my dignity, and he tried to hurt my pride.
Now I have my power and I found my strength inside.
But it took years to understand that I was not to blame.
I found women just like me who were feeling the same.

And we’re taking back the night. This is why we’re here.
To speak out against this madness and move through our fear.
Sharing our stories, trusting in our strength.
Listening to our voices, moving through our pain.”

Two participants also described the importance about talking about violence against
women as part of their responsibility for social activism as feminist music therapists and
teachers.
Act of teaching. In addition to looking at the content, or curriculum, of courses, the participants discussed the process of teaching during their interviews. A total of 10 meaning units (14%) from three participants were collected in this subcategory. Topics explored in the meaning unit the “act of teaching” included the differences and similarities between teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels, teachers’ responses to students’ focus on a grade-based, and not learning-based, educational model, and comments regarding the ways in which the participants taught based on FMTP. Many of the participants took a critical look at their own teaching methods, as well as those used in traditional pedagogical approaches in alignment with feminist theory. Samples of participant responses follow:

*Sandra:* “I probably should do more feedback, like informal, confidential, or anonymous feedback from the students. I get a lot of nodding heads, and ‘yes this is exciting,’ so I suspect that there are, you know [alternate viewpoints], and I’d like to be able to address what those fears might be.”

*Michele:* “Well…especially with international students, they [pause] they have a hard time…because they’re used to the lecture and not really offering opinions [pause]. And when I go around the room and say, ‘what do you think of that?’ And, ‘no, what do you really think of that?’ [they have a hard time]. Because at first a lot of students will answer what they think I want them to say about that. And I always have to say, ‘there’s a spectrum of reactions to this particular theory that we’re talking about.’ People who have a take on this and love it and people who have a take on this and don’t understand it at all, and people in the middle. ‘Really,
where are you with it? There’s no right or wrong answer to this, but it’s worth a discussion. For us to talk about, you know, where we are in relation.”

Even the participants that did not teach undergraduate students recommended the inclusion of feminist theory in undergraduate music therapy education. Susan described her thoughts about the issue and how she personally teaches about and uses feminism in undergraduate training in the excerpt below:

Susan: “I think you can do this [teach using feminist pedagogy] in a classroom of undergrads. You can have them present for each other and provide each other feedback. And they realize how much they do know. I even find that in the supervision experience, where the seniors are co-leading the supervision space while we’re [music therapy faculty] still there….I will often participate and ask questions and almost act as a model in some ways. Because some of them are still learning. Some of them have said, ‘you know, I feel like you’re rescuing me and I don’t want that.’ And I say, ‘okay, well I’ll say less.’ And other people will say, ‘I don’t want you to say less. I want you to say something because it’s like watching an artist paint. And I can think, that’s how I want to paint.’ So, you have to find the balance for each person….But, if I say nothing, I feel like the power has shifted, and I’m there as the person who’s evaluating all the time. Whereas, I feel that if I’m there participating and answering questions, posing questions, and acting as if I’ve been in the situation in clinicals [music therapy practica]—well, not ‘acting’ but just bringing up...
my learning experiences—then it helps to equalize that space a bit.”

**Evaluating and grading.** Three of the four participants discussed their ideas related to assessment of student learning in a total of four meaning units (5%). One participant reported to enjoying the process of test making and described their use of a traditional exam to measure student learning. Other participants described their reluctance to use traditional examinations as well as their thoughts about the subjectivity involved in grading student work. Below is an excerpt from Elizabeth’s interview in which she is reflexive about her own use of evaluations in her classes:

*Elizabeth:* “I think ways that I can improve [in terms of my teaching methods include] alternative evaluation methods [and] portfolios. I [assess student learning] more in terms of oral presentations [and] research papers. I like developing those oral skills, if I can call them that. But I could look into alternative evaluation more. I tend to be more traditional in my testing methods, probably because I love making tests. [I enjoy] test development [and] psychometrics, which is one of my contradictions too. I find the process of creating a test to be very creative for me. And that’s an interesting contradiction—[ways in which] I feed into patriarchy and into empirical science, which is also patriarchal [while still using feminist pedagogy].”

*Michele:* “I really hate grading. It’s my least favorite thing to do. Um, I never think you can actually be fair in grading.”
Use of music in-class. While all music therapy educators use music in the classroom, it is how the participants described their use of music in the classroom that seemed to be unique in terms of FMTP-based teaching methods. Two participants described how they used songs and/or song lyrics as part of the way they taught from a feminist perspective, with attention paid to the composer of the song, the lyrics of the song, and the constructs contained within the song. Below is an excerpt from Elizabeth’s discussion on the use of music in her classroom:

Elizabeth: “[I believe that] music challenges traditional gender roles. I believe [that music is] a great impetus for discussing gender roles and women’s issues...Annie Lennox is great for [lyric analysis/song discussion]…Her last album is very woman centered and very political. [It] deals with African women with AIDS and [contains] a lot of very powerful songs about women’s issues. And so, so I think social justice issues and activism are more identified in my curriculum in the songs that I bring [in to class] to illustrate ‘women’s music.’”

Susan also discussed how she uses music in her classroom to point out instances of privilege and oppression, as shown below.

Susan: “In guitar [class]…we’ll be singing a song and I would just say something that critiques it. And they’ll [students] look at me like I’m odd. So, we’ll sing ‘This Land is Your Land' and I’ll just drop in, ‘except if you’re a Native American.’ You know. ‘Or maybe, if you’re not black’….see, and what I would do, I would sing it and say, “oh, I wonder what they meant by that.” [laughs]….I have to always sort of find
a balance of ways they can hear a song and hear it differently. You know, or ‘God Bless America’ and I’ll say, ‘and [to heck with] the rest of the world’ [laughs]. Or, ‘that’s so important because it is the center of the universe.’”

**Overview of category 3.** Thus far, an exploration into the lived experiences of four music therapy educators and their use of FMTP has shown a multilayered view and understanding of philosophical foundations, goals, and teaching methods used based upon FMTP. Clearly, no single method or approach to FMTP has surfaced. Instead, the participants have described their process of continual self-examination and critique, as well as critique of social structures and constructs that promote privilege and oppression in academe as well as society as a whole.

The teaching methods described by the participants included various adaptations they have used in their classrooms. One participant discussed her initial choice to have students call her by her first name, her decision to be called doctor, and her current feelings of uncertainty about the issue. Other participants described ways in which they adapt traditional classroom methods such as with the creation of a safe place for learning and exploration. Another way in which the participants described their teaching methods based upon FMTP was as an approach that encouraged risk taking. The participants sought to serve as role models in their own risk taking, regarding teaching and supervision methods, as a means of being authentic as well as encouraging students to look beyond the traditional ways and methods of exploring education and therapy. Additionally, the participants described various ways in which they used non-hierarchical learning models. Some participants described this phenomena as a leaderless model while
others called it participatory or collaborative learning. Regardless of the label used, the participants described the need for the teacher to simultaneously be a student in a feminist classroom. Yet another teaching method used by the participants was de-centering. This teaching approach provided an opportunity for students and teachers to crack their potentially crystallized viewpoints of constructs and to rebuild them again in a way that was more inclusive of a variety of viewpoints and voices. Next, the participants described how they examined both the process and the product of teaching—the act of teaching and the curriculum itself. The participants described alternative ways to engage students in their learning environments as well as their own critiquing of the traditional curricular content in academe. Additionally, the participants described their own self-critiques of various methods of evaluating and grading student learning that are used in higher education. Some participants reluctantly used grading systems and examinations while others enjoyed the actual test making process. Finally, some participants described ways in which they use music in the classroom as part of FMTP. The analysis of music lyrics, the inclusion of specific music lyrics, or the changing of music lyrics to assist students in consciousness raising was described by two participants.

**Category 4: Institution and Social Issues**

The first three categories of meaning units concerned the lived experience of the four participants inner world, or personal use and philosophies of FMTP. The last two categories, as described by the participants, involve external factors or barriers to the use of FMTP as described by the participants. For Category 4, the external factors garnered from the interviews that they included: (a) the role of patriarchy, (b) the role of women in academe, and (c) the continued use of traditional pedagogy in higher education. See
Figure 9 for the distribution of meaning units by subcategory for institutional and social issues.

Figure 9. Distribution of meaning units for category 4—Institutional and social issues.

**Patriarchy.** All four participants discussed the implications of patriarchy in their interviews. They described how constructs and stereotypes were perpetuated by the media, the effects of internalized patriarchy, and the existence and consequences of privilege and oppression. Some participants described the effects of patriarchy within academe itself, as seen in an excerpt from Elizabeth:

*Elizabeth:* “But in feminist pedagogy we talk about more egalitarian relationships and in feminist therapy as well. [We work to create]…relationships [that] are more egalitarian [and] less top-down. [Therefore], mentoring relationships and supervisory [relationships] become very important. How that relationship is nurtured rather than critiqued [is something we think
about]. What a challenge that is to cultivate. I like to think that I…role-model [this] for my students….So I hope that I am able to mirror…that professionalism to them in a way that is meaningful and that [feminist pedagogy] transcends that patriarchal, academic model of [the teacher] having all of the knowledge [and] of [the students] being a container of [the] knowledge that I disperse to [them]. And, I work within a patriarchal institution. Academia is a patriarchal institution. So, I’m situated within patriarchy [pause] within a hierarchal structure [pause] to meet the requirements of the institution. My classroom is observed from time to time, my teaching methods are observed by my peers and by the Dean. And so, my methods are often more traditional [laughs] and I laugh when these observations are scheduled, and sometimes I realize that I show methods that they would be more [pause] that would be more easily understood by them, as more traditional academics. So, I may tend to lecture more, show a PowerPoint, something that’s more didactic when I’m being observed. But, I’d like to think that within the classroom, that I’m providing an opportunity for my students to be co-investigators with me. That questions are asked, but not always answered by me. That projects that I assign are shared within the classroom so that students can become co-leaders with me.”

Sandra discussed what it was like to introduce feminism in a traditional and conservative university she used to teach at in the next quote.
Sandra: “[That reminds me of] when I was teaching in Georgia—Georgia is [a] very, very traditional [place]—definitely the Bible-belt of the country, so when you say ‘feminism’ it is the f-word for many. It’s a very scary word. And that’s very true, although less explicitly articulated, it’s still true elsewhere. Uh, and even those who aren’t antagonistic or fearful of feminism…[think that] the term feminist, in our day and age, there’s a lot of students at a certain age, who think, ‘well, we’ve been there and done that.’ And, ‘everything’s been accomplished—there’s no need to have a feminist understanding.’ So, I sort of ease in gently with students, who aren’t specifically coming because they’re excited to learn about feminist music therapy.”

Some participants talked not only about the barriers that exist because of patriarchy, but also for a need to critique patriarchy and social assumptions. Susan’s quote, seen below, explores these issues.

Susan: “And so, there are people who are living this experience [of being marginalized] and critiquing society. Critiquing what’s normal and critiquing everything else. And we [music therapy educators] don’t utilize that stuff [critical theory] enough. They go into what I’m calling feminism, because it’s looking at ways in which people have been oppressed and marginalized [pause] and looking at power structures [pause] and looking at everything else. And I think that we [music therapy educators] need to incorporate—content-wise—all of those perspectives in
our teaching and work out ways in which music therapists can draw on that stuff.”

An examination of the role of media in perpetuating and/or exploiting stereotypes and social constructs was also described by the participants, and will be explored in the quote below:

*Sandra:* “Have you seen that ad—this is personal! A woman driving a sports car, the roof’s down, and this sexy macho looking guy is on the side [of the road] with his thumb up. And she stops and looks at him and says, ‘you wanted your wide open spaces’ then she drives off…so, they’re selling sports cars to women by appealing to feminist experience, but we haven’t been able to grasp it and embrace it in therapy when it’s so critical to the lives of many. A lot of people also think that feminist therapy should be—if you even do it—it would be something you do with women. But of course, men and women have equally grown up in quite profoundly patriarchal culture [silence]. So….”

Susan described an examination of both privilege and oppression in an assignment she gives to her students. She describes this below:

*Susan:* “So, when I ask them [music therapy students] to look at their oppression and their privilege made visible I’m asking them to really look at things they’ve taken for granted. That in their readings they’re like, ‘oh, I’ve been oppressed before’ or, ‘oh, I’m an oppressor in this way.’ It’s easier for them [music therapy students] to say, ‘I’m privileged’ than to
say, ‘I’m racist.’ Because they don’t want to take personal responsibility for that.”

The concept of privilege and oppression, and the effects of this, is also discussed in a song discussed and sung by Elizabeth during her interview—“Donna, Donna” (Baez, 1960/2006, track 7)—which she described as depicting the horrors of the Holocaust.

*Song Lyrics:* “‘Stop complaining,’ said the farmer.

‘Who told you a calf to be?

Why don’t you have wings to fly with,

like the swallow so proud and free?’

How the winds are laughing,

they laugh with all their might.

Laugh and laugh the whole day through,

and half the summer’s night.

Donna, donna, donna, donna, donna, donna, donna, donna…

Calves are easily bound and slaughtered,

never knowing the reason why.

But whoever treasures freedom,

like the swallow has learned to fly.

How the winds are laughing.

They laugh with all their might.
Laugh and laugh the whole day through,
and half the summer’s night.

Donna, donna, donna, donna…”

As a researcher, I also had to process my own ideas regarding patriarchy, and my own internalized patriarchy while reading through the transcripts and playing the music described by the participants. Below is an excerpt from my research journal regarding my personal process:

Memo: “I have too many male theorists in my literature review. What will people think when they read this? ‘I thought this was a dissertation on feminism?’ I feel trapped in an academic whirlpool. If I don’t include foundational [male] pedagogues, then I’ll be seen as if I am making unwarranted leaps in my thinking. If I base my literature review predominantly on important women in education, I can’t use ‘scholarly’ sources, since women’s history is not recorded in the same way as men’s….’The master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house.’ I keep hearing that Ani [Difranco] song (Difranco, 2003, track 11) in my head. How do I balance the voices and the untold stories? Through poetry. Women’s poetry—interspersed throughout the sections of the literature review. I will include women’s voices where they have been left out. It will be unexpected, and maybe the reader will think, ‘what’s with all these poems.’ And, perhaps that will be enough to get them thinking about where women’s voices have been all along—the sidelines. I want to make them front-and-center. I wonder what my
committee will say. How do you balance a need to de-center your reader and also maintain academic rigor? What is academic rigor? Who decides?....”

**Women in academe.** All four participants discussed the status of women in academe, describing their own lived experience as well as their observations of their colleagues. A total of 12 meaning units (43%) were collected for this subcategory. Ideas discussed by participants included ways in which women have access to power (or lack of) in academia, the tenure and promotion process, lack of pay equity, the gender differences between full professors and non-tenured faculty, and the individual ways in which women in academe can make differences for other women. In the following quote, Michele describes how she felt when she was awarded a 10-year contract:

*Michele:* “Those [contracts] are huge factors. Those are huge factors. I can’t even say enough about that. The protection you feel about having that is huge and my university [Lesley University] doesn’t have tenure...we do have 10-year contracts. It’s the most people get. And, I do know that when I got promoted to full professor and I was handed a 10-year contract, it just opened all kinds of doors about what I could do and say that NO WAY was I going to go down those roads and talk [about feminism]...there was no way I was going to go down those roads until I had that type of security. And I think, what I realized then—I was really shocked—‘wow! I had no idea that I was, you know, still so worried about really putting it out there.’ And so, that’s a double-edged sword. Because part of it is, ‘oh, I’m relieved, oh I can do this now.’ The
other part is, you know, people who do it without all of that [tenure or 10-year contracts] are a lot more courageous. People who do it without, you know [a] contract, without job security and all of that—that takes a lot more courage than to do it when you have job security [pause]. I, so that was part of why [I] was so judgmental about myself. At the same time, I’m doing the work now. Yes, I waited until—I didn’t consciously wait…it wasn’t like I consciously said, ‘I can’t do this until I felt safe.’ But, once I felt safe, I went, ‘oh, it’s like, I could never do this before’… Once I’ve got myself into a place where I really felt safe then I could do it for other people. But, but, that’s just [pause] that in-and-of-itself is just so interesting…it was only in feeling safe that I realized, ‘oh, I have never felt safe before.’ That was a surprise.”

The importance of the safety, described by the participants, in receiving tenure and/or long-term contracts was described as significant towards helping [to] create gender equity in higher education. Some participants described receiving tenure as important on a personal level, in terms of how they teach and what they research. The inequalities in higher education between men and women that have tenure is described by Sandra below:

*Sandra:* “Look at how many men have moved up in the academic circles to Professor. Uh, and most of the women are still down at Instructor or Assistant Professor. Look at how many men and it’s the same when I did that [survey], way back in the 80s (Curtis, 1990), and you know that one article that was showing that we were almost having parity
in publications. Well, except that 90% of us are women—and, still are. So, that’s not parity unless you have 90% of publications women and 90% of academic program directors in music therapy women. So, we have a greater profile, but we should have 90% greater profile [silence].”

Elizabeth also raised questions about the tenure-promotion process for women in higher education and posed several questions, which are described below:

Elizabeth: “I teach at a women’s college [laughs]. But it certainly doesn’t always espouse feminist points of view. However, many of the women faculty in history, women’s studies, psychology [pause] I would say are feminist…. I’ve just become Chair of Music Ed/Music Therapy. We have another Chair in History/Composition [pause] those two together [pause]. We have an Assistant Dean who is a woman…but the Associate Dean and the Dean are men. And I believe I’m correct in saying there’s never been a female Dean…even though it’s a women’s college…The other thing I think too, in that regard, is the tenure-promotion process and does that favor men in academia? Does that favor music therapy academics who are male? I don’t know. I’m asking a question. I think an interesting question would be, and I haven’t done this head count, ‘how many female music therapy professors are Full Professors?’”

The participants also shared stories of how colleagues, that were women, had been “written off” because they held feminist viewpoints or because they challenged the patriarchal system within academe. Seeing power being misused in academe led to discussions of appropriate uses of power, as seen by quote below:
Elizabeth: “It is quite hierarchal and there are a lot of power politics within academia. And, again, [I am reminded of] how this [feminist pedagogy] is still very much a process [pause] and [I wonder], ‘how do I assert my empowered self in my role as Chair? How do I assume power ethically?’ I think in some ways I tend to dismiss my power or deemphasize it. And [I] probably could be more assertive. I’m still on that journey [pause]. I’m still on that path.”

Traditional pedagogy. Another aspect of working in academe the participants described, was working in an environment that valued traditional pedagogy. Seven meaning units (25%) were collected from the transcripts for this subcategory from all four participants. In the next quote, Susan describes her own experience as a participant-learner in the classroom as well as her views of the banking system of education:

Susan: “I think another important thing is we’re learning that we’re [music therapy educators] participants in the learning process. So, [I believe] that we’re not all knowing gurus, but that we can learn much from our students and their life experiences, and the literature, and our own experiences, all the time. Right. That learning never ends, and that it can come from anywhere. So you’re a participant learning, and as such—that’s why I don’t like the banking system of education. That’s why I like a more dialogical approach, it’s all a journey and it’s all an exploration. It just means that I don’t always have all the answers [pause] and it’s not because of a lack of interest in finding out the answers. It’s not a copout, ‘I don’t know the answer.’ It’s more like, ‘well, I’m grappling with that myself.”
And these are some of the ways that I’ve thought about it.”

While some participants struggled with using FMTP in an environment that encouraged traditional pedagogy, other participants discussed their ideas regarding how concepts of FMTP have been re-packaged and re-labeled in newer pedagogical approaches without acknowledging their roots in feminist theory.

*Sandra:* “And you’ll see a lot of that now outside of feminist therapy [FMTP principles], but I think it’s definitely been informed by the feminist movement. Both psychology and education, so a lot of people are moving away from that traditional patriarchal format of teaching. But I think, also, feminist pedagogy is more than that. Because, also, then I’m having my students, having them have an understanding of what it means to be male and female, for them as students [and] as clinicians, and looking at their clients.”

Some participants also discussed the lack of formal preparation for music therapy educators to become university teachers. Michele captured some of these ideas in the following quote:

*Michele:* “Well, that’s what I wrote about when I wrote in the supervision book (Forinash, 2001). I talked to all these supervisors. And [I asked them], ‘have you ever taken a course in supervision? Did anyone teach you to supervise?’ No! You either supervise like someone you like or you supervise in opposition to the way you were supervised. And so it’s the same with teaching. You either teach [pause] you either like your teacher and you’re doing what he or she did or you hated your teacher and you’re
doing the opposite. Same with parenting! But, do you get a course in teaching? No. Nothing. You’re thrown in and just do it. Just do it. Figure it out. But that would be such an interesting thing to write about and do a panel on and to, you know….”

**Overview of category 4.** While the first three categories described the participants’ ideas related to FMTP itself, Category 4 focused on broader institutional and social issues that either effected the participants, or people that they knew, or were personal concerns of the participants. Such issues included the existence of patriarchy in Western culture as well as within academe. Participants described concepts such as gender, race, ability, and sexuality stereotypes and/or constructs perpetuated by the media, internalization of patriarchy, and privilege and oppression that exists both within and outside of academe. Another area explored by the participants was the role of women in higher education. Topics they discussed included a lack of pay equity for women in academe, disparity in tenured positions for women, and the choices the participants made when they were non-tenured vs. tenured. Finally, this section examined the emphasis, by some universities, on traditional pedagogy and the banking system of education. Participants described personal reasons for why they chose not to use traditional pedagogy in the music therapy classrooms and also discussed the lack of formal education for music therapy educators. Overall, this section provided an impression of the broader social and institutional pressures that the participants either experienced themselves or witnessed from colleagues. The next category describes a more covert opposition to FMTP experienced by the participants in terms of the backlash they experienced related to their identification with feminist music therapy.
Category 5: Backlash and Response

Some of the barriers, from Category 4, were described by participants as unspoken but understood. The final category of meaning units, backlash and response, describes the covert barriers the participants have experienced as well as their responses to such comments. A total of 34 meaning units were gathered from the interview transcripts for this category. Three subcategories were created when looking at the essence of these meaning units. These included: (a) the critique of FMTP, (b) a need for professional dialogue about FMTP, and (c) future hopes the participants have for feminist music therapy. See Figure 10 for the distribution of meaning units for the category backlash and response.
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*Figure 10. Distribution of meaning units for category five—Backlash and response.*
Critique of FMTP. Nineteen meaning units (56%) were gathered under this subcategory. All four participants described their personal experiences of being critiqued for their alliance with either feminist music therapy or for using FMTP. See Figure 11 for the three themes found in critique of feminist FMTP.

Figure 11. Distribution of meaning units for the subcategory critique of FMTP.

General critiques of feminist music therapy. Fifteen meaning units (79%) were grouped under the theme general critique of feminist music therapy. These meaning units were reported from all four participants. The participants described negative responses from other music therapists as well as from some students. The harshness of the targeting some of the participants experienced left lasting impressions upon them which they reported was part of their broader desire to educate music therapy professionals about what feminism is and to dispel some of the myths that continue to persist. Below is a sample of the intensity of the backlash one of the participants, Susan, experienced when she used a goal of FMTP, critical thinking, in one of her classes:
Susan: “I critiqued something in the Bible once, and I got such a backlash about that. And, I was told that I was close to the anti-Christ and that I had no respect for the Christian faith. That floored me. It was making a huge assumption about my belief system, based on the fact that I was looking critically at something rather than just taking it as a given. So, therefore, if I critique anything that’s in the Bible, if I critique anything that’s in the U.S. [United States], if I critique anything about white people, suddenly I get this huge pushback. ‘Oh, you’re married to someone who’s black. You have no respect for the Christian faith. You’re not American.’ Rather than seeing it as, ‘okay, so you’re an educated person and you’re just trying to grapple with these ideas. And you’re trying to look at them in terms of not just taking them for granted. Not just having them as normal, but really looking at them and wondering why things are the way they are.’ That becomes difficult. I think it’s always difficult, as soon as you start questioning something they’ve [students] always felt to be true.”

Aligning with feminist principles, which has as one of its goals to critique the status quo, can be difficult for professionals, as well as students, to understand. Sandra described the difference between aligning with feminist principles and claiming the identity as a feminist, in terms of the personal attack she received once she self-identified as a feminist music therapist.
Sandra: “They [music therapists that do not claim the label feminist] might even get to the point of saying, ‘I believe in feminism, but I’ll keep that quiet. That will be hush-hush because of all the response [backlash].’ And, not, you know…not speaking up—not wanting to be targeted, but also because you will be a target [when you] self-identify as feminist. Whether you’re a man or a woman. Targeted—in some quite violent responses. Not physically violent, but violent all the same. And as a judgment of you as a person. Nobody is going to say that when you say a different approach like cognitive behavior therapy, it’s a judgment of the therapy. Whereas when it’s feminist therapy, it’s a judgment of the person. A critique. And an attack of the person.”

All four of the participants in this study were also panelists at the first feminist music therapy panel at the American Music Therapy Association conference in Louisville, KY in 2007. Each participant described their lived experience when one audience member stood up and critiqued the concept of feminist music therapy as well as the absence of men in the book, *Feminist Perspectives in Music Therapy* (Hadley, 2006), or on the panel. This same audience member went on to critique Hadley’s book in an essay published in the British Journal of Music Therapy (Meadows, 2008). All four participants mentioned their experiences in response to this critique in their interviews for this study. Michele describes her reaction to this critique of feminist music therapy below:
Michele: “We need to talk about it [feminist music therapy] and to have discourse, but, then to have the hostility from Tony Meadows [pause] that was just [pause] so [pause] interesting. That was so, you know, ‘wow are we threatening or what?’ That was just really interesting to me…it was extremely aggressive. It certainly felt, as a panelist, it was kind of like, ‘wow, I haven’t [pause] it’s been a long time since I’ve gotten that kind of a response’….but that sense of you know—putting yourself out there. And realizing there are people who are going to be very threatened by this and are going to react not well. And react hostilely. And, but again, I’m back to that I feel fairly safe in my life now. I feel like I have respect in the community and I can take that and somebody can be hostile and aggressive back, but I don’t think that’s going to damage me. I think I can handle it. But I’ve been around for 27 years in the field and I have a reputation. That I have built on [pause] but if you don’t have that, or if you’re building that, it’s [pause] a lot more [pause] you have a lot more to lose. You know? You have a lot more to lose.”

Effective teaching vs. FMTP. Three meaning units (16%), from three participants, were collected from the interview transcripts for this theme. In an effort to address a concern raised in the literature (Hahna, 2010; Meadows, 2008), participants were asked by the researcher to describe what they saw as the difference from teaching effectively and using FMTP. While the purpose of this study is not to compare the difference between feminist educators and non-feminist educators, participants were asked to respond to the following position posed by Meadows:
Both [Forinash and Hadley] see the teacher as a reflexive learner who embraces multiple perspectives and values student empowerment. Both view themselves as learner-participants, thus permitting self-reflection and self-analysis. By implication, however, the reader is left with the impression that all of these admirable qualities are exclusive to self-identified feminist educators. It may be important for these authors to acknowledge where and when these qualities occur in educators (women and men) who are not necessarily “feminist.” (p. 41)

In addition, participants were asked to respond to the following quote a participant in the study conducted by Hahna (2010) regarding FMTP:

Participant 20: Feminists enter a slippery slope when they begin aligning themselves with qualities that may simply represent effective teaching.

All three responses will be provided in full to provide for a rich description and understanding of the lived experiences of the educators:

Michele: “Well, I suppose it depends on how you define effective. How you define effective. Because, if you, if you want students to memorize a certain set of [pause] certain content, and you want to be able to demonstrate that [pause] with a pre-test and a posttest. That they [students] have [learned] that content [pause] then I don’t suppose you would need to be feminist. And you could demonstrate that your teaching is effective by saying, ‘okay, here’s when you do a pre-test, here’s the content you need to know. Let’s do a posttest. You now know this content.’ That makes an effective teacher. I can see that’s true. But, my way of teaching is much less about [pause] I mean I guess I could say,
‘okay so give all the people a pre-test. I will link my teaching to feminist pedagogy in terms of helping them create their own understanding through the content. Not necessarily memorize it. But, for them to figure out how they are in relationship to that.’ So, sorry [pause] that’s just really [pause] to me, I guess I can say from my course eval[uation]s I seem to be an effective teacher. And I teach from using feminist pedagogy, so [pause] but that doesn’t mean you couldn’t be an effective teacher without it. You just would do it really differently, and I wouldn’t want to do it [laughs]. Maybe that’s my bottom line. I don’t want to teach that way. I don’t want to give people, ‘here’s what you need to know. Memorize it. And I’ll test you on it.’ Because that’s just not that’s not feminist that’s not a feminist way of doing it. It’s about the relationship. It’s about the voices. That’s an interesting discussion. That would be an interesting panel for a future conference. A feminist teaching—teaching from a feminist [perspective]

Susan: “I think that the difference between feminist teaching and good teaching is that you can have effective teaching of certain content and you can be a good teacher without transforming people in a particular way. And I think that an important part of a feminist approach is that it’s transformative, and any critical pedagogy is going to concentrate on transformation. Personal transformation. Not just learning something, but being transformed by the experience. And I think that you can be an effective teacher, you can learn all those things you want to do, without it
being a transforming experience. In a very fundamental personal and political way.”

Sandra: “I think there’s a very distinct difference between effective teaching and feminist teaching. Although, I’m certainly not an expert on feminist pedagogy at all, or feminist teaching for that matter, since this is new to me and I’m on a journey of my own. Um, because although one should know that of course effective teaching has been markedly impacted by feminist discourse on teaching. So, a lot that there is now came out of feminist pedagogy, and then got gender-neutered. Because of course, then teaching’s not scary. It doesn’t get people hot under the collar, where feminist [teaching] does. But, feminist goes beyond—both in therapy and in pedagogy—beyond being very effective. It actually has a feminist analysis and looks at issues of gender and what role they play. I started thinking of these things before I started…doing feminist therapy…feminist practice. Because it made sense to me because of my background. And so, you know…egalitarian relationships, etc., all those things made sense to me—but they also made sense outside of the feminist framework. I was also interested in Community Music Therapy but Community Music Therapy does dovetail with [feminist] music therapy because you talk about not just what happens in your therapy room but out in the community. But, what Community Music Therapy doesn’t do, what effective teaching doesn’t do, is it doesn’t look through a feminist lens. And look at issues of gender and the profound impact that
it [gender] has in our lives. Whether, you’re feminist or not, I think you probably couldn’t deny that there is a profound impact.”

No time to teach feminism. In addition to general critiques of feminist therapy, one participant described her response to the critique of not having enough time to teach from feminist perspectives. One meaning unit (5%) was used to capture this topic. Susan discussed her response to this critique in the following excerpt:

Susan: “I think one of the important reasons why people are not turning to feminist pedagogy at an undergraduate level is because we have so much we have to teach with so few classes, and for them [music therapy educators] having to look at something else [pause] to start looking at all these other areas—people [music therapy educators] are balking at it. When we teach ethics and we look at multicultural perspectives, they [students] go, ‘well we haven’t even been learning music that’s not Western music. And we need to learn all of these songs, how are we going to learn all of that in an undergraduate degree?’ And that’s the thing, ‘how can we learn all of this in a short amount of time? We don’t have time.’ Exactly. And so when you start looking at, well let’s also add into the mix, all this critical thought [critical pedagogy], some people will say that students at this age aren’t ready for it. They’ll say, ‘we just can’t fit it in with all the other things that are so important.’ It depends on, again, your philosophy of life and what is important, right? Part of my thinking is if I teach them how to be critical, and I teach them how they can learn, then I don’t have to teach them all this stuff. But, you’ve got a lot of ingrained
ways of learning to go against with that. Because they’ve [students]
learned to be receptors and not explorers.”

**Need for dialogue.** Seven meaning units were collected (21%) under the theme “need for dialogue” based upon the readings of the interview transcripts. Participants described both a personal desire and a professional need for communication within the music therapy community about feminist theory, feminist music therapy, and FMTP. Some participants described the importance of the *Feminist Music Therapy* (Hadley, 2006) book in terms of creating a sense of community for the authors and readers of this book. Others called for a need to communicate professionally in-person, at conference presentations, and in scholarly publications about feminism. Below are some responses for this theme:

*Elizabeth:* “Sue [Hadley] has done us such a service by bringing at least some of us all together and having this dialogue. In writing this book (Hadley, 2006). It was a major validation for me. To be part of this book and to know who my colleagues were, at least some of them. It would give voice to others who read the book and go, ‘yes! This is a part of what I do as well, but I had not been able to name it.’”

*Michele:* “I have to say, after that article I wrote in *Voices* (Forinash, 2009), not a comment. Not a comment….well, people have emailed me privately [pause] people, a number of people, have emailed me and called, you know, and said, ‘wow that was really powerful.’ Colin [Lee] (Lee, 2008) and I both tried to open that door, and nobody’s publically doing it. Although I did talk to ________ at this conference and…she/he said [they]
would write a response and make it public. And I was like, ‘okay.’ Then
maybe we’ll get some dialogue happening. But it’s so interesting to me,
you know, for an association [American Music Therapy Association]
that’s largely female [and has] a lot of international students in music
therapy…you know [pause] it seems to me we have a fairly well
represented gay and lesbian population in the association, now I don’t
know the numbers but, it seems that we do. [The fact] that we don’t have
a diversity committee, that none of that is really addressed…that there’s
one CMTE [continuing music therapy education] or one session tomorrow
morning [on LGBT—Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, & Transgender—issues]
when I’m not even going to be there [is unacceptable].”

Sandra addressed the need for feminist music therapists to engage in this dialogue in the
following quote:

* Sandra: “I think we have to [communicate about feminism]. I know some people
say, ‘oh, that’s their problem.’ And maybe that happened also in the
feminist women’s movement when women of color got sick and tired of
having to explain to white women. And maybe feminist women are
getting sick and tired of having to explain it to men, but I think it’s to our
advantage to. But the ultimate thing is, if we have a feminist
transformation, it will be of benefit more to women than men. Men will
have to give up some things. And so, if we can help them understand why
it might be important, uh, because it’s like when you’re making a whole
lot less than somebody else. That person that is the elite is going to have
to give up getting more money and having more advantages. And so they’re going to have to be willing to sacrifice.”

**Future hopes for feminist music therapy.** Eight meaning units (23%) were collected from the interview transcripts for the subcategory of future hopes for feminist music therapy. As with previous sections, the responses from the participants varied from participant to participant, with some people commenting on their hopes for younger academics beginning their career to the creation of a feminist music therapy think tank. This section will begin with a quote from Michele about her hopes regarding the connotations of the word “feminist:”

*Michele:* “Growing up [pause] the label feminist was an insult…it meant [pause] it was an insult. To really call yourself that and get away [with it]—you couldn’t get promoted, you couldn’t get a job—it closed a lot of doors. And, I think people—especially my age—still carry some of that, some of that fear. But as, I know, I know [pause] ‘what are they going to say of me if I say this?’ [laughs]. But I think that’s changing. I look at my own kids, and I feel like, they don’t [pause]. They just know a lot more of who they are. So, I don’t know. I guess I’m hopeful that the world is opening and changing. There’s more space [for diversity] [silence].”

Elizabeth also described her desire for the younger academics in music therapy to learn about FMTP without stigmatization. She describes her thoughts on this topic below:

*Elizabeth:* “I wonder about younger academics coming along. How you address the issue with the younger ones of you. Because part of my hope is that I’m leaving some kind of legacy. And I too have been in the closet about
my feminism in many, many ways….and again, I do hope that this is
[feminist pedagogy] being passed down to your generation of academics
and how you will continue this process of empowering yourself and other
women who are in the field. And men too. So that men feel empowered
with empowered women. And not afraid of us.”

Sandra described her desire for the newer generation to remember the connection of
women’s rights with feminism and to not be afraid of the label feminist.

Sandra: “At least now people don’t say, ‘a man has a right to beat his wife’….we have made some really strong [gains] and that’s the hard thing you
know, women at university, women in academic careers. We’ve made
huge leaps and bounds, but without—we sort of cut off the connection
between this progress and figuring out who was responsible for that
progress. And so, that’s the hard thing—how do you get young women
coming in the world to have an understanding of what a gift they’ve been
given, what opportunities they now have that they never had before.
And, that’s a lot to be [pause] to not be ashamed of the f-word, but to say,
‘man, that’s great!’”

Summary of Category 5—Backlash and Response

The experiences shared by the four women interviewed in this study highlighted
the personal attacks that many of them experienced from colleagues either in person or in
a scholarly format for self-identifying with the feminist movement, feminist music
therapy, or for using FMTP. These lived experiences of the backlash fell into three
categories. The first category was a general critique of feminism and FMTP as being
either unessential or inherently biased. A second critique of feminist FMTP the participants reported was the allegation that FMTP was not different from “effective teaching” and/or that it was difficult to distinguish from “effective teaching.” The participants discussed ways to assist other music therapists in understanding the complexities of FMTP as compared to teaching using more traditional pedagogies. The third critique of FMTP was that there was no time to incorporate and/or learn about it given the already full course load for both students and music therapy educators. In response to this, the participants described a need for dialogue, both with themselves in terms of forming a community as well as with other music therapists that either did not understand FMTP or who are critical of FMTP. The participants emphasized a need for professional discourse that did not involve personal critiques but that involved professional discussions. Finally, this section ended with a description of the participants’ future hopes for the practice of FMTP. Some participants discussed their desire for the ending of the stigma around the word “feminist” and others hoped that feminist pedagogy was being taught to young academics entering the field.

**Chapter Summary**

Feminist pedagogy is a theoretical approach that is being used in teaching music therapy that is quite varied and complex in its definition, use, goals, and teaching methods. Four participants shared their lived experiences in using FMTP. Five categories emerged as meaning units from the transcripts that were used to organize the presentation of the data in this section: (a) philosophical framework, (b) goals, (c) teaching methods, (d) institutional and social issues, and (e) backlash and response. A total of 294 meaning units were synthesized and presented, along with over 40 of the researcher’s analytic
memos and 10 music lyrics mentioned by participants, in synthesizing the essence of the participants’ experiences with using FMTP. Table 3 provides an overview of each participant’s responses to this study’s research questions. The reader is encouraged to read the thick description from each participant throughout this chapter to better understand the context and complexity of the responses listed below. Table 1 is meant to serve as a guide or a reference point, and not as a distillation of information. The reader is cautioned that these summaries should not be taken out of context or used as a definitive definition of FMTP, as this is neither the purpose of this study nor the purpose of this table. Instead, Table 1 serves as a reference point to demonstrate the fluidity, complexity, and variety of perspectives described by the participants regarding the phenomena feminist pedagogy.

Table 1

Summary of Participants’ Responses to the Study’s Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: Do you use of FMTP?</th>
<th>Elizabeth</th>
<th>Susan</th>
<th>Michele</th>
<th>Sandra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“not an academic feminist”</td>
<td>“It [feminist pedagogy] becomes everything you understood about the world”</td>
<td>“my core values…lined up very nicely with what I see feminist [pedagogy] to be”</td>
<td>“I might not define myself or label myself as a feminist teacher”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“informed by feminism”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I’m an accidental feminist teacher”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Elizabeth</th>
<th>Susan</th>
<th>Michele</th>
<th>Sandra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External vs. Internal Identity Markers</td>
<td>Critical Pedagogy Community MT</td>
<td>External vs. Internal Identity Markers</td>
<td>Community MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label feminist Naming</td>
<td>External vs. Internal Identity Markers</td>
<td>Label feminist Naming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: Lived Experience—FMTP</td>
<td>Civil rights movement Women’s rights movement</td>
<td>Passion for learning Always questioned</td>
<td>Grew up as an “army brat” Previously in a heterosexual marriage Mother Lesbian</td>
<td>Teaching women’s studies Feminist MT “my own guided experience &amp; life journey”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4: Definition of FMTP</th>
<th>Elizabeth</th>
<th>Susan</th>
<th>Michele</th>
<th>Sandra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“the collaborative nature, the egalitarian nature, personal is political...how do I integrate my feminist principles into my teaching methods. That’s how I define feminist pedagogy”</td>
<td>“it’s a way of teaching which looks to de-center dominant unquestioned forms of knowledge and seeks to bring into the center marginal viewpoints in terms of ways of knowing. So, the process of learning, the things we learn about…the process and the product…and that makes visible things that have not been visible before”</td>
<td>“it’s about relationship. It’s about voices.”</td>
<td>“I link my teaching to feminist pedagogy in terms of helping them [students] create their own understanding through the content. Not necessarily memorize it [content]. But, for them to figure how they are in relationship to that”</td>
<td>“it’s a grassroots movement and there is no single definition, but that makes it challenging for every[one]…but there’s such plasticity…in feminist thought and also in our own experiences…we should continually embrace a diversity of approaches…and a diversity of voices. And that’s always a problem when you’re beginning at it and you’re trying to define it. You’re trying to narrow it down. But that’s the old traditional way of looking at something. We should constantly be redefining it”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants described important aspects of FMTP for themselves, compared FMTP to traditional pedagogical approaches, described ways in which they implement FMTP, philosophical concerns they have for music therapy and society as a whole, and described pressures and barriers they experienced both within their universities and
within the profession. While this section provided thick description of the participants’ experiences divided into five categories, the next chapter will examine the findings of this study as a whole, the relationship of these findings to the literature, and the implications of this study to the field of music therapy.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the phenomena of feminist music therapy pedagogy (FMTP) and to attempt to gain an understanding of its use from the perspective of music therapy educators’ lived experiences using FMTP. As a researcher, my goal for this study was that it would contribute to current scholarship on feminist pedagogy and shed light on how this theory of teaching could serve as a theoretical foundation and approach to teaching music therapy. By focusing on the perspective of the music therapy educator, I had hoped that the results of this study could help inform music therapists interested in using FMTP in terms of their own pedagogy, teaching strategies, and curriculum decisions.

This research used in-depth, semi-structured interviews and empathetic interviewing (Fontana & Frey, 2005) to collect data based upon a phenomenological method (Giorgi & Giorgi, 2008). Purposive sampling and snowball sampling were used to find the participants for this study that used FMTP. In-depth interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim by the researcher, and analyzed using Giorgi’s (1975) phenomenological method. A “phenomenological attitude” was used throughout this study in which I bracketed my assumptions and attempted to understand the phenomena of FMTP “as a phenomenon for the experiencer but not necessarily a reality in the world” (Giorgi & Giorgi, p. 2008, p. 170). The study was based upon the following research questions:
1. Do music therapy educators use FMTP?

2. If so, how do they use FMTP?

3. What is their experience in using FMTP?

4. How do feminist music therapy educators define their use of FMTP in undergraduate and graduate music therapy education?

Although there were many similarities between the participants’ understanding of FMTP, each participant also described her own unique connection to this phenomena. The findings presented in Chapter 4 provide a detailed description of each participant’s lived experience and understanding of FMTP based upon five categories: (a) philosophical framework, (b) goals, (c) teaching methods, (d) institutional and social issues, and (e) backlash and response. This chapter will focus on identifying “general and unique themes” as well as the “contextualization of themes” in alignment with a phenomenological method (Hycner, 1985, pp. 292-293). This chapter will attempt to unify and integrate the findings the study and present them in the following ways: (a) as a composite summary of the phenomenon of FMTP, (b) in light of the research questions, (c) in context of relevant and divergent literature, (d) through the presentation of unexpected findings from the data, (e) by revisiting assumptions from Chapter 1, (f) in terms of the implications and limitations of this study, (g) through the presentation exploration of guidelines for using FMTP, and (h) areas for further research. The literature taken into consideration for this study includes studies from higher education, women’s studies, music therapy, and feminist pedagogy. This chapter will conclude with a reexamination of my own personal reasons for conducting the study as well as personal biases and assumptions. As a researcher, I am honored to have had the opportunity to
share the participants’ experiences with a larger community in the writing up of the findings of this study, I feel their perspective has a lot to contribute to music therapy educational theory and practice. I hope that this chapter will help to place the participants’ quotes in context of the larger experience and phenomena of FMTP that the participants so powerfully described to me.

**Composite Summary of the Phenomena FMTP**

In an attempt to understand the phenomena of FMTP in music therapy education as a whole, I have attempted to synthesize and integrate the shared experiences of the participants in a brief composite summary of FMTP. Hycner (1985) described the final process of phenomenological analysis as involving “plac[ing] the themes back within the overall contexts or horizons from which they emerged” and then “writ[ing] up a composite summary of all the interviews which would accurately capture the essence of the phenomenon being investigated” (pp. 155-156). I wish to recognize that there are multiple ways to view and encapsulate the findings of this study and that this section of the study represents my perspective, which is simply one among many perspectives. Given this understanding, I share my composite summary below:

FMTP is a philosophy of learning and teaching that infuses principles of feminist theory into the classroom. It is a living practice. It is both an art and a science. FMTP encompasses more than merely adding women’s issues (Brunch, 1987) to the music therapy classroom. It involves the formation of identity around feminism and feminist theory in which practitioner self-identify as feminist therapists and/or feminist teachers and chose to incorporate FMTP into their lives as educators and music therapists. It is a foundational approach to teaching and learning that is both a philosophy and a practice,
which enables teachers and students to transform the traditional format of education into a place of emancipation and transformation. As with feminism and feminist music therapy, FMTP does not have a single definition or approach—it has as many variations as there are practitioners. Some of the many characteristics of FMTP, as described by the participants, include critical thinking, giving voice to the oppressed, acknowledging power differentials, examining privilege and oppression, recognizing larger systems that create social constructs, engaging in reflexivity, striving to create egalitarian relationships, identifying oneself as both a student and a teacher, collaborating in the learning process, and engaging in social action and transformation through the process of teaching and education. FMTP acknowledges the inherent bias and political nature that exists within academe (such as racism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, classism, etc.) as well as the overt and covert effects of patriarchy that have ramifications on all aspects of the university and the people working within this system. Part of this acknowledgement comes with the feminist teacher’s examination of his or her own biases, internalized patriarchy, and/or desire for external validation. Social action is used to dismantle the systemic oppression and lack of equity that exists in academe and in the lives of the students, teachers, staff, and administrators that work and learn in this system. Some educators come to FMTP as a result of lived experience within the women’s movement and then begin to study feminist theory in an academic way. Others begin to study feminist theory, which then informs and affirms their approach to teaching using FMTP. Regardless of how music therapy educators come to FMTP, both a lived understanding and a theoretical understanding of feminist theory and its application within the educational system is needed to practice within a feminist perspective. When practiced
with intention, FMTP is a theory set into action—it is a living, breathing phenomena that the music therapy educator embodies through “aspiration.” See Figure 12 for a visual depiction of FMTP’s philosophy, goals, and teaching methods. Notice how feminist theory (the trunk of the tree) connects to the philosophy (the roots of the tree) of FMTP and to the teaching methods and goals (leaves and branches). This image of the FMTP tree demonstrates how FMTP is a theory made visible and how feminist theory, as the trunk of this tree, supports the branches and connects them to the roots of the tree, or the philosophy behind FMTP. Each practitioner’s tree is unique in terms of how FMTP is manifested, with the context and lived experience of the tree playing an important role in its development. Some trees may have been planted by seed in fertile soil; others may have been transplanted; still others may have been grafted or pruned.
Figure 12. FMTP tree: Philosophy, goals, and teaching methods.
Research Question 1

The first research question sought to ascertain if music therapy educators used feminist pedagogy in teaching music therapy. All of the participants reported using aspects of FMTP however one participant, Sandra, did not fully self-identify with calling herself a feminist teacher. She reported “I might not define myself or label myself as a feminist teacher.” The other participants embraced the label “feminist pedagogy.” Interestingly, the concept of the “academic feminist” emerged during the interviews and with Beth and Sandra both making distinctions between their lived experiences and studying feminism. I will explore the concept of the academic feminist in the section below.

Feminism has undergone multiple waves of resurgence and focus with the first wave occurring in the mid-1800s-1920s, the second wave occurring in the 1960s and 1970s, and the third wave occurring in the 1990s (Enns, 2004; Hadley, 2006). The first wave of feminism in the United States focused on women’s suffrage. A reappearance of interest in the feminist movement coincided with the civil rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s and with Betty Friedan’s book *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963. A critique of the second wave of feminism is based upon its focus on white, middle-class women (Minnich, 2005; Villaverde, 2008). The third wave of feminism has attempted to address the intersection of gender, race, class, ability, sexual orientation, age, size, religion, nationality, and other social constructs with the acknowledgement that women and men have multiple identities and identity markers that intersect (Ballou, Hill, & West, 2008; Hadley, 2006; Villaverde, 2008). During the third wave, however, some feminist scholars in academia embraced the postmodern movement, highlighting a possible shift from
protest-based activism towards a more academic discourse or intellectualism of feminist theory (Enns, 2004; hooks, 1994; Minnich, 2005). Both Elizabeth’s and Sandra’s comments about not being an “academic feminist” might include clarification of their connection to second-wave feminism and/or to their connection to the importance of social activism in feminist music therapy pedagogy—emphasizing both the philosophy and practice that make up this phenomena. In addition, one critique of feminist pedagogy and/or scholarship in academe is the influence of the institution on activism as compared to activism within grassroots movements (Ballou, Hill, & West, 2008). Boxer (1998) described this issue, in her review of women’s studies by asking the following passage:

Others query instead whether, as it [women’s studies] has succeeded in institutionalizing itself, women’s studies has lost its activist impulse and become an academic enterprise like others, no longer serving to advance the causes of feminism in its many forms but merely serving to assure career success for a professional elite increasingly given to arcane discussions of theory. Is “academic feminism” an oxymoron? (pp. 161-162)

Another filter in which to situate the concept of an academic feminism is with a more broadly defined identity issue within music therapy education—are we music therapists, researchers, or academics? Bruscia (1987) described “professional identity issues in music therapy education” that still ring true today (p. 17). As he suggested in his article, “some music therapists draw distinct boundaries between the two disciplines [music education and music therapy]” perhaps due to the close ties that music therapy had with music education from the establishment of music therapy as a profession with E. Thayor Gaston (p. 23). While Bruscia described the polarity between some music
therapists’ self-identification with the profession of music therapy or the profession of music education (K-12), I wonder if music therapy educators in higher education have in some ways carried these same issues with them into academe in terms of defining who they are. This issue of identifying as a music therapist (and not as a music therapy educator) can also been seen in current literature. Rickson (2011) described her recent process of completing her Ph.D. in music therapy and the reasons why she decided to pursue this endeavor in the following quote: “And so, I cast my mind back five years to consider how I got started on my PhD journey. Although I was also a music therapy teacher, at the time I was mulling over the idea of doing a PhD, and to this day, I consider myself first and foremost a music therapist” (para 2). It is interesting to place the participants’ quotes within the broader history and development of both the women’s movement as well the profession of music therapy in terms of distancing of one’s personal identity from the label “academic.” Put together, I feel that these two labels, “academic” and “feminist” seem to hold more stigma than when used separately, which could be another reason why two participants made distinctions between their self-claimed identity markers related to FMTP. Perhaps we can also view the participants’ responses in terms of an understanding of feminist identity development (Downing & Rousch, 1985; McNamara & Rickland, 1989; Sue & Sue, 2003) in which the participants, in identifying with FMTP, may have developed their own identity as a result of moving through the cyclical stages of feminist identity development. These stages include (a) “passive-acceptance” of stereotypical gender roles and constructs, (b) “revelation” through consciousness raising, (c) “embeddedness-emanation”—developing feminist identity in connecting with other women, (d) “synthesis” which involves “the integration
of personal and feminist values that result in an authentic feminist identity”, and (e) “active commitment”—engaging in social change (McNamara & Rickard, pp. 68-69).

Depending upon where each participant is on this cyclical path of identity development, each participant may feel differently towards owning, rejecting, and/or feeling ambivalent towards different labels.

**Research Question 2**

The second research question sought to determine how music therapy educators use FMTP. There were several connective threads between the participants’ descriptions of FMTP: (a) intention, (b) feminist-identity, (c) feminist-informed understanding of teaching and learning, (d) openness, and (e) the use of a leaderless model. The first connecting thread mentioned by the participants was the importance of intention in FMTP. The participants thought deeply about curricular decisions, assessments of learning, class assignments, in-class use of music, instructional methods, course content, and the goals of a course (or program) from the foundation of FMTP. The decisions they made regarding teaching music therapy did not seem to happen randomly—rather, they emerged from a solid foundation on feminist theories. The idea of consciously and intentionally using feminist pedagogy is also discussed in literature outside of music therapy. Ropers-Hilman (2009), a women’s studies professor, talked about her “conscious desire to hold fast to certain [feminist] principles” in her approach to teaching (p. 44).

A second connecting thread regarding the phenomena of FMTP was the participants’ personal identification with feminist theory and feminism. Statements of self-identification with feminism and as a feminist appeared frequently throughout each
participant’s transcript. One link between feminist identity and an embodiment of feminism, expressed by the participants of this study, appears to be through social activism. Ways in which the participants described their use of activism included concepts such as transformation, advocacy, and the idea of music as a change agent. A call to social action was also seen in disciplines other than music therapy and has its roots in the women’s movement, as described by Worell and Oakley:

One of the more controversial themes of feminist pedagogy is encompassed by the two principles “transforming the discipline” and “advocating for activism and social change.” The mandate to effect revisions in the multiple ways that society subordinates and oppresses women of all backgrounds has been at the heart of the Women’s Movement and remains its cornerstone. (2000, p. 181)

A similar sentiment is shared by Sandra, regarding social activism:

*Sandra:* If you only help women in their lives, within...a room with a closed door...then, you’ve not really helped them much at all. It’d be like re-arranging chairs on the Titanic. Because then you send them back out to a world that is sexist but also condones and encourages violence against women and blames women for the violence they experience. So, I do [engage in social action].”

A third connecting thread between the participants’ lived experiences in using FMTP included ways in which feminism informed their understanding of learning, teaching, knowledge, research, scholarship, and music therapy. Through the lens of FMTP, participants engaged in critiquing, questioning, and transforming traditional concepts of knowledge, pedagogy, and leadership in academe (Hardin, 1991; Kolodny,
The participants spoke about using FMTP as a way of working towards congruence of their feminist philosophies and their actions, both inside and outside of the classroom. Michele talks about making these connections in the following quote:

Michele: “What I had to do was go back and look at what my core values were… about teaching, about research, and a lot of those things. When I looked at what my core values were, they lined up very nicely with what I see feminism to be. And so, I was able to say, ‘well so [while] I haven’t been talking about it [my core values] in those terms, I have been talking about it.’

These connections are also described in the following passage by hooks (1994): “within revolutionary feminist movements, within revolutionary black liberation struggles, we must continually claim theory as necessary practice within a holistic framework of liberatory activism” (p. 69). hooks’ quote highlights the importance of practice and activism in using FMTP—it is a framework, a lifestyle, and a way of existence. It also emphasized the importance of feminism as a foundation, which informs all other aspects of the participants’ lives. Educators that use FMTP are themselves transformed by feminism. Crabtree and Sapp (2003) discussed the importance of authenticity in terms of feminist practice and activism in the following passage: “feminist pedagogy is not simply about learning the theory and applying it to the classroom, but more important, a way of living life professionally and personally” (p. 132).

Yet another similar aspect in the participants’ descriptions of FMTP was their openness to contrasting viewpoints, identities, and perspectives. The participants
described their openness to critique in a variety of ways—critique of themselves as the “teacher,” critique of music therapy theories, and/or critique of social constructs. Additionally, the participants were reflexive about their personal process and journey with FMTP, pointing out their own contradictions and struggles with FMTP. Further, the participants displayed an openness to the inclusion of non-objective forms of knowledge and knowing by actively encouraging their students to share both their feelings as well as their lived experience within the classroom.

A final connecting thread between the participants’ descriptions of FMTP is the use of a leaderless model. The participants disclosed an insight that they came to in using FMTP which was that they realized that they did not have all of the answers. The participants also described a willingness to use leaderless models of learning and to embrace the role of both student and teacher within the classroom. This striving towards egalitarianism was described by Elizabeth in the following quote:

Elizabeth: “I hope that I work towards consensus building and shared leadership [in my classes], even with my [laughs] strength and dominance and understood power difference. [I hope] that I use my power wisely. I must accept the fact that I am in a powerful role [pause] that there is a power differential, just based on the hierarchical structure of teaching and academia. But I hope that I’m working within a framework that is inclusive and that I equally listen to students.”

The concept of using a leaderless model as part of a pedagogical approach in higher education in also supported in literature on feminist pedagogy outside of the field of music therapy. Forrest and Rosenberg (1997) described the use of feminist pedagogy in
psychology classes where the teacher cultivated “creative communal dialogue” by using different forms of “shared leadership and classroom decision making [such as] sharing the responsibility for designing the course, selecting course content and texts, developing strategies for learning, decreasing instructor control,… and deciding on methods of evaluation [together]” (p. 185). There is additional support for an openness to shared leadership in music therapy literature of FMTP. Hadley (2006) described how she used “shared leadership” in group supervision where senior music therapy students could take turns leading group supervision, with the music therapy faculty member there as a role model. The shift from the concept of an authoritative teacher to that of a mentor or role model was used so that the students “are all involved in the teaching and the learning process” (p. 407).

The use of intention, self-identification as a feminist, feminist-informed pedagogy, openness, and a leaderless model are ways in which the participants enact FMTP in their classrooms. How these concepts are translated into the music therapy classroom is where more individuality between participants’ responses occurred. Ways in which the participants’ descriptions of FMTP differed included how they intentionally used and adapted aspects of the learning environment. Michele described ways in which she included specific language on her course syllabi emphasizing her desire to cultivate multiple perspectives and a diversity of voices. Susan described her struggle regarding finding a balance between creating a safe place for students to expanding their thinking and helping to create cracks or fissures in her students’ crystallized world views. Both Elizabeth and Susan described their thought process regarding the use of music in-class. Susan spoke about spontaneously singing different words to a song to aid in
consciousness raising for her students. Sandra spoke about ways in which she directly incorporated feminist theories or principles into the classroom as well as into the clinical space, in ways that transcended the walls of the classroom or clinic.

**Research Question 3**

The third research question sought to determine what the experience of using FMTP was like for the participants in this study. It seems as if each participants’ experience in using FMTP is highly individualized and has changed over time. Some participants reflected on their own process and journey in learning about and self-identifying with FMTP. Within these descriptions they included struggles they experienced, either internally or externally, and pressures they felt from others to define FMTP or be the spokesperson for FMTP. In the following quote, Sandra describes the pressure that she felt, and continues to feel:

* Sandra: “There’s so much pressure, you know, because the spotlight is put on one person to represent and define feminist whatever feminist music therapy might be…It is a grassroots movement and there is no single definition, but that makes it challenging for every…for some who say ‘this is my approach and this is the way I do it so this is the way the world should do it.’”

The participants were also aware of misuses of power, systematic oppression, the exclusionary nature of academe, patriarchy, and the threat of backlash as they worked within a system they were attempting to change. Ways in which they used FMTP to engage students in co-creating social change and transformation in the classroom was by giving voice to those that have not historically been included in discourse, valuing
women and women’s issues, encouraging students to share diverse viewpoints, and honoring knowledge that comes from feelings as well as lived experience. In the literature, women’s narratives regarding the exclusionary nature of higher education and the impact this has on society as a whole has been well documented. In the following passage, Virginia Woolf (1938/2006) described the patriarchal views of women and the oppression this created for women:

> We who have been shut out from universities so repeatedly, and are only now admitted so restrictedly; we who have received no paid-for education whatsoever, or so little that we can only read our own tongue and write our own language, we who are, in fact, members not of the intelligentsia but of the ignorantia?…..Not a single educated man’s daughter, Whitaker says, is thought capable of teaching the literature of her own language…nor is her opinion worth asking….

(pp. 104-105)

The historical exclusion of women in higher education was also compounded with engrained social stereotypes. The participants reflected on the impact of social constructs, such as gender, and the systematic use of power and privilege within academe in their interviews. Others described pressures they felt, academically, to teach all of the required music therapy competencies in already full courses. This sentiment can be seen in Susan’s interview below:

Susan: [Some people say], ‘how can we learn all of this [music therapy competencies] in a short amount of time? We don’t have time.’ Exactly. And so when you start looking at, well let’s also add [FMTP] into the mix, all this critical thought [critical pedagogy], some people will say that
students at this age [undergraduates] aren’t ready for it. They’ll say, ‘we just can’t fit it in with all the other things that are so important.’ It depends on, again, your philosophy of life and what is important, right? Part of my thinking is if I teach them how to be critical, and I teach them how they can learn, then I don’t have to teach them all this stuff. But, you’ve got a lot of ingrained ways of learning to go against with that. Because they’ve [students] learned to be receptors and not explorers.”

Bruscia (1987) echoed this same concern of having a large amount of competencies to teach in music therapy courses in a short amount of time in the following excerpt:

In perusing these lists of [music therapy] competencies, it is easy to become overwhelmed by the staggering amount of knowledge, skills, and abilities that need to be learned to enter the profession. For music therapy educators, these lists raise some very fundamental questions: To what extent is it even possible to teach all of the competencies needed within the allotted time period, and at what breadth and depth can any of them be learned? When faced with the realities of designing curricula, developing courses, and setting up practica, educators quickly realize that priorities have to be established, and that certain competencies will have to receive less emphasis than others. (p. 17)

In addition to academic pressures, music therapy educators using FMTP have the additional challenge of reimagining traditional pedagogical systems and transforming the learning environment into an emancipatory place for students and teachers. Finally, the participants’ experience of using FMTP also entailed them experiencing backlash and personal attacks for using feminist music therapy and/or FMTP in both personal and
professional areas. The participants described instances of personal attacks and/or
discrimination due to their identification with FMTP such as being called the Anti-Christ,
being denied grant money, and experiencing aggressive responses from their colleagues.
They have been challenged by their peers for “bringing politics” into the classroom as
well for either not using “effective” methods of teaching and/or confusing “effective”
methods of teaching for FMTP (Hahna, 2010). In an essay response (Meadows, 2008),
feminist music therapy was critiqued for having “incongruities in feminist viewpoint” (p.
37), “sweeping, stereotype-led generalization[s], without specific references to evidence”
(p. 37), “the absence of male students….experience of [FMTP]” (p. 41), and a general
critique in terms of confusion regarding feminist music therapy. The reader is encouraged
to read both Anthony Meadows’ essay and Susan Hadley’s response (2008) to this article
in the *British Journal of Music Therapy* for the full context of the critique and response
regarding the phenomena of feminist music therapy and FMTP.

The participants also discussed limitations they experienced being women in
academe during their interviews. Sandra, for instance, described the discrepancies she
experienced between the gender distribution of the profession of music therapy and the
gender distribution within academe. The following quote encapsulates her feelings and
ideas regarding gender and academe:

*Sandra*: “Look at how many men have moved up in the academic circles to

Professor. Uh, and most of the women are still down at Instructor or

Assistant Professor. Look at how many men and it’s the same

when I did that [survey], way back in the 80s (Curtis, 1990)…and you

know that one article that was showing that we were almost having parity
in publications. Well, except that 90% of us are women—and, still are. So, that’s not parity unless you have 90% of publications [by] women and 90% of academic program directors in music therapy women. So, we have a greater profile, but we should have 90% greater profile [silence].”

The participants described the campus climate at universities that they worked in as well as student responses to their use of FMTP in classes when they were describing their experiences. These experiences were portrayed on a continuum from downplaying the role of the feminism in pedagogy to being requested not to use the word feminist.

Outside of the classroom, the participants described instances of the presence of a glass ceiling in academe describing a lack of women in places of power and/or leadership on-campus, even at an all women’s university, and the lack of parity in terms of the tenure and promotion process as well as in publication for women. Just as Sandra described the “ideal white woman standard of motherhood” there too may be an “ideal white male standard of pedagogy” in which educators using FMTP may have to struggle to attempt to dismantle and/or transcend boundaries imposed from the patriarchal system of higher education. These experiences, however, and not isolated to the academic cultures this study’s participants experienced. Sandler (1993) examined how women faculty were treated in higher education and described this climate as “chilly” (p. 175). Female faculty members experienced difficulties regarding the intersection between social constructs, such as their gender, and how women were treated differently within their departments as compared to male faculty members with comparable education and experience. Instances of being devalued, discriminated against, stereotyped based upon gender roles, overlooked, objectified, and sexually harassed were all reported as being part of the
cultural climate that women in higher education experienced on a day-to-day basis. The participants’ disclosure of these practices helped bring this to light in the context of music therapy education.

In addition to critiques and backlash, the participants also experienced moments of inspiration, aspiration, and transformation in using FMTP. The participants described how using FMTP was empowering for themselves, in terms of re-evaluating their own worth and value, as well as for their students, in terms of using shared leadership and shared power within the classroom. They also reported that they felt a sense of community in using FMTP. This was expressed in a number of ways including the grassroots community of feminism, the community of music therapy educators using FMTP, and the communal aspects of a feminist classroom. Participants in this study also experienced a clarified sense of self in using FMTP. They described that through personal transformation with FMTP, they had a greater sense of who they were. This heightened sense of self led participants to use FMTP as an informed practice. Beth described FMTP as being “further than yourself. It becomes what everything you understand about the world becomes.” And with this changed and heightened sense of self also comes a feeling of humility and respect for being a collaborative and equal part of the learning process with students, for bearing witness to students’ lived experiences and stories that are brought into the classroom, and for the transformative nature of FMTP for oneself, others, and society.
Research Question 4

The final research question for this study sought to examine how music therapists using FMTP defined FMTP in terms of undergraduate and graduate education. The participants described no single definition of FMTP. Instead, they shared what FMTP meant to them based upon their lived experience and understanding of the phenomena. The participants described FMTP in terms of its roots in the women’s movement and feminist theory. FMTP was seen as an application of each participant’s definition and understanding of feminist principles to the music therapy classroom. They defined FMTP as an embodiment of these principles that infused and informed their theory of teaching music therapy. Various ways in which this manifested in their definitions included phrases such as “de-center dominant unquestioned forms of knowledge”, “create their own sense of understanding”, “collaborative nature”, “diversity of approaches”, and “constantly…redefining it.” Different participants tended to focus on different aspects of feminist philosophy more strongly than on other aspects of FMTP depending upon student need, the course they were teaching, and their own intuitive sense of FMTP. The participants’ definitions were also influenced by their connections to related pedagogy theories, such as critical pedagogy. The blending of these emancipatory pedagogies is supported in the literature, as they are more similar than they are different:

Realistically, when one’s politics guide the ethics of any course, more will be at stake in the pedagogical process. This is where feminist pedagogy, critical pedagogy, and “good” teaching leak into one another. I suggest these are not separate types of pedagogies; theoretically they work from similar premises that pedagogy is an emancipatory process; it is about identity formation and the
development of critical awareness. Central expectations are the development of
critique and social change through an analysis of power and language. Identity is
at the crux of these pedagogies, where race, gender, ethnicity, class, culture,
sexuality, language, and other social categories detour theory and praxis for
poignant meaning-making experiences. Depending on whether the emphasis of
pedagogy is on gender or critical theory, the curricular goals may vary or shift,
yet the overarching commonalities are change and awareness. (Villaverde, 2008,
p. 120)

Examining the above definition, in relation to the participants description of FMTP as a
whole, the participants in this study have similar understandings and definitions of FMTP
as applied to their personal lives and classrooms.

**Unexpected Findings**

While analyzing the data from this study, surprising discoveries emerged. The
first unexpected finding from this study was each participant’s initiative in using FMTP
when teaching in relative isolation from each other. The interview transcripts contained
descriptions of barriers to FMTP including patriarchy, misogyny, racism, heterosexism,
ableism, classism, and the professional ramifications of a backlash towards FMTP. The
data also contains descriptions of the lack of equity for women in academe in terms of
rank, financial compensation, and scholarly activity such as publication. Even while
experiencing these factors, including most significantly the stigma of the term feminist,
all of the participants took it upon themselves to change the classroom they taught in and
the way they envisioned music therapy based upon their understanding of FMTP. And
yet, the data also reveals how little each participant knew of each other’s use of FMTP,
especially before the publication of the book *Feminist Perspectives in Music Therapy* (Hadley, 2006). Their willingness to initiate change within a broken system through the use of social activism is impressive and unexpected given the fact that none of the participants were communicating with each other about their use of FMTP and/or encouraging one another during the inevitable ups and downs of using a transformative pedagogy such as FMTP within a system that perpetuates traditional pedagogy. They all seemed to follow their hearts and their intuition as the early embracers of FMTP. The relative isolation of the participants when beginning to use FMTP yet striking similarities amongst their descriptions of FMTP seems to corroborate the idea that FMTP is understood from lived experienced and self-identification with feminism—the expression of which is FMTP.

A second surprise from the data was the discussion and response to the open critique they received for identifying as feminist music therapists and participating in a panel discussion on feminist music therapy. All four participants described their personal experience of having an audience member stand up and critique feminist music therapy and the book *Feminist Perspectives in Music Therapy* (Hadley, 2006) during a panel discussion on feminist music therapy. The fact that this memory was still vivid for all of the participants many years later appears significant given the connection between feminist music therapy and FMTP. The other surprising aspect of the data is in relation to their response to the critique they experienced as panel members on feminist music therapy. The participants did not appear angry when recounting these memories. Instead, they emphasized the need for additional dialogue in music therapy regarding feminism and FMTP to dispel myths and provide information on FMTP. The fact that their
descriptions of this experience all included a collective need to engage and dialogue within the field of music therapy appears to be significant in terms of an area for further research and social action.

Finally, the use and reference to music by some participants during their interviews was an unexpected finding that emanated from the interviews. Music therapists referring to music is not in-and-of-itself surprising as it is the modality from which they work. What was surprising, however, was the type of music referenced and sung during the interviews. The participants referenced women musicians, singers, and songwriters. They referenced lyrics that discussed social justice issues and pointed out instances of oppression and power differentials based upon a patriarchal standard of normalcy with the lyrics of the music. The surprise, then, that emerges from the data is how the participants activated the concepts of FMTP through their use of music in the interviews. They expanded the story, told the story, and allowed for elaboration of the story through music itself. This further points to their internalization of feminist concepts within both their personal and professional lives. It was again, how they used music and not simply the fact that they used music that further described the essence of FMTP. Perhaps the participants’ use of music to tell the story or narrative of FMTP speaks of their desire to give voice—to sing—the untold story of FMTP. Or, perhaps this was a way in which they could connect to the broader community of music therapy and further bring the theory of FMTP into practice and into their lived experiences.
Revisiting Assumptions from Chapter 1

Chapter 1 provided an overview of the assumptions I had prior to starting this study. These assumptions were based upon my personal experience using FMTP as well as my understanding of FMTP from reading relevant literature on the topic. The four basic assumptions identified at the inception of the study will now be reviewed in the context of the results and conclusions of the study.

The first assumption of this study was that traditional pedagogies do not ameliorate the experiences of women in academe or necessarily create an optimal environment for students to learn. This premise was supported in the review of literature documenting the herstory of education (Farello, 1970; Pearson, Shavlik, & Touchton, 1989; Goodsell, 1931/1970) as well as the literature on the banking system of education (Freire, 1970/2000; Freire, 1998; hooks, 1994). Comparisons of traditional pedagogies that use the banking system to FMTP were explored by participants of this study as well as the use of FMTP to assist with student learning. The participants found positive outcomes from using FMTP in terms of students’ ability to internalize, synthesize, and apply music therapy concepts and theories to their lived experiences as well as to the clinical setting.

The second assumption of this study posited that competency-based instruction was an important step in music therapy education yet music therapy as a profession was still lacking a pedagogical basis upon which to base the teaching of music therapy skills and concepts in higher education. Music therapy literature revealed the historical trends in music therapy education which began with articles reporting the need for standardization in music therapy education and training as early as 1954 (de l’Etoile,
2000; Harbert, 1954). Later publications showed a movement towards competency-based education in music therapy as the basis for structuring education programs and unifying curriculum from program-to-program (Braswell, 1987; Jensen & McKinney, 1990; Maranto & Bruscia, 1988). Maranto and Bruscia (1988) both documented the need to have a qualified educator as well as the understanding that “learning theory and developmental theory need to be considered in designing curricula, practica, and internships” (p. 56). Only recently has literature emerged on music therapy pedagogy (Bruscia & Maranto, 1987, 1988; Goodman, 2011; Hadley, 2006; Hahna, 2010). Perhaps as a profession music therapy has assumed that having a criteria for measuring competency in student learning was more important than pedagogy and/or took the place of having a theory for teacher education and music therapy pedagogy. The field of music therapy could be well served by examining not only music therapy competencies but also pedagogical theories that are consistent with, and conducive for, music therapy instruction (Hahna, 2010). It is only from a strong theoretical basis that our shift to competency-based instruction can truly flourish.

The final assumption of this study was that feminist-based qualitative research was the most appropriate method of inquiry to study FMTP. This assumption held true in that the modifications of the traditional phenomenological interview method to include empathetic interviewing as well as the incorporation of feminist research methods (Reinharz, 1992), in terms of process and ethics, assisted in providing a substantial amount of participant descriptions of their lived experience with FMTP. While feminist research methods and/or qualitative research methods are not the only ways in which to explore FMTP, this approach was consistent to the theoretical concept being studied.
Limitations

Limitations of this study included adaptations of the traditional phenomenological interview to include an empathetic interviewing stance which could potentially have changed the descriptions shared by participants during the interviews if a more traditional interview stance had been employed (Seidman, 2006). The adaptations chosen were, however, consistent with a feminist research method (Reinharz & Chase, 2002). Additionally, due to the small number of music therapy educators that currently use FMTP a small sample size \( (N = 4) \) was used for this study. While sample size is not an issue in qualitative research, both the sample size and the scope of the research limit generalizability of the findings of the study to the population of music therapy educators as a whole. While it was not the purpose of this study to apply the findings to all music therapy educators, the nature of qualitative research’s use of purposive sampling should be considered when examining the findings of this study. The results of this study can, however, be used to inform and/or generate theories regarding music therapy pedagogy and the use of FMTP in teaching music therapy.

Implications and Recommendations for Future Research

The use of FMTP was explored as a phenomena in terms of its philosophy, goals, and teaching methods in music therapy education. Additionally, FMTP was placed in context, as understood by the participants, of broader institutional issues, social issues, and occurrences of backlash that the participants experienced. The results of this study provide the field of music therapy with an understanding of FMTP based upon the lived experience of the participants as well as ways in which FMTP has been used by music therapy educators to not only teach music therapy but to promote social change through
the transformation of the classroom, through the breaking down of traditional pedagogies, and the emergence of FMTP.

This study expands music therapy literature on music therapy education from an emphasis on curriculum, competencies, and instruction towards a theory of teaching music therapy that can include FMTP as both a philosophy of teaching as well as practice of teaching. The results of this study, in addition to previous studies on FMTP (Hadley, 2006; Hahna, 2010), can help us better understand, define, and develop a theory of FMTP. While I recognize that not all music therapy educators may self-identify as feminist, this study can help our profession move towards examining and developing pedagogies of music therapy and expand the music therapy literature in the spirit of redefining teaching as a scholarly endeavor itself as seen in the field of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (Boyer, 1990). As a profession, music therapy developed first from lived experience, with the work of Margaret Anderton, Isa Maud Ilsen, Harriet Ayer Seymour, and Eva Augusta Vescelius (W. B. Davis, 1993), and then towards a more formalized coursework and education. Perhaps it is now time that we develop, as a profession, our own music therapy pedagogies based upon our lived experience of teaching music therapy and creating more formalized theories of music therapy pedagogy. Unkefer made reference to this very progression from a grassroots movement towards a more systematic look at music therapy education and clinical training in his remarks at the 1956 National Association for Music Therapy conference:

The pioneers or “grandfathers” of the organization who started their work [as music therapists] long before a formal university training course was developed have cast off their apprehensiveness about not having the appropriate degree. The
young “degree-in-hand” member of the second-generation is now willing to evaluate his own training in relation to his responsibilities in the institutional position in search of more adequate solutions to training problems. (p. 219)

Perhaps, as a member of the new generation of “degree-in-hand” music therapy educators, we can take it upon ourselves to be “responsible,” as Unkefer urged, in developing music therapy pedagogy to address our current clinical training issues. Regardless of the pedagogy used, the profession as a whole would be strengthened by training current and future music therapy educators in not just what competencies to teach, but also about which theory of teaching and learning they are basing their instructional methods upon. I believe that it is time for our profession to move beyond standardization and skill development. It is time for us to develop our theories of education, teaching, and learning.

This study has implications for not only music therapy education and pedagogy but also for teacher training in music therapy. It is recommended that we engage in a more systematic exploration of doctoral education in music therapy, especially in terms of preparation of music therapy educators to teach music therapy. Literature in art therapy doctoral training indicates this movement towards an examination of art therapy education, including pedagogy (Gerber, 2006). Gerber’s research into pedagogy used in art therapy education included a “continuum of teaching models that range[d] from teacher-centered to student-centered to self-directed learning” (p. 107). She also recommended that art therapy doctoral training include training not only in teaching methods and curriculum structure and content, but in pedagogy to assist with in training art therapy educators. Given the similarities between the creative expressive arts therapies
(Johnson, 1999; McNiff, 1986), it seems that music therapy could benefit from such an approach to doctoral education as used by art therapists as well. In addition to teacher training, consideration of continuing education specific for music therapy educators is recommended. The expansion of Continuing Music Therapy Education (CMTEs) trainings to include specific skills for music therapy educators is recommended as we move professionally towards developing a theory and approach to music therapy pedagogy.

As we begin to build a theory of music therapy education, we may have to examine some assumptions. From the lens of feminist pedagogy, the examination of our values and assumptions of what is “knowledge” and what is “learning” is an important part of the development of FMTP, as this has clear implications on what we teach, how we teach, and why we teach. Understanding various philosophies of learning and teaching can help us to unify and inform university programs, curricular decisions, and means of assessment. In addition, our voyage into the world of pedagogy will allow us to enter the emerging field of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Finally, an exploration of pedagogy might help music therapists deal with professional identity issues that have been expressed in the literature regarding how we view ourselves—Are we music therapy clinicians? Are we music therapy educators? Are we music therapy researchers? Perhaps our lack of scholarly exploration of pedagogy and music therapy education has resulted in many music therapy educators failing to own their identities as educators. We often work with students to help them transition psychologically from the identity of a student to the identity of a therapist. How can we help ourselves, as music therapy educators, transition to an identity of a teacher? How can we fully own this role
and understand what it means for each of us to teach? Because, from a feminist perspective, if we are not working on consciousness raising and reflexivity, we run the risk of inappropriately using our power to re-create patriarchal constructs and relationship patterns. This “hidden curriculum” (Apple, 1990) is something that we, as music therapy educators, have to be consciously aware of so that we do not unintentionally teach our students messages regarding class, gender, race, culture, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, ability, religion, etc. that are based upon a majority culture of privilege and oppression instead of the content that we think we are “teaching.” Palmer (2007) encourages us to find “the teacher within” as a starting point for our journeys as authentic teachers (p. 30). He also advocates that training for teachers today should include “education for transformation” (p. 191) which contains five areas he feels are important for teacher training: (a) “we must help our students debunk the myth that institutions possess autonomous, even ultimate power over our lives”, (b) “we must validate the importance of our students’ emotions as well as their intellect”, (c) “we must teach our students how to ‘mine’ their emotions for knowledge”, (d) “we must teach them how to cultivate community for the sake of both knowing and doing”, and (e) “we must teach—and model for—our students what it means to be on the journey toward ‘an undivided life’” (p. 205). He described a moral and ethical obligation for teachers to work towards social change and to teach from the heart. I would like to invite music therapy educators to do the same as we embrace our own identities as teachers.
Guidelines and Areas for Future Research

In spending time reading, re-reading, and analyzing the data, I would like to present loose guidelines for music therapy educators interested in using FMTP to inform their practice. These guidelines do not serve as a prescriptive method for using and applying FMTP. They emerged as part of my own inductive analysis of the emergent themes regarding FMTP. The reader is encouraged to adapt these in a way that is meaningful to them. Below are 10 loose guidelines for using FMTP as the basis for your music therapy classroom:

1. Immerse yourself in feminist theory through lived experience and scholarly endeavors.

2. Be reflexive, honest, and critical in examining your own biases, values, and identity markers. Encourage your students to do the same.

3. Be reflexive, honest, and critical in examining society’s biases, values, and identity markers. Encourage your students to do the same.

4. Make it a personal mission to work towards change in areas of your life (as a music therapy clinician, researcher, or teacher) that perpetuate oppression of others through systemic distribution of unearned privilege and power to certain groups and the exclusion of power and/or access to resources of other groups based upon social constructs. Encourage your students to do the same.

5. Be open, flexible, conscious, and intentional in how you envision teaching, learning, research, scholarship, power differentials, roles, and goals of teaching. Find ways in which shared leadership of all classroom decisions can be held by all of the stakeholders in the music therapy classroom—teachers and students.
6. Re-imagine the music therapy classroom as an emancipatory space where the students and teachers can collaboratively transform themselves and their communities while simultaneously learning about music therapy theory and practice.

7. Provide a safe place of encouragement for your students as they connect with their own identity markers, investments within the patriarchal system of privilege and oppression, personal experiences of oppression, and begin to connect with and trust their lived experiences, emotions, and intuition as valid forms of knowledge(s).

8. Transform the ways in which you manifest more traditional pedagogies and replace them with practices that are more congruent with your understanding of FMTP.

9. Build a community of music therapy educators using FMTP. Advocate for FMTP to help dispel myths and to educate others about FMTP.

10. Trust women, trust yourself, and trust that in including women’s voices and values in the music therapy classroom that you are not excluding other voices. Instead, you are building a tapestry of voices that allows the teachers and students to have a rich understanding of music therapy practice and lived experience.

Areas for future research include the continued exploration of FMTP within music therapy. It is necessary to continue to document ways in which FMTP manifests in the music therapy classroom. Additionally, conducting studies to examine the students’ experiences in music therapy classrooms based upon FMTP is needed. The results of this study also point to the need for education and continuing
education specific to music therapy education. It is recommended that Continuing Music Therapy Education (CMTEs) presentations focus on the needs of music therapy educators who may have little knowledge of philosophies of teaching and learning, and instead may be focused on competencies (teaching and learning outcomes) or teaching methods (i.e., lecture vs. small groups.) Further, it would benefit the profession of music therapy as a whole to become more knowledgeable about feminist theory and FMTP. The instances of backlash the participants described as well as the published critique of feminist music therapy points to a lack of understanding of what feminism is. Regardless of a music therapist’s theoretical foundation, increasing knowledge and understanding of diverse viewpoints could help decrease instances of backlash and attacks towards music therapy educators that use FMTP in instances where such attacks and/or critiques are based upon misinformation or lack of information. Also music therapy publications on “music therapy pedagogy” that focus primarily on teaching strategies instead of philosophies of music therapy specific pedagogy point to a need for education on the differences between pedagogy, teaching strategies, the act of teaching, and outcome/learning assessment within the profession of music therapy. Panel presentations on music therapy pedagogy, FMTP, and feminist music therapy are recommended to provide opportunities for professional discourse on these subjects that allow for a more collaborative learning environments which include diverse viewpoints.
Personal Reflection

After a long journey with four knowledgeable guides, I have come to reflect on my own reasons for beginning, continuing, and documenting the phenomena of FMTP. It is not by chance that I have come to this topic. My graduate work adapted the Bonny Method of Guided Imagery and Music (GIM) to include feminist perspectives (Hahna, 2004). After working in the domestic violence shelter system as a music therapist and learning about feminist theory, I knew that I had to find a way to adapt GIM in a way that was congruent with my philosophies as a feminist music therapist and also honored the women I was working with and their stories. While it took a lot of soul searching, research, and time, I finally became more comfortable in synthesizing my understanding of feminist theory with music therapy practice. When I began to teach music therapy using the traditional pedagogical approach I had become accustomed to as a student, while simultaneously practicing feminist music therapy, I encountered similar difficulties and incongruencies that I had experienced using traditional GIM. I had to find a way to incorporate feminist theory into my teaching so that I could be authentic in the classroom and in the clinic. In my first few years of teaching, I had little choice over textbook selection, course content, or lecture notes. During those first few years, I knew that I was both attracted to academe and immensely constricted by this same institution. I tried to teach in the way that was expected of me during this time, but this was painfully difficult. I experienced a variety of instances of internalized patriarchy, adherence to traditional pedagogies, and resistance to FMTP. I experienced censorship in my ability to teach students about certain music therapy theories and research paradigms. I experienced backlash when I began to incorporate FMTP into the classroom. I was asked to explain
the “effectiveness” of FMTP as compared to traditional pedagogies and this made no sense to me. I was interested in teaching from the heart and teaching for equality. I realized that from my philosophical foundation, traditional teaching methods were only effective in perpetuating patriarchy and not in teaching music therapy. While working with the data from this study, my own experiences of backlash within academe came to the surface, and I chose to process these memories and feelings through the use of my research journal, talking with colleagues, and through personal work. For instance, I remembered advocating for minority student who I felt was experiencing systemic oppression that was affecting his/her success in the classroom and I was told that it was that particular student’s “attitude” problem and that I should not worry about an issue that I could not change. Memories such as these would surface while I analyzed the data, and I would have to bracket them and process them before I could continue analyzing the data. This was an important process for me and I took my time in working with the data (I analyzed the data for over a year) to allow for this.

My decision to focus on FMTP was inspired by the work of some feminist music therapists that validated my own desire to work towards change (Hadley, 2006). I conducted this study because I wanted to learn about why other music therapy educators chose to use FMTP even in the presence of strong backlash from educators and administrators that were still invested in the patriarchal system of academe. I wanted to understand FMTP from the perspective of educators that used it, and not from those arguing against its use. After deciding to pursue my doctoral studies I also decided to teach in a university that would support a variety of pedagogical approaches including FMTP. It was with this shift in institutional culture that I began the first interviews of
participants for this study. As I conducted each interview and transcribed each interview,
I would journal about FMTP and each woman’s personal story about the phenomena.
And with each interview I also felt more and more empowered to deepen my own
connection to FMTP. I felt honored to record the stories of the participants and I felt a
tremendous amount of internalized pressure to share these stories honestly and in a way
that was consistent with a feminist research paradigm. “Would I do it right?” I worried.
My own experience of backlash in academe is nothing compared to the pioneers in
FMTP—at least the people critiquing my use of FMTP had heard of it before! I realized,
in working with the data from this study, how fortunate I am to be able to use FMTP
because of the hard work that the participants in the study have already done and
continue to do to change misconceptions about feminism, feminist music therapy, and
FMTP. The women I interviewed in this study were using FMTP before anyone had
written about it in music therapy literature, and this took a lot of courage and conviction.
I also became self-conscious of my use of FMTP. In some ways I was not as radical as I
felt I “should” be in the classroom. Why was I still worried about what other people
thought about FMTP? At the time that I am writing this study, I am a temporary
employee who is not on tenure-track with the institution I work for. I feel a constant inner
tension in writing up the results of the study and looking at my own practice in using
FMTP. “Am I feminist enough? Do I play it too safe in the classroom and in academe?”
These are questions I do not know the answer to.

My doctoral studies were also met with instances of backlash and resistance to
feminist theory. Surprisingly, much of this came from my peers who would ask, “why
does it always have to be about women’s rights with you” or “why is everything political
with you?” or “why can’t you be more psychodynamic and less political?” When I would critique a theory in class, many of my professors saw this as my ability to assimilate, synthesize, and analyze information in terms of critical thinking. They encouraged a diversity of viewpoints. But some of my peers voiced feeling uncomfortable with my willingness to critique the status quo when we were outside of the classroom. During one class, a peer tore up my drawing of a woman that was being silenced as part of his/her aesthetic response to my piece. These experiences were difficult for me to go through on many levels. I ended up incorporating the torn paper into a paper Mache figure of a goddess, and this process still serves as a metaphor for me. I can connect to these feelings of discomfort expressed by some of my peers with my own discomfort in initially owning the label of feminism. It took me a long time before I could own the label feminist and I now understand this identity formation process to be a journey—it builds over time, and sometimes being uncomfortable is an important stage that helps us to, hopefully, move towards social action, intention, and authenticity. Now I wonder why I was so afraid to call myself a feminist music therapist. For me feminism means equality, and who would be against equality, especially in the classroom? It does not make sense to me, but I understand people’s hesitation in aligning with it.

My own reactions to the data of this study are mixed. I feel saddened by the continued experience of backlash that the participants in the study went through and are continuing to experience. The hardest parts of the transcripts for me to read were instances where fellow music therapists attacked the participants for their identification with feminism. I wondered, “what is so threatening about feminism? Are music therapists afraid that it is contagious? Why isn’t there room in our field for multiple perspectives?
Just because it [FMTP] does not fit your philosophy of music therapy education does not mean that it is invalid.” I think I first embarked on this study to “prove” FMTP’s “effectiveness.” This was the critique that I had experienced year after year in using FMTP. This was the same critique that was also documented in the literature (Hahna, 2010; Meadows, 2008). But somewhere in the middle of the study I realized that this was the wrong stance. The argument of “effectiveness” can never be answered about any theory. For me, a theory is a way of viewing the world that is based on our understanding of a phenomenon. Do our insecurities as a relatively new profession lead us to desire dichotomous thinking about theories? At what point will our profession allow for multiple perspectives and remember that theories are not provable or they would not be labeled theories in the first place? Music therapists will continue to argue over effective models of music therapy—psychodynamic vs. behavioral—or philosophies of research—qualitative vs. quantitative, and I realized that this is not the place in which I wish to enter FMTP within the professional discourse on music therapy. To place FMTP into that eternal argument is to situate it in the wrong paradigm. For me, it is thinking backwards instead of forwards as many philosophers in the field of music therapy are accepting more viewpoints such as postmodernism and critical theory (Ruud, 2010). I came to FMTP because I realized that the traditional system of academe is broken. FMTP is not “the answer,” but it is a philosophy upon which I can situate my understanding of learning, teaching, and the need for social change. I have obvious bias in using FMTP and studying FMTP—I think it is a rich, diverse approach to teaching music therapy that allows for reflexivity, critique, openness, intention, and flexibility. But I do hope that being an insider into this culture has allowed me to explore more deeply the nuance of the
phenomenon and approach of FMPT, less from an empirical or positivistic standpoint and more from the perspective of lived experience. As a teacher, I have come to understand that I am not here to teach competencies. I am here to teach music therapists. Competencies are the outcome measures we have agreed upon as a profession for entry-level practice. Basing teaching solely upon competencies, and not a philosophy of teaching and learning, is to put the cart before the horse, so to speak. I believe that it is now time for music therapy to examine pedagogies consistent with music therapy theory and then base our teaching strategies and assessment measures upon this foundation. We still need competencies, for sure, but we also need to build our theories and philosophies.

**Concluding Remarks**

This chapter portrayed the phenomena of FMPT from a variety of perspectives—(a) a composite summary, (b) from the context of the research findings, (c) the relevance and divergence of the results with the literature, (d) unexpected findings that emerged from the data, (e) an examination of the study’s assumptions, (f) an analysis of implications and limitations of the study, as well as (g) guidelines and areas for further research. The discussion revealed various connections between the participants’ understanding of the phenomena of FMTP as well as individual ways in which they put this theory into practice within their own classrooms. It offers insight into why music therapy educators use FMTP, how they use FMPT, as well as how they each define FMTP. I encourage and invite you to think about both the Results and Discussion Sections from the perspectives of the participants themselves instead of from a literal interpretation of the scaffolding that the categories and themes represent. To truly understand FMTP is to realize that it is a nuanced, personal, lived theory that is put into
action in a conscious and intentional way every day by its practitioners. It is not something that can be studied at a workshop or that you become “certified” to teach in. It instead becomes part of who you are as you embrace and live FMTP in the classroom.

Susan: “It [FMTP] becomes everything you understood about the world.”
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT
You are invited to participate in the research project titled “Conversations from the Classroom: Reflections on Feminist Pedagogy in Teaching Music Therapy”. The intent of this research study is to gain an understanding of the experience of music therapy educators who use feminist pedagogy and to identify important tenants of feminist pedagogy specific to teaching music therapy coursework. You are being asked to participate because of your use and knowledge of feminist pedagogy in music therapy education. Your participation will entail an interview (either in-person, on the phone, or via electronic means (i.e. email or Skype) which will last approximately 1 ½ hours. No more than ten participants will be part of this study.

This study will involve the use of an interview, which will be audio taped to create a transcript. The interview itself will take place in a location that is mutually agreed upon by the research and yourself. Possible locations for the interview include your home, your workplace, the phone, the internet, and/or a conference.

Participation in research is voluntary. You have the right to refuse to be in this study. If you decide to be in the study and change your mind, you have the right drop out at any time. You may skip questions. Whatever you decide, you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

You have the right to remain anonymous. If you elect to remain anonymous, we will keep your records private and confidential to the extent allowed by law. We will use numerical identifiers rather than your name on study records. Your name and other facts that might identify you will not appear when we present this study or publish its results, unless you indicate a desire to be identified as a study participant. If you do not wish to remain anonymous, you may specifically authorize the use of material that would identify you as a participant in this study.

Any and all of your questions will be answered at any time and you are free to consult with anyone (i.e., friend, family) about your decision to participate in the research and/or to discontinue your participation.

Participation in this research poses minimal risk and/or discomfort to the participants. The probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are no
greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life. Possible benefits that you may experience are increased clarity in your use of feminist pedagogy.

If any problem in connection to the research arises, you can contact the researcher Nicole Hahna at (828) 964-6930 and by email at nhahna@lesley.edu or Lesley University sponsoring faculty Dr. Robyn Flaum Cruz at (412) 401-1274.

The researcher may present the outcomes of this study for academic purposes (i.e., articles, teaching, conference presentations, supervision etc.)

I am 18 years of age or older. The nature and purpose of this research have been satisfactorily explained to me and I agree to become a participant in the study as described above. I understand that I am free to discontinue participation at any time if I so choose, and that the investigator will gladly answer any questions that arise during the course of the research. I understand that I will receive a copy of this informed consent form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Researcher’s signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There is a Standing Committee for Human Subjects in Research at Lesley University to which complaints or problems concerning any research project may, and should, be reported if they arise. Contact the Dean of Faculty or the Committee at Lesley University, 29 Everett Street, Cambridge Massachusetts, 02138, telephone: (617) 349-8517.
APPENDIX B

CONSENT TO USE AUDIOTAPE RECORDINGS
CONSENT BETWEEN: Nicole Hahna and ________________________________.

Expressive Arts Therapy Doctoral Student Participant’s Name

I, ____________________________________________, agree to allow Nicole Hahna
Participant’s Name
Expressive Arts Therapy Doctoral Student
to use an audio tape to record interviews, so the researcher can type a transcript of the interview. This transcript will be used to analyze the content of the interview, using a phenomenological approach. The results of this analysis will be used for academic purposes (i.e. dissertation, articles, teaching, conference presentation, etc).

It is my understanding that neither my name, nor any identifying information will be revealed in any presentation or display of my artwork, unless waived below.

☐ I DO ☐ I DO NOT wish to remain anonymous.

This consent to allow audio recording of my interview may be revoked by me at any time. I also understand I’ll receive a copy of this consent form for my personal records.

Signed ____________________________ Date ___________________

Participant

I, Nicole Hahna, agree to the following conditions in connection with the use of the audio tape of
Expressive Arts Therapy Doctoral Student

the interview: I agree to keep your audio recording safe, to the best of my ability and to notify you immediately of any loss or damage while the audio recording is in my possession. I agree to safeguard your confidentiality.

Signed ____________________________ Date ___________________

Expressive Arts Therapy Doctoral Student

Nicole Hahna, MS, MT-BC, FAMI
(828) 964-6930
712 Hemlock Square
Zelienople, PA 16063
nhahna@lesley.edu
Name: ______________________________ (if you wish to be anonymous, please falsify)

Age: ________

Race: ______________________________

Gender: ____________________________

Number of Years You Have Been a Music Therapist: __________

Number of Years You Have Taught Music Therapy: __________

Number of Years you Have Used Feminist Pedagogy: __________

Type of University or College you currently Teach at:

☐ Public Institution

☐ Private Institution

☐ Other (please specify) __________________________

Type of Students you Teach (choose all that apply):

☐ Undergraduate

☐ Graduate

☐ Other (please specify) __________________________

What other ways would you describe yourself and/or do you identify yourself?
APPENDIX D

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Music Therapy and Feminist Pedagogy Interview Questions

Each semi-structured interview was unique in terms of the questions asked, however, each participant was emailed with the following list of questions prior to their interview as possible focus questions. Participants were encouraged to incorporate their own ideas and questions to the interview process as well. Here is the list of focus questions used for this study: (a) How do you use feminist pedagogy in the MT courses you teach?, (b) What is your definition of feminist pedagogy?, (c) How does it differ from effective teaching?, (d) What connections between feminist MT & feminist pedagogy do you see in the MT courses you teach?, (e) What are the challenges and/or benefits you’ve experienced using feminist pedagogy?, (f) How has feminist theory and feminist music therapy informed curricular changes you may have made?, (g) Do you tell your students you are a feminist music therapist and/or feminist teacher?, (h) Some respondents to the feminist pedagogy survey did not feel comfortable with political action in the classroom. Do you feel that “the personal is political” is an essential part of feminist pedagogy?, (i) How do you incorporate this into your classroom?, (j) How do you negotiate power imbalances in the classroom?, and (k) Do you see different application for feminist pedagogy for undergraduate and graduate students?
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