

“It’s you—not the music”: musical skills in group interventions in multicultural kindergartens

Nora Bilalovic Kulset

ABSTRACT

This article presents findings from a self-study inquiry conducted in multicultural kindergartens during music group interventions (MGI). The inquiry is based on theories within musicking and communicative musicality. It addresses the claim: “It’s you—not the music” in search for whether this statement might be true or not. My purpose is also to question what is ‘me’ and what is ‘the music’ in this statement. MGIs were conducted for 19 weeks in three different multicultural kindergartens with children aged 3–5 (n=30). All were videotaped. Findings are based on the video material, qualitative interviews, informal talks, and critical friends, and this research material points towards the necessity of musical confidence to be able to make use of musical skills. Keywords: teacher competence, didactical conditions, musical skills, musicking, communicative musicality, multicultural kindergarten, self-study

Introduction

This article presents findings from a qualitative research inquiry within *self-study* (Hamilton, 1998). The object of the inquiry was me and my practice as a music teacher in kindergartens with a high level of linguistic minority children, and the motive was to find out “what I do and why I do it” (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 2009: 3). The reason for this is based on discussions about the findings in my previous study on singing and second language acquisition (Kulset, 2015a) with schoolteachers, kindergarten teachers, and caretakers who work with linguistic minority children (and adults). These discussions have brought forward a need to have a closer look on the didactics in the music group interventions (MGI). Even though my prior study has awakened interest and enthusiasm among teachers and caretakers, the very same group of people nevertheless express a lack of faith in their own musical abilities. They claim they either know too little of music or that they are too shy to conduct such a musical language trajectory, and watching me they simply state: “It’s you—not the music.” They express a view and an attitude towards my ability to conduct ‘successful’ MGIs in socially challenging groups (as is often the case with multicultural groups due to the lack of a common language) as if it was a part of an innate musical genius that is unattainable to most people. I have of course argued against this view.

However, as an experienced music teacher who has been working on a daily basis with kindergarten children and staff for more than 20 years, I started to ponder: Could they be right? Is it I who make this happen, not the music? And in that case, is it my personality? My musical skills? During the interview for my PhD application, I was asked a similar question: “How can you know that what happens is on account of the music and not you?” I realised that I needed to look for answers to these questions before I could move on with my research on singing and second language acquisition. Is it ‘me’ or the music—or both?

I put the word *me* in the section above in quotation marks because this ‘me’ might contain a whole lot more than the immediate superficial meaning when people point at me and say: “It’s you—not the music.” This ‘me’ and what lies in it is in fact the very subject for the present study. What is ‘me’ and what is ‘the music’? And what elements of my ‘personality’ could also be considered musical skills I have acquired through many years as a music teacher? The expression *musical skills* in this article refers to teacher competences, or the Norwegian expression *lærerferdigheter*. I use *musical skills* because this implies that to make music is a part of the teacher competence here mentioned. The expression *lærerferdigheter* brings us to the didactic relation model as originally presented by Bjørndal and Lieberg (1978) which I will elaborate later in this article. I also use the term *musical* and not *music* as I am not talking about skills

in music per se. ‘Musical skills’ in this article refers to expressions like *communicative musicality* (Malloch & Trevarthen, 2009) and *musicking* (Small, 1998) which I will come back to, while ‘skills in music’ might be (but not only) limited to be perceived as skills in playing an instrument, to know a lot of songs, or to sing with a trained voice.

The inquiry presented in this article is a part of my PhD study on singing and second language acquisition in multicultural kindergartens. A number of studies have pointed out the connection in the brain between music and language (see, e.g., Arbib, 2013), and also particularly singing and second language acquisition (see, e.g., Schön et al., 2008). This was also the topic in my previous study. A finding of interest was how singing facilitated relationships across language barriers, and how this speeded the linguistic minority children into playtime with the majority lingual children (Kulset, 2015a). In the present inquiry, I have put this topic aside to investigate the importance of the music teacher in this connection. If the music teacher, her personality and musical skills are as important (and seemingly unattainable) as many teachers and caretakers seem to believe, I need to find out what these skills are, and also address whether they really are unattainable to others or not. By analysing my conduct, what it is I am doing during the MGIs, and framing this in a didactical perspective, I might also hopefully be able to facilitate ongoing teacher development.

The role of the teacher

In her study on MGI’s influence on phonemic awareness in young children, Gromko (2005: 206) noticed how great an impact the teacher’s enthusiasm had on the children’s motivation and reasoned that this might have contributed to a more positive outcome of the music-activities than the music-activities alone. She even proposed future designs that offer children in control groups the same attention of an enthusiastic teacher as those in the treatment group. Gromko might have been correct when she argued that the teacher and the way he or she conducts the music activity, are just as important as the music itself. Also Patel (2011, 2012) emphasizes in his OPERA hypothesis how important positive emotions and unforced attention are for music-driven neural plasticity to occur. As Patel formulates: “Imagine a child who is given weekly music lessons but who dislikes the music he or she is taught” (Patel, 2011: 9), implying that the music and the music teacher must awaken enthusiasm, positive emotions, and attention in the child for the music to result in enhanced neural encoding of speech.

The fact that music awakens positive emotions and so may function as an empathy promoter among children (Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010; Rabinowitch et al. 2013) and adults (Anshel & Kipper 1988; Wiltermuth et al. 2009) is by now rather obvious. There

are several explanations on why music promotes empathy and pro-social behaviour. Grape et al. (2003) reported a significant increase in the oxytocin level in adults after a choir rehearsal. Oxytocin is known to promote empathy (Zak et al., 2007). According to Trehub et al. (2015), music promotes social and pro-social behaviour through a variety of mechanisms such as jointly experienced arousal and synchronous action across cultures. Cross et al. (2012: 337–353) have developed a theoretical model to elaborate and explain these circumstances, the theory of empathy promoting musical components (EPMC). The main concept of EPMC is that the flexibility in interpretation of music makes it easier to reach a state of shared intentionality and intersubjectivity. Cross et al. (2012) call this *floating intentionality*, and this floating intentionality in the music might be one of the reasons to an increased feeling of empathy between the participants. All these studies mention methodological elements like movement, imitation, entrainment, and joint rhythmic beat. Yet, none of them address the issue of the teacher and the role this person plays in mediating these musical components, and moreover, what kind of musical skills the teacher needs to carry out such MGIs.

Hence, to fill this gap of knowledge, a more precisely defined research question for this article is: what musical skills are needed to conduct music group interventions in multicultural kindergartens?

The didactical perspective on musical skills

“It’s you—not the music. “What is ‘me’ in this statement, and how is this ‘me’ divided from ‘the music’? Is it simply a question of my musical skills as an experienced music teacher? As previously mentioned I choose to use the expression *musical skills* as synonymous to the teacher competence, in Norwegian known as *lærerferdigheter*. Bjørndal and Lieberg (1978) were the first to propose the didactical relation model. In their original model we find *lærerferdigheter* localized under *didaktiske forutsetninger*, in English ‘didactical conditions’, alongside two other categories: ‘student competence’ and ‘physical, biological, social and cultural competences’. In this article I will focus on the teacher competence.

The purpose of creating the didactical relation model was, according to Bjørndal and Lieberg, to give teachers a system of concepts that shows the relations between different factors that needs to be analysed when plans for teaching are made (Bjørndal & Lieberg, 1978: 135). More recent versions of the didactical relation model have used different terms than this original model, many of them leaving teacher competence out. Instead, it is replaced by expressions such as ‘frames’ and ‘working method’ (Lyngsnes & Rismark, 2007: 80).

To avoid confusion or a possible mix-up I need to emphasise, particularly in consideration to Norwegian readers, the difference of *læreforutsetninger* or *læreferdigheter* (learning conditions) and *lærerferdigheter* (teacher competence). Several later versions of the didactical relation model includes the category *læreforutsetninger* or *læreferdigheter* (see e.g., Hiim & Hippe 2006; Lyngsnes & Rismark 2007) while *lærerferdigheter* is left out. It is of my opinion that the category *lærerferdigheter*, teacher competence, clarifies and underlines that the skills the teacher brings into the situation will colour how he or she relates to the teaching situation per se—to all the different aspects demonstrated in the didactical relational model. This knowledge, the teacher competence, is often tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 2009). I believe that using categories like teacher competence in the didactical relation model will contribute to shed light on our tacit knowledge. Hence I will use the original term teacher competence, or *musical skills* in this article.

The musical perspective on musical skills

Many scholars still embrace a perspective on music as an almost exclusive domain of professional musicians (or extremely talented laymen) who have perfected their skills with years of practice (Blacking, 1973: 4; Honing et al., 2015). Although one might think this is not a widespread attitude among educators of teachers and kindergarten teachers, surely it is the view of a substantial amount of the common man, and thereby also the students we educate. This view will affect their ability, or at least their belief in their ability, to make music (Ehrlin & Wallerstedt, 2014; Ericsson & Lindgren, 2011; Lamont 2011).

Small’s concept of *musicking* takes on a very different view on both music and the ability to make music, namely that music first and foremost is an activity, an act of togetherness—hence the verb *musicking*. According to Small, it is a figment to talk about music as if it was a thing. To music is to take part in “the gestural language of biological communication” (Small, 1998: 58), in the continuous passing of information that goes on in each individual living creature. This information, according to Small, always concerns relationships. Friend or foe, offspring or potential mate? Fight or flight, feed or breed? He argues that the verbal languages have limits compared to the gestural language of biological communication, a view shared by Cross (2005: 30, 35) who emphasises music’s ambiguity and *floating intentionality* as a positive factor in group cohesion. Both Small and Cross state that verbal language has proved to be less adequate in articulating and dealing with our complex relationships with one another and with the rest of the world (Cross, 2005: 36; Small, 1998: 38).

The gestural language of biological communication, in which Small places music activities, can on the other hand give us the chance to articulate and explore relationships, to “try them on to see how they fit” (Small, 1998: 63). This is highly relevant in multicultural kindergartens where the children need to be given what Cross (2003: 26–27) calls a “consequence-free means of exploring and achieving competence in social interaction.” He also supports the notion of musicking (Cross et al., 2012: 346) and argues that musical activities (in the concept of musicking) are specifically suited to the exploration of social interaction because of their nonefficaciousness and their multiple potential meaning (Cross, 2003, 2005).

Rituals are given a vital position in the theory of musicking. Small defines rituals as organized behaviour based on gestural language, or paralanguage, that leads us to affirm, explore and celebrate our ideas and conceptions of our relationship to cosmos, the world, our society, and each other (Small, 1998: 95). A ritual might be a family dinner, a large state celebration, a romantic movie date—or the MGI in kindergarten. They all have in common that they contribute in articulating people’s concepts of how the relationships of their world are structured, and thus how humans ought to relate to one another. This is what defines a community, and therefore rituals are used to say ‘this is who we are’ (affirmation), ‘this is whom I might be’ (exploration) and ‘we are happy to share this identity’ (celebration). Thus the ritual is a cornerstone in human life, and Small simply states: “ritual is the mother of all the arts” (Small, 1998: 105).

Also the literature on *communicative musicality* (Malloch & Trevarthen, 2009) speaks of the importance of the ritual in music making. Communicative musicality’s starting point is the studies on the rhythmic turn-taking vocalisation and facial expressions in the communication between the newborn infant and the mother. Furthermore it is a view on musicality as a psychobiological capacity that first and foremost facilitates group cohesion and coordination and is thereby essential to human cooperation (Dissanayake, 2009: 26). According to the concept of communicative musicality, music making is an innate ability connected to human relationships. As with language (another innate human skill), musical skills are learned and socially determined through the rituals in shared performance (Bannan & Woodward 2009: 467). The MGI in the kindergarten is an example of such a shared performance, a ritual where social skills are tested and acquired through the floating intentionality of musicking.

The study

The MGI programme consisted of weekly MGIs in three different kindergarten¹ groups over a period of 19 weeks. I conducted all the MGIs. The MGIs were designed as natural minimalistic interventions leaving out all extra instruments only a trained musician (or a music loving teacher) can make use of. As in the previous study, I decided to concentrate on 3–4-year old children. They already have an established language, and the linguistic minority children in the group might still have had little exposure to Norwegian language. Moreover, they are not yet part of the kindergarten’s preparations for getting ready for school and are free to play and establish connections across the group in terms of age. Every MGI was filmed and analysed with an explicit focus on the music teacher (myself) and what I did:

- 1) In what way I used the music,
- 2) How I behaved towards the children, and
- 3) How this affected the group.

I discussed incidents that happened during the MGIs with the kindergarten teachers immediately after every MGI. Most of these talks took place in an informal manner while the kindergarten teacher was tidying or waiting for children to get dressed for outdoor play. I also discussed cuts from the films with the kindergarten teachers, the head of the kindergartens and some of my colleagues as we went along (all with written permission from parents). I also conducted interviews with two of the kindergarten teachers at the end of my project period. The aim was to analyse myself and answer the following question: what musical skills are needed to conduct music group interventions in multicultural kindergartens? This leads to questions such as:

- 1) What am I doing during the MGIs?
- 2) How am I doing it?
- 3) How is the relationship between ‘the music’ (the content and the activities) and the ‘me’ (the teacher competence)? Are they intertwined and interdependent or is there such a thing as ‘me’ with tacit knowledge to an extent that makes the situation difficult to analyse?

1 In Norway, we use the term ‘kindergarten’ on all pre-schools, crèches, or playgroup activities led by educated kindergarten teachers alongside other care givers. Children start school at the age of 6.

Method

Design

The inquiry that this article builds upon was designed as a case study, also known as self-study research. The case was my own praxis as a music teacher in multicultural kindergartens where approximately 50% of the children spoke little or no Norwegian. One of the reasons to do self-study research is to find out “what I do and why I do it” (Hamilton & Pinnegar 2009: 3). One of the key arguments of self-study is that those engaged in the practice of a particular profession are particularly well qualified to investigate that practice (Schön, 1995; Zeichner, 1999). Munby and Russell (1993) argue that research on practice conducted within the practice from the perspective of the person who holds responsibility for the practice, gains authority based on the experience of the researcher (‘authority of experience’). Essential to the quality of a self-study is that the data is derived from multiple and varied sources and perspectives so that you can analyse your research questions from more than one data source or perspective. Having multiple data sources increases the validity (Samaras, 2011: 213), and “critical friends” is one such data source (ibid.: 214). Critical friends are colleagues who serve as validators who provide feedback while you are shaping your research. They also serve as your validation team to provide feedback on the quality and legitimacy of your claims (McNiff & Whitehead, 2005: 11). My critical friends were the teachers and heads of the kindergartens and colleagues within music teaching and education.

Participants

Children (3–4 years) from two kindergartens in Norway participated in weekly MGIs conducted by me. In one of the kindergartens I had two different groups of children, making it three groups of children in all. There were 10 children in each group (n = 30) where approximately 50% spoke little or no Norwegian and thus were in the category ‘linguistic minority children’. Kindergarten sections like these are typically socially challenged due to different language, cultural behaviour, family background, and so on (see Kulset, 2015b for a broader discussion on the subject). One or two kindergarten teachers always joined the MGIs, preferably the same teachers every week.

Data generating

The data in this inquiry is based on two qualitative interviews, 23 informal talks, feedback from critical friends, and 23 video recordings during MGI in three different groups of children. Videos were recorded on a video camera placed on a tripod in the corner of the room, pointing towards me, the teacher. The camera was a combined photo/video camera looking like the ordinary photo camera used in both kindergartens to document an activity or a special occasion. In this way, the children did not notice or comment on the camera in the corner as they were used to seeing a similar device. The video data were structured by CAQDAS (Computer Assisted Quality Data Analyses System). The qualitative interviews were performed at the end of my project period and included the two kindergarten teachers 'Ingrid' and 'Mona' who both had participated on a regular basis throughout the project period. They worked in different kindergartens, and I interviewed them individually. The interviews were planned as semi-structured but both ended up classified as open. Both teachers had a great amount of topics and subjects based on their experiences during the project period that they wanted to discuss with me. This fitted well into my self-study research, as my reason for wanting to conduct these interviews was to cross-check what kind of topics and issues the kindergarten teachers had discovered as important during the project compared to my own findings. The themes brought up by the interview subjects extracted the same issues that I had found. The interviews were recorded with my phone, and the sound was of very good quality. The informal talks happened right after each MGI and were not recorded. These talks involved different members of the staff, including those without an education as a kindergarten teacher. In Norwegian they are titled 'assistants'. After each informal talk I immediately wrote down all I could remember as it was being said. The duration of these talks would be anything from 5 to 30 minutes. In the analysis presentation I have left out quotations of the informal talks in respect for the informants, as I could not be sure that all of them fully understood that their spontaneous utterances and sharing of partly big emotions would end up not only in my research log, but also in print.

The MGI programme

A specific music intervention programme was designed to meet the following criteria:

- No instruments
- Includes songs, rhymes and dance
- Repetition of the same songs, rhymes and dance for the whole period.

I set the criteria as for any kindergarten teacher to be able to conduct the same MGI.²

I chose five songs (including rhymes), which I thought would encourage participation on the grounds of certain attributes:

- Movement and gestures
- Promote varied use of voice
- Both with and without melody
- Rhymes both with and without steady beat
- Both sitting down and standing up dancing/moving around
- Apt songs or rhymes to cue start and end of session.

Furthermore I set a rather loose didactic framework that would correspond with the already set criteria:

- Songs in same order every time
- I would not do a lot of talking in between songs to tell what song comes next or to ask the children whether they want to sing the song one more time
- Never count to three before starting
- Repeat songs at least three times
- Vary songs using easily accessible musical parameters (high and low volume, high pitch and low pitch voice and so on)
- Not asking the children what they want to sing.

Each MGI had a typical duration of 15 minutes.

The design is based on my teacher experiences from conducting MGIs during 20 years. The criteria also corresponds well with the concept of *ritual* (Malloch & Trevarthen, 2009; Small, 1998), with the notion on *communicative musicality* and its wordless yet meaningful ways of communicating through *musicking*, and with Cross et al. (2012) theory of Empathy Promoting Musical Components (EPMC), where elements such as imitation, entrainment, flexibility, and floating intentionality are cornerstones.

The analysis

I applied a stepwise-deductive inductive (SDI) approach by which empirical data are thematically categorized (by induction) followed by a verification of these thematically

² In Norway all kindergarten teachers have been trained in music during education and are expected to be able to make use of music in their profession. However, many are shy to musick, ashamed of their own voice (Schei, 2011) or caught up in a negative self image (Ehrlin & Wallerstedt, 2014; Ericsson & Lindgren, 2011; Kulset, 2015a; Lamont, 2011). Also the number of music lessons they have been offered varies, both between institutions and caused by the students' own choice. Hence their musical skills and ability may vary at large. Due to the limits of the article formats this is not the place to further elaborate these issues.

outcomes in the empirical data (by deduction) (Tjora, 2012: 175–176). The intention in SDI is to develop concepts that capture central characteristics that also have relevance to other cases than the one being studied. It is closely related to Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) but a more suitable method for this project, as it might be conducted within a shorter time lapse than does Grounded Theory (Tjora, 2012: 176). In the first step of the analysis the video data were coded empiric-close into nodes or themes. This led the themes to reflect the actual content of each MGI video and not my main research questions or what I initially (thought I) was looking for. I found this particularly important as I was studying myself and in this way lowering the risk for a biased point of view. “The aim of self-study research is to provoke, challenge, and illuminate rather than confirm and settle” (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001: 20). Out of 56 different themes, all with the explicit focus on the music teacher, four main categories were created and used as a basis for the further analysis and concept development. The development of these categories were also a result of feed back from my critical friends, my informal talks with the staff and the qualitative interviews.

Results and discussion

The inquiry presented in this article was set off by such comments as: “It’s you—not the music”, consequently I needed to find out whether or not this could be right. Hence the research question: what musical skills are needed to conduct music group interventions in multicultural kindergartens?

In the analysis, four different but closely related findings appeared as particularly interesting:

- (1) Intentionally overlooking chaotic episodes/conflicts.
- (2) Deliberate use of voice and gestures.
- (3) Structure.
- (4) The physical surroundings.

I will in the further text concentrate on the analysis of the two first of these four categories, namely those most closely related to ‘me’: (1) Intentionally overlooking chaotic episodes/conflicts, and (2) Deliberate use of voice and gestures. I do not consider the data material to be exhausted, and additional categories might be discovered in future phases of analyses. I will present the results as narratives from the videos and

the interviews with the kindergarten teachers, which then will be discussed in the light of relevant theory. All names in the narratives are anonymized.

After the first preliminary analysis, my response to the statement: “It’s you—not the music”, pointed towards “they have been right, it *is* me.” Watching the video material made me realise to what extent the many years of professional music teaching had shaped me and how much tacit knowledge I possessed. Would it at all be possible to verbalise this behaviour and transform it into didactical descriptions? I carried out several rounds of analyses (including informal talks and discussions with critical friends) to reveal new layers of this “me”. This brought me to investigate in depth the two categories: (1) Intentionally overlooking chaotic episodes/conflicts, and (2) Deliberate use of voice and gestures.

Intentionally overlooking chaotic episodes/conflicts

I will start this analysis section with an excerpt from the video material that after several rounds of analyses made me realise it is not me neither the music. There is something more. This video clip gives an example on a situation where the kindergarten teachers afterwards typically would state “It’s you”. At first it is tempting to agree. I am not doing much to solve the situation; there is just ‘something’ in my behaviour that silences the conflict.

The Music Box—2015-06-02

Khaalid starts to cry outside the picture at the same time as I start to play on the music box (which is part of our opening procedure). He cries really loud and I stop playing and direct my focus towards him. He runs and sits down on Mona’s lap and Mona asks with a loud and strict voice to the other two boys outside the circle: “What happened?” I put the music box back into my pocket and Annam asks me if we may continue. Mona asks again in a loud voice: “What happened?” I tell Annam that we have to wait a bit because Mahmoud is really sad. “His name is not Mahmoud, it is Khaalid”, Toni tells me. I look at him with deliberate exaggerated astonishment, and then I look at Mona. She smiles at me. “You are so *glemsom* [forgetting]”, Toni says (using that specific term). I touch his shoulder and say: “Yes, I was a bit forgetting.” Then I turn to Khaalid who sits on Mona’s lap across the circle. He still cries a lot. I lean towards him while I say in a quiet low voice: “Hey, Khaalid?” I wave him nearer with my finger. Mona points at me. “Come

and see this", I address him and start to play the music box, still leaning towards him. He stops crying immediately. In the background Johan shouts out "Hey! Hey!" I look at him and make a quiet and slow "ssshhhh"-sound while I continue to play on the music box. Jonah returns to the circle and sits down on a pillow, tip-toeing as to not disturb. I smile at him. Khaalid leaves Mona's lap and sneaks closer to find a pillow to sit on. Peace is restored and we continue the MGI.

What happens here? There are considerable conflicts going on, several children have already left the room crying prior to this excerpt. Nothing particular has happened to make them cry, it was just one of those days where one child had the wrong jam on her bread for lunch, another child the wrong pair of trousers and so on. While we are busy trying to solve the matter on jam and trousers, something else happens outside our scope: three (or two, we do not know) boys have been fighting and now one of them is crying. We do not know whether the crying boy is the one to blame or if he is the one to comfort. The kindergarten teacher Mona takes on the responsible role and tries to figure out who did what. "What happened?" she keeps asking the boys who are not crying while she comforts the crying boy Khaalid. She gets no reply, but she keeps asking. What else can she do? She needs to sort this out, she is a trained teacher and she must make sure everyone understands it is not OK to fight. So she turns to verbal language: "let us sort this out." The problem is we do not know what has happened.

Another problem is that Khaalid speaks almost no Norwegian. As both Cross and Small state, verbal language may be unproductive in situations with complex relationships and social uncertainty because of its unambiguously meaning (Cross, 2005: 35; Small, 1998: 38). In any communication the capacities of the sender and receiver must be similar enough for the receiver to be capable of all the processes that are necessary to decode the message, and Cross (2005, 2012), Small (1998), and Malloch and Trevarthen (2009) highlight musical communication and musicking as an alternative (and in some circumstances, as in situations of social complexity, even better) common language of communication. As Small points out, the gestural language of biological communication, in which he places music activities, can give us the chance to articulate and explore relationships, to "try them on to see how they fit" (Small, 1998: 63). Hence, when I turn toward Khaalid and use my whole repertoire of gestural language while I completely overlook the chaos and conflicts that are going on, I manage to shift the group's focus from the conflicts toward the ritual of the MGI. I address Khaalid, and thereby the whole group, using my musical language instead of my verbal language.

By doing this I do not solve the problem of who did what in the conflict between the boys, but I bring back the group's attention to the music making. Using a form of communication the receivers are capable of decoding, enabling them to understand the message. This communication form is the musicking, or the communicative musicality, materialised in my gestural language and focus on the ritual (which the music box is an important part of), not the chaos. One of my critical friends responded as follows to this clip: "You demonstrate to the point the notion on teacher competence in this clip. A full attentiveness toward the child AND the group at the same time. And that the musical elements that you use with your body and your voice, and even the music box, have the exact capacities that communicates to children."

Tolerating chaos

On the whole, I as the music teacher appear to be very calm during the MGIs no matter what happens. I engage in both the children and the music but still seem cool-headed. Whenever chaotic situations arise (for instance small conflicts between the children or children running back and forth) I keep on making music in such a way that conflicts seems to solve by themselves without need for extra regulations by the grown-ups.

However this is not synonymous with merely calm and peaceful MGIs. The consequence of overlooking the chaos is also to *tolerate* the chaos, which at times is a lot, resulting in MGIs that not at all appear as very successful. Still, the joint focus and the children's desire to participate in the MGI, comes clearly forward in between the chaos. The fact that I stay focused on the MGI activity and not on the chaos seems to contribute at large to also facilitate the same MGI focus in the children.

The Hairdressing—2015-04-21

Aisha gets up and stands behind me, playing with my ponytail. I continue to sing with the rest of the children. Aisha pulls out my elastic and starts styling my hair. I continue singing and the other children do not seem to take notice of Aisha dressing my hair. When we reach the end of the stanza, Nia gets up and says: "I want, too" and joins Aisha. I pause the song, which is now in between stanzas, and say: "You know what girls, you will have to do my hair another time because it's a bit uncomfortable to get your hair done while you are singing, OK?" The girls both say "yes" and sit back down. While I am fixing my ponytail, Amir grabs Annam's fairy wings, which lie on the floor beside her. She grabs them too and shouts "No, Amir!" They keep pulling

from both sides and Annam screams: “It’s girl’s stuff, no Amir!” I make no comment on their conflict and continue the song where we stopped as soon as my hair is fixed. This takes about five seconds. Amir lets go of the wings as soon as I start singing and both he and Annam join in.

In the interview afterwards, Ingrid claims:

I have been thinking a lot about how wise it seems not to do a lot of talking, the fact that you did not interrupt or set a lot of boundaries within the activity. We have used a lot of time on “Hush, be quiet” and “Sit down” and things like that which I now have observed that when you *don’t* do it, then everything just solves by itself.

My tacit knowledge on how music will catch the children’s attention—how music making as an alternative way of communicating (than verbal language) will affect them (Cross, 2005: 35; Small, 1998: 38)—contributes to my calmness despite the chaotic episodes. As Cross puts it:

Music’s power of entrainment, together with its ambiguity, may allow each participant child to explore forms of interaction with others while minimizing the risk that such exploration might give rise to conflict, effectively underlying the gestation of a social flexibility (...). One only has to envisage a group of children interacting verbally and unambiguously rather than musically to see (and hear) how quickly conflict is likely to emerge in linguistic rather than musical interaction! (Cross, 2005: 36).

I know that the chaos is an expression for many things that has nothing to do with me: that what I do is boring, that the children do not like what I do, that I need to find something else new and exciting to sing and so on. However, to many kindergarten teachers perceptions like these are typical reasons for feeling unsuccessful in the music making (Kulset, 2015a: 34–38). My musical skills prevent me from becoming too self-conscious in a way that makes me assess the rising chaos as something that has to do with me. I am confident in my music making, which I find is a crucial quality.

While noticing the chaos, I know that the children are still new to the situation, they do not know how things are done, how our *ritual* (Small, 1998) takes form, and above all: they are young children and do not necessarily enjoy the MGI the best by sitting quietly on the floor in a perfect circle. I also know that if I just continue and enjoy myself while singing, and if I repeat the same things and hold on to my original

plans (not be tempted to find ‘new and exciting’ songs and activities as if I was an entertainer), the chaos will disappear, and the ritual will take form.

All this tacit knowledge is a result of many years of practice experience that has shaped me. Although these skills might be difficult to put into words, the kindergarten teachers discovered little by little what this calmness through chaos brought forward. This can be seen in the next example where Mona reflects on the consequence of not interfering even when the conflict involves two boys, David and Amir, who often end up fighting.

Chaos anxiety

“The Slippers”—2015-06-23

David runs away with Amir’s slippers and shouts out: “Amir!” in a teasing manner. Mona shakes her head towards David and says in a low tone: “David, don’t do it.” Mona and I exchange looks, but I keep on singing. David returns to the circle. He holds Amir’s slippers up in the air and shouts “Amir!” in the same teasing way. “David”, Mona whispers and she scratches her cheek and seems uncomfortable. He returns a third time, and now he gently hits Amir in the head with one of the slippers, still calling out: “Amir!” At this point David is standing close to me and I manage to grab one of the slippers. I put it next to Amir. This makes David let go of the other slipper too, and Amir puts them both close to his side. All this time we have been singing continuously, and Amir has been participating with great enthusiasm. No conflict emerged.

Mona reflects upon this particular episode in the interview:

I have been thinking about those shoes. When David tried to take Amir’s slippers. That was also one of those times when...it didn’t work out [for the ‘trouble maker’]. So then I realized: “Aha, he is lost in the song, he is lost in the circle time. He actually doesn’t bother to care about David running around with his slippers.” He really didn’t care about those shoes, although the other one made a big effort. That was so fascinating to see. He was a part of the relationship created by the singing, and he didn’t want to leave that feeling. And if you had interrupted and made a stop, started to talk about those shoes...it is so easy to do that. I was all: “no, no, don’t do it”, right? Because you know how easily Amir [she slaps her hand in the air

as if to remind me that he hits other children a lot]. But luckily, I didn’t say anything. (...) I mentioned this incident at the staff meeting and we had a good talk about it. This was such an important revelation to me, because I was all: “m-m-m!” [she presses her lips together, looking very strict and shaking her head] but then nothing happened. I think the reason is that we had this sense of community due to the singing.

In these two previous interview quotes both Ingrid and Mona question their own problem-solving as it has taken form up till now, by hushing, continuously organizing the children telling them to sit down, and interrupting oneself all the time to solve conflicts between the children. They state that when you *don’t* do this, the atmosphere is actually more peaceful. How and why am I able to overlook the chaos, to tolerate the chaos?

As I mentioned on the previous page, it is my teacher competence and the confidence this gives me that leads me to be able to behave in this way. Instead of being caught up in a (potential) fear for chaos; I am able to keep the didactical perspective. Hence whenever the children are restless in some manner, I do not assess the situation as problematic. I evaluate the situation from the full range of the didactical conditions where also the student competence and the physical, biological, social, and cultural competences are important factors (Bjørndal & Lieberg, 1978). The children might be restless for a number of reasons, for instance because they are not used to the concept of circle time (which was the case in two out of three groups in this project), they do not understand what is going on because they do not understand the language, they are not used to doing things together because they do not speak the same language, they do not trust each other because of a typical high conflict level, or they do not yet know the routine of the *ritual* and so they are still testing the boundaries (“What happens if I run out of the door? Will I be stopped?”) My competence as a teacher includes being able to unveil these components in the relations that constitutes the MGI.

By reflecting didactically on the situation in this manner, it is easy for me to overlook the chaotic episodes and conflicts and keep the focus on the MGI activity because I can see that the chaos is not necessarily a direct evaluation of me and how I perform or the content of the MGI. By maintaining the focus on what is the most important activity, the music, not the conflicts, I also achieve to create a positive atmosphere. Instead of hushing and using my strict voice while trying to solve conflicts, I am free to appear as a smiling and calm adult and make use of all the group singing driven oxytocin release that promotes empathy and cooperation (Grape et al., 2003; Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010; Rabinowitch et al., 2013).

The positive atmosphere that joint music making creates within a group might easily be destroyed by adults continuously interrupting the music making to be ‘peacemakers’ in conflicts between the children, or to make sure that the children are in place and pay enough attention. The attitude found in the video material reveals that I, both despite and because of all the chaos I tolerate, create a situation that is calm and coherent instead of being chopped into pieces in-between every time the teacher finds it necessary to interrupt the music to sort out situations that emerge. I secure the attention of the children by not claiming the attention by force (Patel, 2011, 2012), but instead letting the music solve the potential problem through its floating intentionality and flexibility, as explained in the theory of EPMC by Cross et al. (2012).

Deliberate use of voice and gestures

Facial and bodily expression (what Small calls the gestural language of our biological communication) is a common theme in the video material, as demonstrated in the narrative *The Music Box*. Two stories that are completely different from *The Music Box* give another angle to the same category:

The Thumb—2015-04-21

I show my thumb to David and Aisha who both have left the circle, and ask them if they remember the mouse. (The thumb represents the mouse in a rhyme they already know.) I keep sitting with the thumb up waiting for them to join us, smiling but with no more words. The other children are sitting quietly with their thumbs up, too. Aisha runs quickly towards us, while David considers the situation for two more seconds. Then he makes a grand gesture throwing his hand thumb up in the air and hurries to sit down in the circle.

The prolonged M—2015-06-16

I am about to start the rhyme “Musepakk” (“Mouse rabble”) when Mona suddenly turns towards two children outside the circle saying very loud: “Careful with that cupboard!” All the other children immediately focus their attention towards the two children who have left the circle. I continue the rhyme—I had but started the first sound: “m.” I keep holding that “m” and make it rise

in volume while I do the corresponding hand gesture really slowly. At once the children turn their heads back to me and join me in the rhyme.

These examples bring forward the concept of *communicative musicality* as interpreted by Erickson (2009), and how much one can communicate through body language. I deliberately use my voice and my body to invite the children and to have them focus on the MGI. As Erickson (2009: 451) puts it: I “summon the students’ collective attention” by using my communicative musicality. Attention has its natural ebb and flow—we cannot pay attention continuously, he states. To make deliberate use of musicality when you address the children, might contribute to increasing their attention ability (Erickson, 2009: 450).

The video demonstrates that I vary my voice in volume and timbre both in songs and rhymes, and I use my body language (including facial expressions) when I address the children or want to catch their attention, thus drawing on principles of communicative musicality (Erickson, 2009). With my voice and body I indicate the beginning of a song or a rhyme, whether it is to do it over again or in transition to a new song. This conduct both leads the children to focus their attention on what I am doing and also for everyone to understand what is going on. This further supports the idea of music making as an alternative way of communicating (cf. Cross, 2005: 35; Small, 1998: 38). I use my body language to invite children outside the circle to join, or to motivate the group to keep repeating the same songs and rhymes.

Discovering the impact of body language

This category appeared to be the most difficult for the kindergarten teachers to point out by themselves, as they did not talk of it until I brought it up. The peers watching the videos however, easily marked this as one of the main issues. My deliberate use of face and body gestures marked in fact a contrast in style to most of the other adults. They would have the same voice quality regardless of the situation (authoritarian as in giving instructions) sitting rather immobile on the floor, seemingly unaware of how much ‘watch guard’ and maladjustment they communicate to the children by their behaviour (this topic will be brought up later in the article). One wonderful deviation from this is the following example where the staff member Bjorn is delayed and enters the MGI after we have started:

The Panther—2015-06-11

The children and I are sitting very close together in a small circle and the atmosphere is peaceful and calm. Today the staff member Bjorn is delayed, and I have decided to start without him. The finger cymbals and the music box routine are done, and we are about to begin our welcoming rhyme that involves an almost soundless finger tapping on the floor. Suddenly I hear a sound, and I make a small shrinking movement as if to hide, put a hushing finger on my mouth and whisper to the children in a playful manner: “Oh, that’s Bjorn coming! Let’s pretend we’re not here!” All the children immediately look towards the door and then back at me. They smile and look excited. They keep sitting quiet as mice, some of them with the finger on the mouth mimicking “hush”, and they crawl even closer together. Bjorn enters the room and whispers “hey!” while he without a sound sneaks into the circle like a panther. Amelia leans towards him as he sits down, he smiles at her but keeps his full focus on me and immediately picks up where we are in our MGI ritual. I proceed with the finger tapping, and the children keep their peaceful and calm spirits.

When I showed this video clip in a meeting with the staff in both kindergartens, they applauded, notably after I had presented to them the category *deliberate use of voice and gestures*. Watching ‘one of their own’ being able to behave like this and the impact it had on the situation (imagining he had entered in the more typical adult way, talking loud and doing a bit of organizing of the children before sitting down), made them realize how easy it might be if only one possesses the knowledge of another way of doing it. What seemed to them as unachievable ‘magic’ skills only for the talented elite within music, proved to be attainable components of knowledge that might be acquired by anyone.

Mona puts this realisation into words in the following way:

It is all those little things you do. For instance instead of yelling: “Circle-time!” while clapping your hands, you bring out those...[she makes a movement with her hands as if she holds a pair of chiming finger cymbals]...to indicate that circle-time has begun. It is very fascinating.

What Mona really says here is that instead of using the verbal language, combined with a body language that states “I am the boss, you better listen to me, now!” I made use of the gestural language to communicate in a more musical way—that everyone could understand—without having to give strict orders. Thus I could also keep my body language positive and inviting.

Talking about body language

As I have mentioned, this category appeared to be the most difficult for the kindergarten teachers to point out. Nevertheless as I started talking about it, they would bring forward a great number of reflections and notions on the very same category. This tells me that as much as they indeed noticed this, they were not able to tear it apart from the ‘me’ and thus not regard it as a property or skill also they could attain. I had to prepare the ground for them to reflect upon the issue so they could be made aware of its simple existence.

Ingrid brings the topic forward in the following way:

They went totally blissful each time you chimed those finger cymbals. Time after time. A clear beginning and a clear end. You never had to ask them to sit down or hush on them. (...) It is like you created a magic space between those tinkles in the beginning and in the end.

“You never had to ask them to sit down or to hush them”, she says, “it’s like you created a magic space between those tinkles in the beginning and in the end.” This “magic space” was not created by *me* as in the statement: “It’s you—not the music.” It was created by the ‘me’ knowing what effect a pair of finger cymbals as a repetitive musical signal for the start and the end would have on the children. I never had to ask them to sit down or to hush them because my gestural language told them alongside my musical messenger the finger cymbals. My behaviour as an adult signals what kind of relations exists in this group. Are we friendly to each other? Are we to have a good time? Are we to feel empowered because we know what is going on and can participate on our own premises? Or are we to feel uneasy because the adult seems constrained and struggles with the fear of chaos, or even worse, her or his own ability to make music? (Ehrlin & Wallerstedt, 2014; Ericsson & Lindgren, 2012; Kulset, 2015a; Lamont, 2011). I do what Small (1998: 53–57) calls to pass on information about the outside entity that is being perceived. These signals on what kind of relations that are supposed to happen here are communicated through my gestural language, the tone of my voice, the way I conduct, the expression on my face—also defined as communicative musicality.

The language of bodily posture, movement and gesture, of facial expressions and of vocal intonation continue to perform functions in human life that words cannot, and where they function most specifically is in the articulation and exploration of relationships (Small, 1998: 61).

Ingrid contemplates on the impact of a deliberate use of voice in an everyday situation like the line-up for the slide:

Me: You mentioned the line-up to slide down that tiny in-door slide [which had turned out to be a part of the MGI] and the conflicts that arose among the children...those conflicts were all very easily sorted out.

Ingrid: Yes, I was astonished how you made those typical arguments vanish in thin air.

Me: How do you think that would have been different if I would use my strict adult voice and start solving those issues as if we were outdoor on a communal playground and the children behaved really bad?

Ingrid: Well, wow, I think you would actually have made it worse because you would have broken the magic. (She thinks.) That is pretty interesting, I haven't thought about that. Actually it's quite logical once you think about it. In all that magic feel-good, and then suddenly you are tugged back to reality by a shouting adult (she laughs, then silences and thinks).

Again, the word "magic." "In all the magic feel-good" she states, making the MGI sound like an out of this world experience, one that almost nobody can conduct. However, this "magic" comes down to be derived from, in this particular example, my deliberate use of voice. There is nothing "magic" in that. Ingrid even points it out herself, stating that my use of voice prevents the "magic to be broken." With my musical skills I actually makes things easier for myself because I secure that we stay in the "magic" (cf. Erickson, 2009: 450), aided by a deliberate use of voice and gestures as formulated in the concepts of communicative musicality and musicking.

The Finger Cymbals—2015-06-09

Also Mona noticed how my body language affected the situation:

The video camera is switched on and we can see children playing in the room made ready for the MGI. Annam and Nia are dancing a waltz as a pair and the others are running around with the pillows. Mona says loudly but in a cheerful tone: "Come, Annam and Nia, come and sit down!" They do not respond. Then she tells Amir to sit down. While I turn up into the picture

from behind the camera, Amir says, "I want to sit with Lars" and pushes his pillow away from Mona. Mona says: "Amir and Lars, do you both want to come and sit next to me?" Nothing happens, and everyone keeps wandering around. I take the cymbals out of my pockets and make them sound while I smile at everyone in the room. I leave the cymbals to chime with my arms stretched above my head. Annam screeches and smiles at me, and everyone immediately sit down with no fuzz.

When watching this video clip afterwards, Mona sighed: "And all my effort, such a waste, there you come along and just fix it like The Pied Piper of Hamelin!" I had to make her watch it again and tell me *why* I was "The Pied Piper of Hamelin", and she immediately noticed the finger cymbals. Then she also added: "and the fact that you don't tell them to sit down, you don't organize them, you just enter and sit down and do your 'pling'". Again, what is noticed in the first place are the finger cymbals. However it is just as much the fact that I do not give instructions, I just sit down, smile and do what Mona calls "my pling." The sound of the "pling" and my body language cooperate in the musical communication with the children.

The watchmen

An important element in this category is the positiveness in the body language, including facial expressions. One of the first things I discovered as I watched the videos was the fact that I was smiling a lot. It even appeared to be a clear pattern that the mood of the children and thereby the positive sense of group cohesion, was influenced by how much also the other adult was smiling. This is of course not possible to verify as I had no control group or an experimental design set up to test this. It was nevertheless a tendency of a decline in yelling and conflicts when the adults smiled a lot. This requires that the adult is aware of one's body language and facial expressions. As this was the most difficult category for the adults to point out, as I have previously mentioned, this might indicate a considerable lack of awareness and understanding of the importance of body language and facial expressions. Also the interviewees brought up the role of the adult as mainly a strict guard when we talked about body language and voice.

Mona: I mean, not everyone is like this [she makes funny faces], right? But the thing is, you don't have to be like that. At all. I have seen it with you. The calmer you are, the easier you create this sense of fellowship, this group cohesion.

Me: You are right. Remember when we talked about the smiling the other day? That I watched you start to smile on the videos and how much this affected the children? You don't have to be a clown to do music in a way that makes children join us, we just need to sing and enjoy ourselves.

Mona: Yes, exactly, we're just sitting there singing together, looking at each other, smiling. What the children want is to be acknowledged. They find it amazingly fun to sing together like this.

Me: And that we don't have to use our energy looking after them.

Mona: Well, the usual thing is that one adult is in charge of the circle-time and the other adult is present merely to be some sort of watchdog. That is actually not very nice.

Ingrid: Most of the time I feel it is much more enjoyable to do circle-time on my own than with another adult present, just because then the other person becomes this guard. (...)

Me: It appears to me as a very difficult way to interact with each other if one person leads and the other one just chops up into pieces what the first one had planned to do. Destroying the atmosphere and the dynamics.

Ingrid: Yes, just sitting there and interrupting all the time! So true. It's classic.

What both Mona and Ingrid points towards in these quotes, is a lack of awareness in how one's gestural language influences the situation. It seems that the adults' fear of chaos or conflicts colours the MGI to such a degree that it becomes the main issue. As I have pointed out, a tolerance for chaos might bring the chaos to silence. A focus on the didactical relation model as originally presented by Bjørndal and Lieberg (1978) might clarify what this chaos is really about, and to feel confident in one's musical skills might prevent the chaos anxiety to take control of one's assessments and conduct. This brings us back to category one, intentionally overlooking chaotic episodes/conflicts, and the circle is full—for now.

Concluding remarks

Musical skills

I have questioned the statement "it's you—not the music", and I have done this by examining my own practice. The answer indicates that it is not 'me', but my musical skills as an experienced music teacher. These skills can be divided into smaller components and looked closer upon by using elements from the didactical perspective and a musicology theoretical perspective. Moreover, when divided into these smaller components, it seems like these musical skills that constitutes the 'me' are skills that are attainable to everyone, once exposed.

However, to musick is a skill—like language—that is learned and cultivated in social rituals (Bannan & Woodward, 2009: 467; Small, 1998: 207). As I have pointed out, my musical confidence constitutes a large part of my ability to make use of my musical skills. I have learned how to musick through my education as a music teacher and also throughout many years of rituals and shared performances with children and adults in kindergartens. Thus, I am confident in my skills. I am tempted to suggest that this confidence is a crucial part of my musical skills per se. Without it, I might not have been able to raise my eyes above the chaos and analyse the situation in a didactical perspective. Therefore, when I say that present suggested musical skills that constitutes the 'me' is attainable to everyone once exposed, there is an aspect to this that can not be left out: the learning and cultivation of the musicking. Confidence derives from a feeling to master the skill in an appropriate way. Hence, to know *what kind* of musical skills are needed to conduct music group interventions in multicultural kindergartens might function as a guide in acquiring or teaching the appropriate subjects for attaining these skills. Fields of subjects may include body language awareness, the chaos anxiety-discourse, didactical reflections and musicality as a psychobiological capacity.

Hence this "something more" that I mentioned on page 148 is not 'me' neither 'the music'. It is both, intertwined into my musical skills, my teacher competence. The music and its communicative language that enhances group cohesion and cooperation works alongside my ability to facilitate and make use of the different components that lies within the musicking:

Music's inexplicitness, its ambiguity, or floating intentionality may thus be regarded as highly advantageous characteristics of its function for groups: music, then, might serve as a medium for the maintenance of human social flexibility (Cross, 2005: 36).

To chaos or not to chaos

Ultimately I find that the two categories here presented points towards an important factor: a kindergarten discourse that centres around chaos/non-chaos. As a consequence the kindergarten staff are seemingly unable to trust the musical forms of communication and prefer to take on the role as adults in charge, always on the alert and ready to step in if there is any sign of commotion. From this follows questions about how to best communicate the appropriate or preferred behaviour to the children to obtain a ‘successful’ MGI.³ What is a ‘successful’ MGI? It seems, based on the behaviour and feed back from the kindergarten teachers in this inquiry and also my previous study (Kulset, 2015a), that a ‘successful’ MGI is one where the children are paying attention continuously (which according to Erickson (2009) is impossible) and that there is no chaos and no conflicts.

In contrast, what I think constitutes a ‘successful’ MGI is one where we all enjoy ourselves on our own premisses and the musicking during the MGI will contribute positively to the relations and group cohesion in the kindergarten. Maybe a part of the problem is that what constitutes a ‘successful’ MGI, or at least the steps to obtain such an MGI, is somewhat unclear to many kindergarten teachers (and assistants). Is it this simple that the reason for the statement “It’s you—not the music” is guided by this fact; that the underlying reasons for what one might describe as a ‘successful MGI’ differs largely? If some kindergarten staff see a ‘successful’ MGI as in the notion of ‘magic’ (“it’s you”), while I see a ‘successful’ MGI as in the notion of “chaos allowed because I know it will calm down”, what consequences will this bring? What do we need to alter in our way of teaching music making to kindergarten staff and kindergarten students to make them see the MGI as a *ritual* as it is presented in the theory of musicking (Small, 1998) filled with alternative ways of communicating found in both communicative musicality (Malloch & Trevarthen, 2009) and the theory of Empathy Promoting Musical Components (Cross, 2003, 2005; Cross et al., 2012)?

To unify the components in my findings, I will suggest a *theory of musickhood*. This expression, which I elaborate in a coming article, seeks to capture *a condition of state*, rather than a verb or a noun, and is linked to the necessary required skills needed to conduct music group interventions in multicultural kindergartens.

The Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD) has approved this inquiry.

³ I use quotation marks on the word ‘successful’ to indicate the impossibility in stating what is a successful MGI per se.

References

- Anshel, A., & Kipper, D. A. (1988). The influence of group singing on trust and cooperation. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 25(3), 145–155.
- Arbib, M. A. (Ed.) (2013). *Language, music, and the brain: a mysterious relationship*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bannan, N., & Woodward, S. (2009). Spontaneity in the musicality and music learning of children. In S. Malloch & C. Trevarthen (Eds.), *Communicative musicality: exploring the basis of human companionship* (pp. 465–494). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bjørndal, B., & Lieberg, S. (1978). *Nye veier i didaktikken?: en innføring i didaktiske emner og begreper*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Blacking, J. (1973). *How musical is man?* Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Bullough, R. V., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for Quality in Autobiographical Forms of Self-Study Research. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 13–21.
- Cross, I. (2003). Music and biocultural evolution. In M. Clayton, T. Herbert, & R. Middleton (Eds.), *The cultural study of music: a critical introduction* (pp. 19–30). London: Routledge.
- Cross, I. (2005). Music and meaning, ambiguity and evolution. In D. Miell, R. MacDonald, & D. J. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Musical communication* (pp. 27–43). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cross, I., Laurence, F., & Rabinowitch, T.-C. (2012). Empathy and creativity in musical group practices: towards a concept of empathic creativity. In G. E. McPherson & G. F. Welch (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Music Education* (Vol. 2, pp. 337–353). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dissanayake, E. (2009). Root, leaf, blossom, or bole: concerning the origin and adaptive function of music. In S. Malloch and C. Trevarthen (Eds.), *Communicative musicality: exploring the basis of human companionship* (pp. 17–30). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ehrlin, A., & Wallerstedt, C. (2014). Preschool teachers' skills in teaching music: two steps forward one step back. *Early Child Development and Care*, 184(12), 1800–1811. doi:10.1080/03004430.2014.884086
- Erickson, F. (2009). Musicality in talk and listening: A key element in classroom discourse as an environment for learning. In S. Malloch & C. Trevarthen (Eds.), *Communicative musicality: exploring the basis of human companionship* (pp. 449–463). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ericsson, C., & Lindgren, M. (2011). Arts Education in Swedish Teacher Training: What's at Stake? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(8), 18–31.

- Ericsson, C., & Lindgren, M. (2012). Kvalitet och kompetens i den pedagogiska musikverksamheten. In B. Riddersporre and J. Söderman (Eds.), *Musikvetenskap för förskolan* (pp. 53–62). Stockholm: Natur and Kultur.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Grape, C., Sandgren, M., Hansson, L.-O., Ericson, M., & Theorell, T. (2003). Does singing promote well-being?: An empirical study of professional and amateur singers during a singing lesson. *Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science*, 38(1), 65–74. doi:10.1007/BF02734261
- Gromko, J. E. (2005). The Effect of Music Instruction on Phonemic Awareness in Beginning Readers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(3), 199–209. doi:10.1177/002242940505300302
- Hamilton, M. L. (1998). *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (2009). *Self-study of Practice as a Genre of Qualitative Research: Theory, Methodology, and Practice*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Hiim, H., & Hippe, E. (2006). *Praksisveiledning i lærerutdanningen: en didaktisk veiledningsstrategi*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk. (2nd ed.)
- Honing, H., Ten Cate, C., Peretz, I., & Trehub, S. (2015). Without it no music: cognition, biology and evolution of musicality Introduction. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 370(1664), 5–12. doi:10.1098/rstb.2014.0088
- Kirschner, S., & Tomasello, M. (2010). Joint music making promotes prosocial behavior in 4-year-old children. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31(5), 354–364. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.04.004
- Kulset, N. B. (2015a). *Musikk og andrespråk. Norsk tilegnelse hos små barn med et annet morsmål*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Kulset, N. B. (2015b). Sang som sosialt handlingsberedskap for andrespråklærlingen i barnehagen. In S. Kibsgaard & M. Kanstad (Eds.), *Lek og samspill i et mangfoldsperspektiv* (pp. 79–96). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Lamont, A. (2011). The beat goes on: music education, identity and lifelong learning. *Music Education Research*, 13(4), 369–388. doi:10.1080/14613808.2011.638505
- Lyngsnes, K. M., & Rismark, M. (2007). *Didaktisk arbeid*. Oslo: Gyldendal. (2nd ed.)
- McNiff, J. & Whitehead, J. (2005) *Action Research for Teachers*. London: David Fulton.
- Malloch, S., & Trevarthen, C. (Eds.) (2009). *Communicative musicality: exploring the basis of human companionship*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1993). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class.
- Patel, A. D. (2011). Why would musical training benefit the neural encoding of speech? The OPERA hypothesis. *Frontiers in psychology*, 2(142). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00142
- Patel, A. D. (2012). The OPERA hypothesis: assumptions and clarifications. *Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory*, 1252, 124–128. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06426.x
- Polanyi, M. (2009). *The tacit dimension*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (2nd ed.)
- Rabinowitch, T. C., Cross, I., & Burnard, P. (2013). Long-term musical group interaction has a positive influence on empathy in children. *Psychology of Music*, 41(4), 484–498. doi:10.1177/0305735612440609
- Samaras, A. P. (2011). *Self-Study Teacher Research: Improving Your Practice Through Collaborative Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- Schei, T. B. (2011) Kan stemmeskam overvinnes? Om helsefremmende aspekter ved profesjonelle sangeres identitetsarbeid. In K. Stensæth & L. O. Bonde (Eds.) *Musikk, helse, identitet* (pp. 85–105). Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner 2011:3.
- Schön, D., Boyer, M., Moreno, S., Besson, M., Peretz, I. & Kolinsky, R. (2008). Songs as an aid for language acquisition. *Cognition*, 106(2), 975–983. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2007.03.005
- Schön, D. A. (1995). *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. Aldershot: Arena.
- Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: the meanings of performing and listening*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Tjora, A. (2012). *Kvalitative forskningsmetoder i praksis*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk. (2nd ed.)
- Trehub, S. E., Becker, J. & Morley, I. (2015). Cross-cultural perspectives on music and musicality. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 370(1664), 59–67. doi:10.1098/rstb.2014.0096
- Wiltermuth, S., Heath, C., & Wiltermuth, S. (2009). Synchrony and Cooperation. *Psychological Science*, 20(1), 1–5. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02253.x
- Zak, P., Stanton, A., & Ahmadi, S. (2007). Oxytocin Increases Generosity in Humans. *Plos One*, 2(11), 224–227. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001128
- Zeichner, K. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 28(9), 4–15. doi:10.3102/0013189X028009004

Ph.D candidate

Nora Bilalovic Kulset

Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Department of Music

7491 Trondheim

Norway

nora.kulset@ntnu.no