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Editorial

I would like to welcome GEMS readers to the October 2013 issue. One of my guilty pleasures when I have a spare moment is to browse through the Chronicle Forums. Somehow, I feel connected to other people who have the same interests, concerns, and questions that I have. I also feel that the forums keep me up-to-date, current to what is going on professionally. I am not quite sure why, but I love to read the thread started by system_d called “Apply For The D—n Job.” System_d’s sense and sensibility reminds me of my first generation aunts and uncles when I was a child. The no-nonsense advice and responses that system_d provides makes me smile, laugh, and most often reflect. I am also drawn by how people try to rationalize why they should not apply for a certain position. Most often, the rationalization, even to me, appear to be unfounded. However, occasionally, someone would post a challenging situation. I would find myself trying to find a possible solution and to my amazement, system_d would respond in a “nutshell” and bring the challenging situation into perspective – concluding with the infamous “Apply For The D—n Job.” I do not know who system_d is, but I imagine this person to be a well “season” professional with many years of experience dealing with students; whose wisdom he shares can only be learned from “life experiences.” The fact that system_d would take time and effort out of her/his day to help (young) professionals is endearing to me.

GEMS and GRIME members in the past have also shared their knowledge and expertise to help (young) professionals via emails. The fact that I save almost all of them in my email account, tells me that these emails were important to me. The earliest one I found was a Call for Papers announcement call sent by Roberta Lamb on April 15, 2004. This was probably around the time I joined GEMS and GRIME. I know for a fact that without the Call for Papers announcements I would have missed many opportunities. Kathleen M. Mckeage on November 13, 2004 also sent out a Call for Papers for the next GRIME Newsletter. At this time, I had not published any articles and was unsure about the process. Kathleen took the time to answer my questions and encourage me to submit. I am not sure how many Call for Papers went by before I finally submitted a paper to GRIME, I do know that I should have followed system_d’s advice and submitted an article much sooner. I think we all can learn from system_d on one level or another. I would like to suggest that we all follow system_d’s advice and submit an article or a book review for the up-coming editions of GEMS. I do need your help in this area.

With the work of Lamb, Mckeage, and countless others, I know how important communication between members is. Because of this, I have started blog threads for each article in the September and October issues of GEMS. I would like to encourage members to post comments that would up-lift readers professionally. Although I am often amused when some threads on the Chronicle Forums get off track, I would like to encourage article blogs to stay on the issue set forth by the author. As stated in the September issue, I have found GEMS and GRIME members professionally support each other and provide recognition when recognition is due. It is here where I value GEMS and GRIME and find it a unique group of people. With this said, I would like GEMS readers to support the authors whose articles and book review are included in this edition of GEMS by posting on the blog.

In closing, I would like to again encourage article and book review submissions to GEMS. I also would like to invite anyone who would be interested in reviewing articles or who would enjoy proofing or editing to please contact me. gems_editor@yahoo.com

In the October 2013 issue, Dr. Stephanie A. Baer, provides a dialogue that considers what it means to teach and what roles must be considered for one to fully grasp the power and complexity of being a teacher in: “Because I Am A Teacher: A Dialogue For Consideration.” Dr Rick Parker provides the reader with an introduction to the Juvonen’s Sense of Belonging Model and makes applications to education and for the music teacher in: “Juvonen’s Sense of Belonging Model: A Perspective For The Music Teacher.” Then Dr. Inga Rikandi provides a piano pedagogical article that could possibly transcend to other areas of education in: “Rethinking Vapaa Säestys In Finnish Music Teacher Education: A Feminist Critique.” Lastly is Kathleen DeLaurenti’s book review of Anthology of Essays on Deep Listening edited by Monique Buzzarté and Tom Bickley.

Dr. Colleen Pinar, Editor
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Because I Am A Teacher: A Dialogue For Consideration

Dr. Stephanie A. Baer
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Abstract: I am an artist/researcher/teacher seeking to better understand and explicate the role and power of the arts in education. These identities have allowed me to explore the complex nature of what it means to teach and to learn, and has provided an ongoing conversation where I can inquire and respond through written dialogue. In reading a dialogue, we enter into conversation not as observers, but as participants in inquiry. We begin to actively involve ourselves in the vital process of asking questions. We become aware of a means of play within thought. Without this experience, our senses become impoverished of creative potential; we lose the ability and willingness to reach out beyond our own reality and engage in someone else’s. The willingness to imagine possibilities is what makes a good educator. This dialogue questions the senses, because our minds do not teach our students, our whole being and identity teaches students. Our lived experiences teach students. Our wholeness teaches students. We cannot separate out the parts and pieces of us before we enter the classroom. We need to take advantage of our whole beings and teach to the sensibilities we have as humans. It is the only caring, noble, democratic, informed thing we can do. What follows is a pedagogic creed; an exploration; a dialogue that considers what it means to teach and what roles must be considered for one to fully grasp the power and complexity of being a teacher, and the all-encompassing nature of learning.
Why me?

Because you are a part of this whole thing.

What whole thing?

*It is the breath that enlivens your spirit each day. It is the twinge of familiarity when you see something repeated. It is the appreciation you feel when you squint your eyes on a sunny day. It is the pause you take when you hear a rhythm played.*

So, it is nature, then. It is natural. It is implied. It is expected.

*It is understood.*

I fear that I don’t understand. I fear my participation is outside of this place. I wonder if I find this place and then will be unable to lead others to it.

What others?

The others: The souls I have been charged with. The family I claim to belong with. The partners I cling to in this multi-level search.

What are you searching for? Many have asked this of themselves (and of others). There is more comfort in asking others as though we already have met that challenge ourselves. It seems to be muddy and perhaps unanswerable. In this typical existential question, is there something you’re getting at?

The question I really ask is ‘for whom?’ I am finding these levels complex and fraught with more questions. I might lose my footing and find myself on a path undisturbed, taking those first steps alone. Or worse, I could end up laboring over endless repetition of thought, following with my head down and my being desensitized in the lack of creation. Unfruitful repetition is illustrated by teaching what has been taught and who has been taught as though every class is a duplicate of the last, which is never so.

This has been done since the beginning of time. We must teach anew each time, each person, and each sense. We will experience what has yet to be experienced. We live hoping others live alongside; perhaps by our model, perhaps by our guidance.

Who is to say that I am a good model? What gives me the inclination to present myself as a guide for those asking new and personal questions? Am I to assume that we all have the where-with-all to conduct so many symphonies at once? Each brings different instrumentation, hears a different rhythm, recognizes different tones, and chooses different moods for their pieces. Who, but a great, experienced leader could bring forth the audience that is inevitable? Who could show the audience that each musician is a vital member of that orchestra? Who will intricately bring out the nuance of the French horn while celebrating the brass while acknowledging the entrance of the opera soloist? Who will draw forth the participation of the audience by facilitating a one-of-a-kind experience?

It is one who sees, listens, feels, thinks, compares, reorients, reevaluates, considers, expects, waits for, and loves the music. Could that be you?

I do love the music. I do think about it every moment of every day whether I am attending to the thought or not; it is there. I think of the musicians sitting and waiting for direction. I think of stepping onto the freshly polished steps leading up to the stage. I concentrate on the hopeful expressions of my heart. This all happens in a moment.

You describe a simultaneous knowing; bringing forth of one’s own experiences to engage and enlighten the new experiences.

However, it is not something I feel I know. It is something I react to, feel with, think within, and re- evaluate. It requires an opening of the heart and of the mind. I cannot play the music in my head. I need the musicians, their instruments, the music, the chairs and stands, the lights, and the air that circles through us like ignited fire.
This is knowing; just not the way you think. It is an encircling of the body and spirit with the mind. It is bringing the moment into being; this moment that wouldn’t be possible without the touch of each participant.

I am one of those participants. I am waiting and listening just as they are. But I do bring light to the experience. I act as a focus point.

Yes. You are just as necessary as your musicians. There is inspiration in synthesis. You come together and find one another anew.

Perhaps there is synthesis of excitement, of the lifting of hearts that happens at the end of a moving piece; but not in the mind. I have great fear that my musicians will only want to play what I bring to them, that the only music they will enjoy is that which they feel I want them to enjoy. There is freedom in difference. There is value in diversity.

An orchestra would be terrible if you only had flutes, or if you simply relied on the violins to carry the melody for every piece.

I want each member to belong in their uniqueness. It is that uniqueness that allows us to come together and play beautiful music.

And do not underestimate your own uniqueness. Your presence is not merely a facilitary one, but a pedagogical one. You are leading the way, guiding a path of experiences to come, using your own identity to nourish yourself and those you take with you.

I re-see and bridge a connection between my musicians and the lyrical melodies they bring forth, but I forget to include my own harmonies at times. I celebrate the minor chords we sometimes play together. We can cringe at the obvious differences but marvel at the sounds that are then created from that. From minor modalities, harmonious understandings are brought into being. Without the dissonance, there can be no fluidity of process.

We create because we need that dissonance and that fluidity. We are lyrical beings, moving together and apart as we create new understandings of what it means to be alive.

There is a murmur that originates from that connection; a vibration that emanates through the soul, and reminds us that this is what we are here for, and this is what keeps us alive.

The attentive pedagogue reminds us of that murmur each day without giving it a name. They take us to a place of rebirth and imaginative engagement. We all want to remember that place when we leave. But it is difficult.

Perhaps these deliberations do not belong to me. I search, but it is not exhaustive. I seek, but with my own eyes. I rethink, but from my own experience. Because I am a teacher. And because of that, I will continue.
Juvonen’s Sense Of Belonging Model:  
A Perspective For The Music Teacher

Dr. Rick Parker
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Abstract: This study presents a critique of Jaana Juvonen’s Sense of Belonging Model. Juvonen highlights that the quality of a student’s teacher and peer relationships determine whether he or she belongs to his or her school. As Juvonen’s Model only presents a few specific teacher, student, and peer behaviors, her model also does not demonstrate the role that a student’s scholastic environment plays in the academic motivation and/or achievement process. In addition, this study clarifies that very few of a student’s personal behaviors are researched in literature. However, this study does illustrate many teacher and peer behaviors that are published by various authors. Moreover, various pro-social and anti-social behaviors of students, peers, and teachers are discussed. Finally, this study emphasizes several non-behavioral or environmental factors, which impact a student’s sense of belonging, followed by his or her academic achievement.
Research on student motivation has a long history. One factor that has been shown to influence student motivation is the degree to which a student feels that he/she belongs to, or feels connected to, others at school. One perspective on this topic that has generated considerable research is Juvonen’s (1996) Sense of Belonging Model. According to Juvonen (1996), the extent to which a student feels that he/she belongs at school is determined by the quality of relationships that he/she has with his/her classroom peers and teachers. When students perceive these relationships to be positive and supportive, they are likely to feel a strong sense of belonging. In contrast, when students perceive these relationships to be negative and less supportive, they are less likely to feel a strong sense of belonging. Understanding what factors contribute to these feelings of belonging has become an important goal for Juvonen (1996) and other educational researchers, as sense of belonging has been positively linked to a number of different school outcomes, including, but not limited to, academic engagement and achievement (Beck & Malley, 1998; Juvonen, 1996).

According to Juvonen (1996), these aforementioned relationships do not form quickly, nor do they result from the individual actions of students, peers, and/or teachers. Instead, consistent with Albert Bandura’s Theory of Reciprocal Causation (1986), these relationships are formed gradually over time as the result of complex interactions among the behaviors of students, teachers, and peers. From this perspective, in order to understand the impact of individual student, peer, and teacher behaviors on sense of belonging (and subsequent outcomes), one must first understand the effects these factors have on another.

Juvonen’s (1996) model does not specify which behaviors interact most significantly (or often) with one another to impact sense of belonging. However, the model does formally recognize several broad behaviors that have an impact on the quality of these aforementioned relationships. For example, according to Juvonen (1996), students who ask their teachers for advice and direction in connection with both social and academic matters are more likely than those who don’t to form positive, supportive relationships with their teachers (and in turn, develop a stronger sense of belonging). Likewise, students are more likely to form positive relationships with teachers whom they perceive as fair and willing to address conflict among peers/other students in the classroom. Finally, students are most likely to form positive, supportive relationships with classmates when they share school supplies with their classmates, do not act aggressively toward other classmates, and do not engage in gossiping.

As evidenced by the preceding discussion, Juvonen (1996) focuses on behavioral determinants of sense of belonging; she recognizes student, peer, and teacher behaviors that impact sense of belonging as a result of their impact on one another. In contrast to other motivational theorists (e.g., Bandura, 1996), Juvonen (1996) focuses less on environmental determinants of student motivation. Specifically, her model does not formally recognize non-behavioral factors within and/or outside the classroom that have the potential to influence sense of belonging. This represents a potential limitation of Juvonen’s (1996) model, particularly when one considers the wide range of environmental factors that have the potential to impact a student’s sense of belonging (either directly and/or through their impact on student/teacher and student/peer relationships). An example factor includes the degree to which a school generally emphasizes the importance of teamwork and supportive relationships among students and teachers. Other examples include the availability and quality of a school’s learning resources (e.g., computers, textbooks) and the degree to which students experience stress at home (e.g., Richman, Rosenfield, & Bowen, 1998; Sarason & Sarason, 1988; Wentzel, 1997).

In closing, Juvonen’s (1996) model was not formulated to investigate causes of academic achievement. Again, Juvonen’s (1996) model focuses on peer, teacher, and student behaviors that impact sense of belonging; it makes no formal mention of non-behavioral environmental factors. However, given the theoretical relationships among academic achievement and many of the predictors of sense of belonging recognized by Juvonen (1996) (e.g., student aggression, peer helping behaviors, teacher fairness), a considerable amount of research on other predictors and outcomes of sense of belonging and related constructs has been conducted. A summary of these research findings is provided in the discussion that follows.
Behavioral Determinants of Sense of Belonging

As noted previously, most of the research on determinants of sense of belonging to date has focused on behaviors demonstrated by teachers and peers – most notably, those identified in Juvonen’s (1996) model. Fortunately, as interest in the topic of student motivation has progressed, research on related constructs such as connectedness, psychological readiness and academic engagement has revealed a number of other behaviors, including those demonstrated by students, that should, in theory, impact sense of belonging as well. More specifically, according to Juvonen (1996), perceived support is a defining characteristic of sense of belonging such that students who feel supported socially, emotionally, and/or academically are more likely to feel a strong sense of belonging than those who do not feel supported. Each of the behaviors identified in this review can be viewed as falling into one of these three ‘support’ categories (i.e., social, emotional, and/or academic).

Music Teacher Behaviors

Music teachers are in a strong position to influence a student’s sense of belonging. Research on the relationship between teacher behaviors and student motivation supports this proposition. For example, Juvonen (1996) indicated that students are more likely to feel that they belong in school when their teachers demonstrate fairness (e.g., grade homework fairly) and a willingness to talk with students about social problems they might be having.

Other behaviors that should have a positive impact on sense of belonging relate to music teachers’ expectations of students (Wentzel, 1997). In short, students whose teachers voice high social and academic expectations of their students are more likely to feel a sense of belonging and engagement at school than students whose teachers voice lower expectations. In addition, music teachers who provide a safe environment for their students to learn, as well as avoid conflict with their pupils are more likely to have students who enjoy school and cooperate more with one another (Birch & Ladd, 1997). Over time, such cooperation among students leads to higher perceptions of overall support, which in turn has a positive impact on the students’ sense of belonging (Juvonen, 1996).

Other music teacher behaviors that have been shown to influence sense of belonging (via perceptions of overall support) include demonstrating patience, expressing empathy, listening attentively, and encouraging students to solve academic problems within the music classroom (Beck, 1995; Bondy & Davis, 2000; Bosworth, 1995; Carson, 1999; Ferreira & Bosworth, 2001; Goldstein & Lake, 2000; Halldorsdottir, 1990; Horsch, Chen, & Wagner, 2002; Huebner, 1996; Larrivee, 2000; McCray, Browne, Bodenreider, 2002; Noblit, Rogers, & McCadden, 1995; Noddings, 1992; Smith, 2000; Tronto, 1993; Vogt, 2002; Weinstein, 1998; Zimmerman & Phillips, 2000). Research also indicates that music teachers who enable students to work together collaboratively are more likely to foster a sense of belonging among students (Wegerif, 1998). Students are also more likely to feel supported by teachers who listen to them and refrain from judging them (Christenson & Anderson, 2002).

Teaching style has also been shown to influence feelings of belonging and motivation to achieve. For example, several studies have found that music teachers who scaffold students are more likely to motivate students to achieve academically by their positive impact on students’ self-perceptions (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 1985; Grolnick, Ryan, & Deci, 1989; Lepper & Green, 1975; Ryan, 1982; Ryan, Connell, & Deci, 1985). Further, as students begin to learn new things from and about their teachers, their relationships with their teachers improve; the end result is an increase in sense of belonging and academic achievement (Chall, 2000; Christenson & Anderson, 2002; Vygotsky, 1978).

Other music teacher behaviors that can affect a student’s sense of belonging are goal setting and strategy development. Several studies, for example, have found that students perceive music teachers who set challenging goals and offer advice regarding goal accomplishment strategies to be more supportive and caring than teachers who do not (e.g., Christenson & Anderson, 2002). Students who feel this way are likely to experience a greater sense of belonging. Related studies have found that students whose teachers set high performance goals are likely to feel more supported academically and emotionally than students whose teachers set easy performance goals (e.g., Bandura, 1986; Wentzel, 1997).
Finally, research indicates that there is a positive relationship between social support and the degree to which students perceive that their music teachers support and prevent other students from victimizing them. Most notably, several studies have found that students whose teachers permit bullying and classroom teasing are less likely to feel connected to their teachers and peers than students whose teachers address bullying and related behaviors head-on (Banks, 1997). Other studies have found that students whose teachers encourage them to seek assistance from other classmates are more likely to feel connected with, and related to others at school than students whose teachers do not encourage such feedback-seeking behavior (Bandura, 1986; Wentzel, 1997). However, it should be noted that classmate feedback must be perceived as helpful and not harmful in order for students to feel that they are connected and safe (Juvonen, 1996; Banks, 1997).

Peer Behaviors

In addition to teacher behaviors, peer behaviors have been shown to be strong determinants of a student’s sense of belonging. For example, research on social exclusion indicates that students whose peers exclude them from social and/or academic discussions at school rarely feel a strong sense of belonging at school and are prone to experience anxiety (McDonald & Leary, 2005). Social exclusion is the product of not fitting into peer groups. Many peer groups or cliques form in school with status structures. These status structures lead to some groups of students being considered higher status than others (Crick., 2001; Kinney, 1993). Many higher status clichés snub and/or gossip about students in lower status groups (Baumeister & Tice, 1990; Gray & McNaughton, 2000; Adler & Adler, 1998). Although status groups do provide a sense of belonging for different students of different status, some students never find a suitable clique and it these specific individuals who experience the weakest sense of belonging (Adler & Adler, 1998).

In addition to behaviors associated with social exclusion, the extent to which students’ peers demonstrate aggressive behaviors within and outside the music classroom can also have a significant impact on a student’s sense of belonging. For example, several studies have found that students who slap, kick, and/or punch their peers are less likely to feel connected to school compared to students whose peers do not demonstrate these behaviors (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1996; Olweus, 1993; Paquette & Underwood, 1999). Other studies have found that students whose peers engage in behaviors designed to damage students’ social relationships (e.g., gossip, friendship manipulation) report lower levels of sense of belonging and motivation to achieve than students whose peers do not engage in such behaviors (Paquette & Underwood, 1999).

In contrast, pro-social behaviors demonstrated by students’ peers have been shown to have a positive impact on a student’s sense of belonging. For example, several studies have found that students who have peers who proactively seek their academic and social feedback, assist them with social endeavors, and share study strategies and school supplies with them are more likely to feel supported emotionally and socially, and in turn report a greater sense of belonging (e.g., Richman, Rosenfeld, & Bowen, 1998; Wentzel, 1991). Still other studies have found that students who have peers that provide them emotional support during difficult emotional times both within and outside the music classroom are more likely to feel a sense of belonging or general feeling of connectedness at school than students who do not receive such emotional support from peers).

A final set of peer behaviors found to relate to sense of belonging involves the application of music classroom tutoring. Research has found that peers who serve as tutors to other students, and couple this tutoring with immediate reinforcement and positive feedback, help improve students’ sense of belonging and academic performance (Greenwood, 1991; Greenwood, Carta, & Hall, 1988; Hops & Cobb, 1973). Other studies have found that students who take advantage of free tutoring services report improvements in academic performance relative to students who do not capitalize on such services (e.g., Amenkhienan & Hogan, 2004).

Student Behaviors

Compared to teacher and peer behaviors, student behaviors that impact sense of belonging have received little research attention. This is somewhat surprising given the role that the ‘person’ plays in several important theories of motivation (e.g., Theory of Reciprocal Causation, Expectancy Theory,
Reinforcement Theory). Those behaviors that have been studied are reviewed as follows.

When demonstrated by students rather than peers, many of the same behaviors noted previously have been empirically and/or theoretically linked to sense of belonging. For example, research indicates that students who actively attempt to cooperate with and act friendly toward their classmates and peers are more likely than those who do not to feel a sense of belonging at school (Berman, 1997). Likewise, students who do not bully or criticize other students are likely to feel a stronger sense of belonging than those who do (Juvonen & Graham, 1998; Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003). In addition, students who serve as tutors are hypothesized to gain more than personal self-esteem; they are also hypothesized to develop – through the process of tutoring and developing meaningful relationships with others whom they tutor – a stronger sense of belonging and connectedness to school (Noll, 1997). Sharing study tips is another related behavior hypothesized to positively impact sense of belonging.

Students who exclude other students from academic and social discussions are less likely to feel a sense of belonging in the long-run. More specifically, as noted previously, social exclusion is a form of relational exclusion which researchers have found can have effects similar to those of bullying. The end result in either case is that both the bully and the bullied are harmed. The bullied students are less likely to feel a sense of belonging, and the bullies, as previously mentioned, often become unpopular as they do not feel as if they belong (Wheeler, 2004).

Finally, gossiping about other students in an attempt to harm their reputations can lead to students feeling as if they do not belong. Historically, in some honor societies, gossiping was part of a repertoire of behaviors that not only dishonored students but actually contributed to students being removed from universities. Further, current research identifies gossip as a form of social relational aggression that is utilized to harm a student’s self-esteem and/or social standing. Many of the victims of social aggression, especially girls, feel rejected or lose some of their sense of belonging in the school community (Burnett & Walz, 1994; Galen & Underwood, 1997; Kaplan & Johnson, 1992).

Environmental Determinants of Sense of Belonging

It is evident from the preceding review that there are a number of behaviors demonstrated by students, peers, and teachers that can impact a student’s sense of belonging. It is also evident that the potential impact of these behaviors stems from their impact on students’ perceptions of emotional, social, and/or academic support. As noted previously, however, research on non-behavioral predictors of constructs related to sense of belonging (e.g., connectedness, psychological engagement) indicates that sense of belonging may be influenced by more than just behaviors. A second factor may be the overall context, or scholastic environment, within which a student interacts with his/her teachers and peers. A review of the empirical research in this area is provided in the discussion that follows.

One potential environmental determinant is physical safety. Students who feel physically safe at school are more likely to feel a sense of belonging than students who do not feel safe (e.g., Beebe, Beebe, & Ivy, 2010; Juvonen & Graham, 1998; Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003). Related studies have found that students who perceive their school environments to be ‘emotionally safe’ (i.e., students feel accepted by students and teachers alike for being who they are, and nothing more) are more likely to feel a sense of belonging than students who feel less emotionally safe and connected (Johnson, 2009; Olweus, 1987).

Another potential environmental determinant involves the use of technology. Many schools are now emphasizing the use of computers and software programs to maximize efficiency and the overall quality of student learning. Some researchers believe that such technology might actually have a negative impact on sense of belonging via their impact on students’ innate social needs (e.g., the desire to bond on an emotional level with other students) (Kagan, 1990). Unfortunately, little empirical research in this area has been conducted.

Other studies have found that music classroom goal structure influences students’ perceptions of academic support, and in turn students’ senses of belonging. More specifically, research indicates that students respond differently to mastery versus performance goals (Bandura, 1991; Locke & Latham, 1990). While mastery goals often spur from students’
intrinsic levels of motivation and performance goals, although frequently associated with extrinsic motivation, they typically culminate with higher grades in school. However, this depends sometimes on whether the student’s performance goal is related to his/her approach or avoidance behavior. In short, if the student wants to avoid negative consequences, he/she may become more motivated to earn a higher grade in order to avoid adverse consequences (Skinner, 1953; Tolman, 1932; Locke & Latham, 1990).

Student perceptions of their schools’ reward practices have also been shown to influence sense of belonging (e.g., Anderman & Anderman, 1999; Midgley, 2001). For example, several studies have found relationships between student motivation and a school’s perceived use of rewards. Students who believe their schools allocate or withhold rewards based on behaviors or outcomes perceived to have little value tend to be less enthusiastic about learning, reporting lower levels of overall connectedness to school (Skinner, Williams, & Neddenriep, 2004).

Additional non-behavioral determinants of sense of belonging include the availability and quality of school learning resources. For example, although there is relatively little empirical data on this topic, it is reasonable to think that students will be more motivated to learn, and experience higher levels of perceived academic support, if their school is up-to-date technologically (e.g., it provides effective computers), offers need-based academic counseling, and provides quality textbooks at a reasonable price (Hirsch, 1996; Midgley, 2001; Tyson & Woodward, 1989).

The degree to which schools encourage collaborative learning is another variable that should impact sense of belonging. For example, students who are frequently asked to work together with other students on projects tend to develop higher levels of perceived social and academic support, and in turn a stronger sense of belonging to school, than students who work independently (Rovai, 2002). Research further indicates that such collaborative/consensus-based learning is more prevalent in some schools than others. Additional research on the relationship between a school’s collaborative learning environment and sense of belonging is therefore warranted (Weinberger & Fischer, 2006).

An additional environmental variable relates to student tutoring services. Research indicates that students who receive tutoring and participate in tutoring programs as tutors themselves are likely to feel a stronger sense of belonging than students who do neither (Noll, 1997). For this reason, it is reasonable to think that students who attend schools that offer formal tutoring services are likely to feel more supported academically, and in turn experience higher levels of sense of belonging, than students who attend schools that do not offer tutoring programs.

Another potential environmental determinant of sense of belonging involves parental expectations of academic success. For example, several studies have found positive relationships between student achievement and the degree to which students perceive their primary caregiver(s) as supportive of their academic pursuits. Other studies have found relationships between academic engagement and the amount and type of academic discussion that is generated and received at home (Bempechet, Graham, & Jimenez, 1999).

A final environmental factor with the potential to impact student sense of belonging is student stress rooted in activities and events at home. Two specific examples include stress brought on by financial hardship and the death of a close friend or family member. When a student loses a parent to death, he/she loses a key source of potential emotional support that can comfort, empathize, and assist him/her when he/she is faced with difficult academic challenges (Fontana, 1989). Without such support, students are less likely to feel that they belong at school. With respect to financial hardships, research indicates that family financial problems are negatively correlated with a student’s sense of belonging.
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What does it mean to listen? Composer Pauline Oliveros has devoted her life to exploring this idea and has organized her ideas and practice under the label of Deep Listening. Unlike the involuntary and often casual act of human hearing, Deep Listening welcomes whole body hearing and “listening in every possible way to everything possible to hear no matter what one is doing.”¹ This practice has evolved since 1988 into the foundation of the Deep Listening Institute, dedicated to awareness and exploration of the practice of Deep Listening and the Deep Listening Band, which continues to record and perform.²

This peer-reviewed anthology, published on the occasion of the composer’s 80th birthday, serves as an oral history of Deep Listening praxis. Many contributors are long-time collaborators of Oliveros, yet the book is not a congratulatory festschrifte: The focus remains on Deep Listening. Though a few essays exude nostalgia as the authors detail their early experiences with Deep Listening, many are full of exuberance. Founding member of the Deep Listening...
Band, Stuart Dempster presents a joyous essay, “Training for Listening: a Lifelong Practice,” detailing his lifelong fascination with the sound of trains and how it lead to his own journey towards deep listening (p. 13). The excitement as he details his listening experience is contagious! Ione, the artistic director of the Deep Listening Institute, also brings a playful approach to the practice in her essay on listening to our dreams (p. 299). After reading it, I had a night of particularly sound-rich dreams full of incongruously combined sonic wonders from Stravinsky to the rock band Boston along with myriad voices from my past that I had all but forgotten.

In addition to inviting us into the authors’ listening worlds, the anthology also champions listening as a radical act, which can occur in unexpected environments. Renée Coulombe’s essay (p. 113) examines how electronic dance music (EDM) events serve as communal gatherings to practice deep listening. This counterculture is organized around communal listening as part of the group or alone. The unique outsider settings allow attendees to selectively control spatial interaction with their sonic environs as they immerse themselves in one-to-four day listening events. Coulombe contends that in today’s Western culture, communal listening is not a common act. Citing Marshall McLuhan’s observation of the emergence of our visual culture (p. 115), she reminds us (or examines?) how it is increasingly difficult to remove ourselves from our visual surroundings to listen (p. 126).

In “Ear Piece,” 1998, Oliveros asks the performer “What will you hear in the future?”(p. 3) Looking at the counterculture described in Coulombe’s essay, one must ask what Deep Listening could bring to a future where it was not relegated as a fringe activity. Susan Key’s essay (p. 169) on how she employed Deep Listening techniques in the classroom is inspiring. Deep Listening not only provides teachers with a pedagogical practice for bringing the arts to the classroom, but also serves as a pedagogical approach to professional development for teachers who had little arts exposure in the classroom themselves.

Taken in concert with Gayle Young’s commanding essay, a powerful look to what the future of Deep Listening could be begins to emerge. Young uses Marshall McLuhan’s concept of acoustic space to provide “a broad cultural context within which Deep Listening can be understood to have contributed tools needed to enhance listening within changing cultural context.” Young’s assertion that “our experience of acoustic space is, rather, one of increasing information overload of all media, not only of sound, in a cultural context that often appears to lack opportunity for contemplative attention” (p. 227) is hard to refute. The effects of this are something I often see in my classrooms as students attempt to parse and make sense of the massive amounts of information and myriad media they face. Her notion that Deep Listening can mitigate this information overload in many ways mirrors the work of pioneers in the information field like David Levy whose recent work on the use of mindful meditation as a tool to manage stressful information environments received wide-spread media attention in scholarly and mainstream news organizations.3 Key and Young’s essays point to a future where Deep Listening is a more wide-spread practice. Young affirms that Deep Listening enables practitioners to “develop an open approach to listening that enables them to deal effectively with the challenges of controlling attention” (p. 226). I believe that the recent media attention Levy’s work received signals a desire from mainstream culture for practices like Deep Listening that can aid in helping us to refine our attention and sense-making skills to mitigate the effects of information overload in our media-saturated culture.

Currently, the anthology is only to be available as a print monograph. This is a curious choice in light of the content and the technological focus of the Institute itself. The accompanying web page on the Deep Listening site (http://deepllistening.org/essays) is somewhat sparse and perhaps could have been developed more extensively as a companion piece. For example, Miya Masoaka, Paula Matthuson, and David Rothenberg, include cited links to audio, video, and web digital content cited in their essays. However, these are not linked on the companion site. The content that is available is presented in a somewhat puzzling way. Tom Bickley’s fantastic Prezi, illustrating the relationships among the anthology’s authors and the Deep Listening Institute, is presented as a link to a footnote on the web page that links to the presentation, which was somewhat confusing. The videos that Susan Key presented of student work resulting from her project would not play in any of the browsers I had.
available, but were downloadable. I would welcome a more comprehensive companion site from the editors that included embedded digital content and links to digital content cited by the essayists represented. However, such a small inconvenience should not inhibit those who seek inspiration and concrete techniques to bring Deep Listening to their students or those who interested in new ways of thinking about listening.
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