

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF MUSIC

**Microeconomic Social and Resource Barriers to Music Education Expansion in
Impoverished South Carolina Areas**

Submitted to Dr. Dan Hodges,

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the completion of

MUSC 890 – A27

Thesis Project Defense

by

Anna Holley

December 5, 2023

Abstract

Despite much information in outreach in impoverished areas, research has yet to fully show the barriers to music education expansion in poverty-level South Carolina. This qualitative study is conducted using previous data for correlation through research analysis of social attitudes and resource-based barriers to participation rates and expansion of music education throughout South Carolina. Research discovered that impoverished students are much less likely to participate in music education and less than 25% of United States seniors, whether public or privately educated, are actively participating in music education programs. Lastly, statistics shows less than half of students with access to music education without social, funding, or resource barriers choose to participate. This study aims to examine why new students of various ages are not engaged in music programs, whether it be for resource, social culture, or financial reasons. The root cultural music poverty has been misrepresented in historical analysis and undermines impoverished music education participation rates within these poverty-level areas. Research sources includes numerical data and statistics accompanied with current scholarly literature analysis. This study advances the field of music education outreach by discussing the historical variables that influence participation levels and resource funding of musical arts. This project will also serve as groundwork for further exploration of microeconomic barriers and relationships to music education funding and resources in South Carolina.

Keywords: music education, microeconomics, sociology.

DEDICATION

To any and all who endeavor upon academic excellence and self-growth.

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Background of Topic..... | 3 |
| Problem Statement..... | 6 |
| Purpose Statement..... | 10 |
| Significance of the Study..... | 13 |
| Research Questions..... | 16 |
| Hypotheses..... | 17 |
| Core Concepts..... | 20 |
| Definition of Terms..... | 23 |
| Chapter Summary | 26 |
| CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW | 28 |
| The Corridor of Shame..... | 30 |
| Variations Among Counties in the Corridor | 31 |
| Educational Rank Analysis and Curriculum Review for Improved Outreach..... | 35 |
| Sociology of Poverty Mindsets in Generational Education Techniques..... | 37 |
| Professional Musician Experiences in South Carolina’s Poverty Areas..... | 37 |
| Musical Development and Historical Contributions from South Carolina Artists..... | 38 |
| Generational Perception of Music Outreach and Education..... | 40 |
| Political and Social Culture Impacts Generational Trends..... | 41 |
| Sociological Perception and Players in South Carolina Music Education..... | 43 |
| Quality of Music Education Variances in South Carolina Areas..... | 44 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Legislation and Educational Patterns of Music Education in South Carolina..... | 45 |
| Historical Outreach Efforts for Music Education in South Carolina..... | 46 |
| Right to Education Legalities for Music Education Students..... | 48 |
| Learning Benefits for Music Education Program Participation..... | 51 |
| Demographic Influences on Music Participation Rates and Outreach Efforts..... | 52 |
| Conclusion..... | 55 |
| CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS..... | 56 |
| General Participant Overview and Qualifications..... | 56 |
| Questions and Hypotheses..... | 59 |
| Research Question 1 Survey Formation Disclaimers and Content | 59 |
| Research Question 2 Survey Formation Disclaimers and Content | 60 |
| Instrumentation..... | 60 |
| Procedures..... | 61 |
| Participants..... | 62 |
| Collection Compilation | 63 |
| Setting..... | 64 |
| Data Analysis..... | 65 |
| Chapter Summary | 67 |
| CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS | 68 |
| Results..... | 69 |
| Location..... | 69 |
| Age..... | 70 |
| Historical Background..... | 71 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Participant Involvement in Music Education | 71 |
| Poverty Level..... | 73 |
| Generational Education Levels..... | 76 |
| Participant Caregiver and Parental History of Education Levels..... | 77 |
| Parental and Caregiver Support of Participant Involvement in Music Education..... | 78 |
| Social Peer Influence of Music Education Participation..... | 79 |
| Social Perception of the Value of Music Education..... | 81 |
| Funding and Subsequent Music Education Involvement Level..... | 83 |
| Population..... | 83 |
| Generational Perception of Music Education Tax Funding..... | 86 |
| Generational Perception of Long Term Music Education Sustainability..... | 88 |
| General Perceptions of Music Education Resources for Future Generations..... | 90 |
| Summary..... | 92 |
| CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS | 93 |
| Summary of Study..... | 93 |
| Summary of Findings and Prior Research | 93 |
| Funding Trends..... | 93 |
| Income Level and Music Education Participation..... | 94 |
| Generational Influences in Low Participation Trends..... | 96 |
| Social Setting and Perceptions of Adequate Resources..... | 97 |
| Significance..... | 98 |
| Social Value Placement..... | 98 |
| Parental and Caregiver Influence..... | 99 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Sociological Resource Adequacy Barriers..... | 101 |
| Non-Musical Education Achievement Variances..... | 102 |
| Limitations..... | 104 |
| Survey Size..... | 104 |
| Lack of Participant Incentive..... | 105 |
| Technological Barriers..... | 105 |
| Travel Barriers..... | 106 |
| Recommendations for Future Study..... | 107 |
| Incentive-Based Population Survey..... | 107 |
| Microeconomic Sub-topic Analysis..... | 107 |
| Categorical Income Structure..... | 108 |
| Travel Resources..... | 109 |
| Demographic Variance..... | 110 |
| Gender Variances..... | 111 |
| Implications for Practice..... | 112 |
| Summary..... | 113 |
| Bibliography..... | 115 |
| Appendix A: Music Education Survey | 119 |
| Appendix B: Survey Statistics | 126 |
| Appendix C: Arts Fundings..... | 129 |

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Barriers to access music education have been a hinderance to the overall success of increasing outreach and education programs across impoverished South Carolina areas. Since the establishment of formal music education programs in the United States over a hundred years ago in Boston, Massachusetts, many states have struggled to increase participation rates in music education programs while also reaping lower resource and funding levels.¹ From a national perspective, studies have shown that students in any geographically low-income area are less likely to participate in any form of music education or performance opportunity, even among high resource and funding programs.² Within South Carolina, the state ranks as one of the highest in the nation for poverty.³ According to the 2020 census for South Carolina, over 10 percent of the state population was living at or below the federal poverty level, which aids in resource and funding barriers to particularly impoverished music students' participation opportunities.⁴

The economic trend is facilitated by the continuation of previous generational undervaluation and negative social mindsets towards formal participation in music education training or outreach programs.⁵ Historical trends have worked to fuel negative social interest in music education and left many students feeling isolated from cultural norms within music

¹ Marvelene C. Moore, "Guest Editorial," *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 43, no. 2, 2022, 112-114.

² Tina Beveridge, "Does Music Education have a Poverty Problem," *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education* 40, no. 2, 2022, 10-18.

³ "Population with Percent in Poverty by County 2011-2020: South Carolina Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office," *South Carolina Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office*, 2020, 1.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Beveridge, *Update*, 10-18.

education curriculums.⁶ Although efforts have been made to create a more universal and inclusive teaching methodology for student outreach, the research revealed an ongoing issue of funding and outreach on a national and microeconomic level relating to state activity.⁷ The overall state trends have contributed to the overall deterioration and decrease in participation among students of various ages and skill levels. The most vulnerable population for negative economic and education patterns are students who live in low income and underprivileged geographical areas.

The cultural mindset across various socioeconomic groups has caused an increased social and resource-based barriers to advancing music education outreach in underserved areas. Cultural norms in impoverished areas unanimously fuel the idea of “seeing arts as frivolous luxury rather than part of a well-balanced education for our students.”⁸ This mindset continues across various socioeconomic groups and generates a high impact among underprivileged and impoverished students who are more likely to be at risk for education barriers.⁹ Although some groups and organizations for arts advocacy within South Carolina have worked to change the trend of low student participation rates and generate a more positive view of music education, historical barriers to participation within impoverished areas are an ongoing struggle. Through advancement and support of music education funding, resource support, and changing mindsets, modern music education advocates are slowly changing a negative historical trend.

⁶ Alex Newman, "The Beat Goes on: The Struggle to Teach Music," *Teach (Toronto)* (2019): 26-29.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid, 10.

⁹ Ibid.

Background of Topic

Historical trends to lower participation in low income and impoverished areas have prevailed in recent decades, following the United States’ official start of formal music education and curriculum creation over 100 years ago with the Boston Academy of Music.¹⁰ Although the initial start of music education began within a religious-based organization in this historic city, the curriculum and teaching practices have since expanded to encompass a variety of topics and students within and outside of public music education classrooms.¹¹ Since the start of music education, much political action has occurred to pass legislation for desegregation and equal opportunity for participation among students of various backgrounds and ethnicities. As a result, more individuals now have various opportunities to music education in underserved areas. Although much progress has been made, continuing historical patterns have led to ongoing barriers to increasing student participation rates in these programs.

The expansion of music education within various socioeconomic groups provided a step in music education outreach in a public sector setting.¹² With the start of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, all students of color and various ethnicities no longer suffered under “Jim Crow” laws that provided a “separate but equal” treatment among different ethnicities and indirectly contributed to the continuation of barriers to all education, including music outreach and participation.¹³ Once the 1964 legislation was passed, many young students were allowed into a public or private classroom or institution to begin formally studying music curriculum, along with other subjects.

¹⁰ Moore, *Journal*, 112-114.

¹¹ Ibid, 113.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ “Legal Highlight: The Civil Rights Act of 1964,” *United States Department of Labor*, 2022, 1.

Political and legislative expansion continued with music education programs successfully integrating students of different races and social backgrounds within classrooms and teaching methods with modern legislative actions.¹⁴

Efforts were made within the legislative action to create a curriculum that is inclusive of various cultural and ethnicity genres, diversified in sexual representation of different historical figures, and accepting of students' personal music preferences as additions to curriculum materials.¹⁵ However, many social and resource barriers have emerged as a result of increasingly negative social views and socioeconomic standings against music education participation. Current students across the nation feel music education historically lacks diversity and participation in such programs goes against social norms within microeconomics, poverty-level focused groups.¹⁶ As a result of previous generations' experience with poor diversity in curriculum, teaching methods, and overall representation for multiculturalism, current and future generations are reaping socially negative consequences. Previous generations significantly imposed negative social attitudes towards historical participation in music education study.¹⁷ The cultural trend presented itself in the research as a mixture of both negative social attitudes from historical needs in multicultural curriculum and teaching methods through increasing resource barriers to supplies, funding, and higher socioeconomic figures of authority viewing music education as a nonessential luxury to education.

¹⁴ Moore, *Journal*, 113.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid, 114.

¹⁷ Ibid.

The trend of underfunding and lack of musical resources as a result of negative mindsets towards participation in the subject has been an ongoing issue within public and private organizations, particularly within South Carolina. Recalling his early 1900s childhood, the famous jazz musician, Dizzy Gillespie, remembered his music education experiences as lacking specific resources to skill advancement in South Carolina.¹⁸ Gillespie grew up in an impoverished, rural school district of South Carolina and related that his school music facility “didn’t have too many instruments” and “the only instrument they had left was a trombone” for him to play.¹⁹ This resource barrier within local poverty-level music education programs has been an ongoing issue for several years within the state of South Carolina and continues to negatively affect the current population.

¹⁸ Benjamin Franklin, *Jazz and Blues Musicians of South Carolina: Interviews with Jabbo, Dizzy, Drink, and Others*, University of South Carolina Press, 2021, 24.

¹⁹ Franklin, *Jazz*, 24.

Problem Statement

Barriers to music education in low income areas within South Carolina have been a major historical issue to participation rates for students of all ages and skill levels.²⁰ For several decades, young and impoverished students have reaped social and resource barriers to music education courses and programs at all educational levels of study.²¹ According to the South Carolina Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office, less than half of modern students in South Carolina successfully graduate from high school. Among the percentage of South Carolina public school graduates, many choose to participate in non-mandatory music education electives and extracurricular programs rather than musical options.²² The participation trend is facilitated by the continuation of previous generational mindsets. Older generations historically undervalue music education and pass down a negative social mindset towards formal participation in music education training or outreach programs to younger generations.²³ Although students willingly participated in mandatory music education courses as required by the national school curriculum, the levels of participation drastically decreased when given the opportunity to optionally participate in music education programs within the same resource basis or institution.²⁴ As a result, organizations and school districts often cut funding to non-mandatory music education programs. The funding cuts are due to the drastic decrease in demand past the educational

²⁰ Gail V. Barnes, "The University of South Carolina String Project: Teaching and Learning within a Community Music Program," *International Journal of Community Music* 6, no. 1, 2013, 23-31.

²¹ Mara E. Culp, and Matthew Clauhs, "Factors that Affect Participation in Secondary School Music: Reducing Barriers and Increasing Access," *Music Educators Journal* 106, no. 4, 2020, 43-49.

²² "Education and Workforce Report 2021 As Required by §59-18-195," *South Carolina Department of Revenue and Fiscal Affairs*, 2022, P. 1-26.

²³ Culp and Clauhs, *Music*, 43-49.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

requirements for accreditation and graduation, whether in a public or private k-12 or higher education setting.²⁵

The historical trend of negative perceptions of participation in music education is a deep rooted cultural norm of non-participation and misrepresentation of the subject among certain socioeconomic groups coupled with legislative action of undervaluing educational benefits of music programs.²⁶ Within lower wealth level socioeconomic classes, music education is viewed as nonessential and misaligned with cultural norms to not participate in many low income arts outreach or public education courses for young students.²⁷ As a social result, many adult caregivers' mindsets are passed down to younger generations. Such cultural disdain for music education participation in these impoverished and underserved areas results in additional barriers to expanding participation within low income communities.

In cultural comparison, music education participation within the public education or local arts outreach efforts are viewed as nonessential for higher wealth level groups,. This sociological and economic view is rooted in the consumer mindset of a lower value good of these music education programs compared to private instruction or more elite organizational opportunities.²⁸ The similarity between high and low socioeconomic classes exists because both share a similarity in undervaluation of music education needs and economic resources for music education participation in a culturally acceptable setting. However, low income students are at higher non-participation risk due to lacking social resources to travel, patterns of poverty, and

²⁵ Culp and Clauhs, *Music*, 43-45.

²⁶ Klisala Harrison, "the Relationship of Poverty to Music," *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 45, 2013, 1-12.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid, 6-11.

deep historical roots to the exclusion of culturally diverse materials within music education curriculum.

The overall historical context of negative attitudes of lawmakers and political figures toward arts funding has trickled down into the public mindset and subsequent actions of funding and resources available to advance the practices of music education.²⁹ As a result, legislative actions to increase funding for music education and relative artistic efforts are historically perceived as nonessential and wasteful.³⁰ The ongoing barriers to such advancements of music outreach and education to low income areas has only been intensified through historical context of negative mindsets from political and educational leadership within the state. The economic trickle down trend of underfunding and lack of support to several microeconomic and social elements, such as a historical lack of diverse music curriculum for various cultures, has intensified cultural division. By failing to adapt teaching methods to accommodate student needs and general feelings of undervaluing arts education, the South Carolina political leaders are negatively influencing the social and economic support for music participation among students of all backgrounds.³¹

Since the establishment of the public school system, underfunding and resource barriers to low income areas in South Carolina has been an ongoing battle. Dizzy Gillespie's recollection of his childhood in the early 1920s within the town of Cheraw, South Carolina provides a historical example of having few resources throughout his education for music advancement.³²

²⁹ Greenblatt, CQ, 581-604.

³⁰ Ibid, 581-582.

³¹ Ibid, 581-604.

³² Franklin, University, 24.

Similar to many other musicians from South Carolina, Dizzy's story of struggle and barriers to success serve as a historical basis for struggling to advance in music studies within the state.

Although Dizzy was an exceptional student and is remembered as a historical figure in jazz music, the importance of providing music education to young talented students in poor South Carolina areas is a continuing problem in both public and private music education programs.³³

³³ Franklin, University, 24.

Purpose Statement

In order to better understand the driving motifs behind barriers and to facilitate participation in modern music education programs in low income South Carolina students, research was completed to understand the motivating factors that negatively contribute to participation, funding, and resources available for music education. In relation to mindsets of the necessity of musical arts funding, preexisting research conducted by Harrison drew an interconnected approach to resource valuation and mindsets. The researcher stated that by discovering that “cultural poverty and musical poverty should not be understood only as emphatic ways to refer to the lack of culture and music, or misrepresentations thereof.”³⁴ Thus, the fundamental aspect of music education resources, funding, and lacking social support stems from barriers in mindset towards the subject thereof.

From this consumer mindset, the research analysis is rooted in discussing the importance of microeconomics analysis of consumer mindset for various socioeconomic groups of both impoverished community habits, as well as leadership, political, and teacher perception of music education importance.³⁵ Although the reasoning behind low consumer rates of music education varies among different socioeconomic levels within the microeconomic regions of South Carolina, the universal idea of mindsets fueling barriers to funding and education remain constant.³⁶ The data works to display a connection between the attitudes of consumers of music education verses antiparticipation groups. As Byun’s research related, economic theory of

³⁴ Harrison, Yearbook, 1.

³⁵ C. Byun, *The Economics of the Popular Music Industry: Modeling from Microeconomic Theory and Industrial Organization*, New York: Palgrave Pivot, 2015, 31.

³⁶ Byun, *The Economics*, 31.

nonessential goods, such as music, experience higher levels of elasticity of demand and lower valuation than other scarce resources and supplies.³⁷

As a result of the microeconomic theory of demand and valuation perception, current South Carolina based research aligned with Byun's discovery that "economic modeling can go a long way in explaining consumption choices made by consumers in allocating their limited income over two (or many) goods that will bring utility to them."³⁸ The research of consumer mindsets laid the groundwork of consumer choice and consumption of goods. With regard to customer choice, the data relates the differences in consumer bases for music education within South Carolina socioeconomic classes and impoverished students versus non-poverty level populations. Consumer choice data and the valuation of different educational opportunities reveals a sociological connection between education, poverty, social norms, and preexisting economic and resource barriers. Negative participation rates from sociological connections among these cultural elements creates additional barriers to escaping generational patterns of poor education and poverty.

The purpose of the research and ministry project is to discover statistical trends to define specific geographical influences and attitudes that contribute to consumers within the specified range of South Carolina areas. From a Christian perspective, God is willing to provide each human with bountiful resources to meet all needs and alleviate unnecessary suffering in any forms. By gathering data and analyzing the social patterns that influence the continuing poverty in South Carolina areas, Christian music educators can become more equipped to communicate the possibility of blessings when following God's plan and to provide opportunities for students

³⁷ Byun, *The Economics*, 31..

³⁸ Ibid.

with natural, God-given musical talents. By researching and discovering the underlying barriers to music participation and understanding the social perspectives of education, music educators are working to slowly dissolve negative patterns that block spiritual and economic blessings from God.

Significance of the Study

Qualitative research was conducted to reveal the barriers to participation in order to exemplify historically significant trends and aim to increase public perception and participation in music education programs within South Carolina. Although preexisting literature posed questions and analysis to other national or state-level music education perceptions, this study specifically aimed to exemplify South Carolina music education outreach in impoverished geographical locations. The ability to discover barriers within resources and social mindsets that contribute to the historically low participation rates within music education programs in South Carolina significantly altered future participation rates and overall geographical trends within the state.³⁹ Similar to Rouse's study on arts achievement and mindsets in South Carolina, this analysis investigated mental connections among various socioeconomic classes and historical trend rates of music education funding and participation.⁴⁰

The research analysis was significant in relating the overall various mindsets of different microeconomic, socioeconomic groups, such as politicians, teachers, parents or caregivers, and other social leaders. The study exemplified the interconnectivity among the trends for lacking resources and residual attitudes among each group. As a result, the evidence encompassed a multifaceted approach to show how various mindsets among each microeconomic social group contributes to the increased barriers and historical trends in music participation rates in South Carolina's low income and impoverished areas. The research lays the foundation to show how low participation trends can be altered to positively influence future generations' perception of

³⁹ John W. Creswell and J. David Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th ed. (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc., 2018), 180-182.

⁴⁰ Tedro R. Rouse, "A Comparative Study Examining the Affects of Arts Curricula on Middle Level Student Achievement in Rural Schools in South Carolina," ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2018.

music education value and subsequent music education programs in South Carolina schools and organizations of both public and private nature. From a sociology perspective, many researchers noticed that “access of the young, uneducated audience to classical music is becoming increasingly visible in the practices of the local, national and international cultural operators.”⁴¹ State segregation practices of nonparticipation was fueled by generational patterns of social mindsets.⁴² Within the research subgroups, a social and historical view of certain music genres were portrayed as elite or not conforming to the practices and music selections acceptable within the chosen socioeconomic group of identification.⁴³

The study also drew on similarities in research analysis to previous authors by understanding different elements that affect the willingness for student participation rates. Statistical similarities in willingness for student participation barriers included lack of diversity in curriculum, racial barriers, or geographical subtopics within the hypotheses for specifically South Carolina areas.⁴⁴ Additional evidence within South Carolina area organizations and institutions were provided to show how specific programs and initiatives aimed to change historical patterns. Such low participation and resources within these impoverished socioeconomic and microeconomic areas have lagged in modernization of resources and participation opportunities as a result. Similar to Bulgozdy’s study, Race also concluded that “the value of advancing multicultural dialogues to address issues of diversity and social cohesion in

⁴¹ Oana Bălan Budoiu, "Managing the Changes in the 21st Century Performing Art. Methods of Eliminating Social Barriers in the Consumption of Classical Music Performances," *Review of Artistic Education* no. 21, 2021, 95-104.

⁴² Ibid, 95.

⁴³ Ibid, 100-104.

⁴⁴ Felicia Denise Myers Bulgozdy, "The Cultural Relevance of Music Education as it Relates to African American Students in South Carolina," ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2020.

the light of twenty-first century migration flows” creates a new outlet for advancement.⁴⁵ The opening discussions provide a valid argumentative basis for the necessity of increased funding and resource opportunities from the residual shift in cultural attitudes.

⁴⁵ Richard Race, *Advancing Multicultural Dialogues in Education*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, 33.

Research Questions

Negative social mindsets and resource barriers have been historical trends in negative participation rates for low income outreach efforts for music education practices and programs. Within lacking areas of participation among underprivileged students, historical research shows that students who grew up or currently live in impoverished areas are much less likely to participate in music education programs. The low participation data trend among impoverished students continue, even when funding and resources are available to ease burdens for participation.⁴⁶ The negative impact has been a historical social barrier in mindset and perception of music education being a nonessential subject for increased academic success or overall development in young students.⁴⁷ Such negative mindsets increase resource and funding barriers, which are then passed onto higher authority when delegating support for the performing arts.⁴⁸ As a result, the mindsets have historically affected resource and funding barriers across a variety of socioeconomic groups in the state.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the historical interconnected mentality among various socioeconomic status groups has proven to reap higher barriers to music education involvement and support.⁵⁰ In defense of negative perceptions to the support of music education, proactive supporters argued that “exposure to the arts helps students perform better in school and that theaters, symphonies, and museums help bolster local economies.”⁵¹ While the

⁴⁶ Beveridge, Update, 10-18.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 10.

⁴⁸ Alan Greenblatt, "Funding the Arts: Should Government Support Artistic and Cultural Expression?" *The CQ Researcher* 27, no. 25, 2017, 581-604.

⁴⁹ Ibid, 583.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid, 581.

economic boosts across all socioeconomic and microeconomic groups are valid, barriers to initiate such actions are difficult to overcome. As an exploration into these ideas, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What social and cultural attitudes lead to the deterioration of music education participation rates in impoverished South Carolina areas?

2. What micro-socioeconomic barriers to resources exist among teachers and students that contribute to the historical trends of lacking music education resources in impoverished South Carolina areas?

Hypotheses

Research Question One may be answered with the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis One: Negative social and cultural attitudes lead to the deterioration of music education participation rates in impoverished South Carolina areas.

The long-term goal of extending music education to low income areas has historically been negatively affected by social norms and attitudes.⁵² Richard Race's revision and research analysis discovered sociology connections between mindsets of education in low socioeconomic areas and negative participation rates in music education programs of any kind.⁵³ As a result of the social perception of music education not being necessary for education and historical lacking of diversity of curriculum taught within these educational music programs, many students and parents carry on the negative mindset. Through understanding the background of lacking

⁵² Race, *Advancing*, 33.

⁵³ *Ibid*, 33-40.

diversity within curriculum, in addition to general mindsets of nonessential learning, these micro-socioeconomic barriers were identified and provided resolution options to generate a more positive and inclusive environment for students. The research and overall initiative also aimed to possibly increase participation rates in music programs.

Because of this analysis, research can “demonstrate the value of advancing multicultural dialogues to address issues of diversity and social cohesion in the light of twenty-first century migration flows.”⁵⁴ The study hypothesis advanced the ability to shape social mindsets for future generations and increase participation in nonmandatory music education programs. Because of the research, the analysis worked to advance how students and teachers can change mindsets and break down social barriers to advance music education outreach and participation.⁵⁵ The social discovery also decentralized perceptions of music education being available to solely wealthy or certain socioeconomic classes of students. As a result, the research ultimately provided a more inclusive curriculum and approach to teaching modern music education.

Research Question Two may be answered with the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis Two: Microeconomic barriers to resources and funding that exist among teachers and students contribute to the historical trends of lacking music education resources in impoverished South Carolina areas.

The hypothesis of historical underfunding and lacking resources was a primary setback to students’ and teachers’ ability to advance practical applications of music education outreach programs.⁵⁶ Resource and funding barriers primarily stemmed from trickle down effects from

⁵⁴ Race, *Advancing*, 33.

⁵⁵ Thomas A. Regelski and J. Terry Gates, *Music Education for Changing Times: Guiding Visions for Practice*, Vol. 7. Dordrecht: New York, Springer, 2010, 111.

⁵⁶ Greenblatt, CQ, 581-604.

lawmakers and political figures' nonsupport and undervaluation of arts funding.⁵⁷ Although some private entities within South Carolina currently provide small resources and music education outreach programs for low income students, barriers to participation were still present and resulted in low participation rates.⁵⁸ Such resource barriers, like lacking internet access for online learning or not having on-site aid within the geographical areas are historical, are ongoing issues to participation in music programs within South Carolina.⁵⁹ The research problem was presented as a microeconomic barrier to participation abilities in highly susceptible low income areas in music education. The South Carolina geographical study areas also experienced historically lower funding and general revenue from resources. Particularly with the COVID pandemic, low income students were statistically more at risk for experiencing these resource barriers to participation in South Carolina music programs.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Greenblatt, CQ,.

⁵⁸ Victoria Wasylak, "'Designed to be Different': South Carolina's Musical Innovations Celebrates 10 Years of Serving Music Schools," *Musical Merchandise Review* 179, no. 3, 2020, 35.

⁵⁹ Alice Hammel, "Addressing Barriers to Accessibility," *School Band and Orchestra* 23, no. 4, 2020, 1-2.

⁶⁰ Ibid, 1.

Core Concepts

Social culture and economic consumer mindset, two core concepts of this study, provided realistic and correlative explanations to the historical trends of lacking expansion of music education programs in South Carolina organizations. Because the consumer mindset of economic theory is applicable to nonessential goods and services, the research principle was applied to the failing participation rates of music education program. Analysis of the principle issue was particularly addressed and studied within low income areas of the state.⁶¹ The economic concept of valuation with regard to certain optional educational courses, like music education, reaped lower consumer value perception rates.⁶² Perception of value was also adjunct to the principle of the substitution effect regarding consumer perception of other subjects' valuation being higher than music study's value.⁶³ Thus, the negative mindset valuation from economic theory turns the nonessential core subject into a much lower value subject for consumption and subsequent funding for the courses from government. In return, financial donors reap negative returns on efforts for community engagement through public and private funds.

The core barriers to participation and funding to expand music education, according to the research for this study, is rooted in cultural operators at low and high socioeconomic groups.⁶⁴ Social and economic operators of music education being nonessential to young students' development and going against cultural norms only worked to fuel increasing barriers

⁶¹ Hammel, *School*, 1.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Budoiu, *Review*, 95-104.

of lacking resources and funding.⁶⁵ The social norms did not always directly reject formal music education when directly presented with the option. However, the socioeconomic and macroeconomic view of music education curriculum as not being diverse or inclusive to the social groups' cultural norms and attitudes plays into the historical trends of choose to not participate.⁶⁶

Individuals of all generations, in both higher and lower income and social status, shared a common historical trend but differ in root causes of mindsets for non-necessary participation in music education programs or organization. Because of variations in opportunity costs for participation and cultural value of the same study options, the root causes of low participation and support for musical arts programs among high and low socioeconomic groups varied. Although these root social operators and valuation were different among various groups and valuation, the direct effects of negative perception and participation rates were consisted as a unified result.⁶⁷ Within this mindset of undervaluation and abnormal activity to participate in music programs from lower socioeconomic students coupled with lawmakers' view of music as a nonessential subject for funding, the ability to, as one author put it, "facilitate the access of the young, uneducated audience to classical music is becoming increasingly visible in the practices of the local, national and international cultural operators."⁶⁸

A core concept was discovered in the cultural mindsets of high and low socioeconomic groups that indirectly work together in consumer behavior to generate higher resource and

⁶⁵ Budoiu, *Review*, 95-97.

⁶⁶ Ibid, 95-104.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 96-97.

⁶⁸ Ibid, 95.

funding barrier to low income students. Such cultural mindsets were a result of negative economic consumer perception towards music education advancement practices. The goal of the research was to delve deeper into the microeconomic mindsets of these groups. Such economic and socioeconomic research aimed to discover the linkages and negative effects of cultural attitudes and exemplify the subsequent connection to historical trends in barriers to the advancement of music education programs in impoverished areas.

Definition of Terms

- 1) Mindset barriers: The traditional definition of social norms associated with activities, learning strategies, and smaller segregated topics, such as gender and race.⁶⁹
- 2) Social Attitudes: belief systems that contribute to the deterioration of participation or negative perception of any form of music education within all learning levels, extended to various mindsets in South Carolina as it related to differing socioeconomic classes, and historical trend rates of music education funding and participation.⁷⁰
- 3) Statistical Differentiation: defined as the correlation between lacking resources and funding, versus the presence of such without the social support of participation. Data showed no effect on overall outreach productivity in the study and previous research.⁷¹
- 4) Socioeconomic barriers: the analysis of mindset and physical barriers within resources and funding that contribute to the historically low participation rates within music education programs in South Carolina.⁷²
- 5) Music Education Attitudes: individuals who were active or social participants of music programs, such as politicians, parents, or relatives participating actively, socially, or indirectly with the subject of music education and outreach.⁷³

⁶⁹ Creswell and Creswell, *Research*, 180-182.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid, 180-182.

- 6) Barriers to Participation: regarding music education includes the usage of physical and nonphysical application to barriers. any variable that prevents or discourages participation in music education programs.⁷⁴
- 7) Physical barriers: transportation, resource for transportation, or participant disability is included in the term.⁷⁵
- 8) Underlying Social Barriers: includes obstacles less obvious and more socially driven, such as historical trends in racial discrimination in curriculum or cultural variances in music education value perception that contribute to participation differences in music education programs of nonphysical barriers.⁷⁶
- 9) Microeconomics: focused area of research and analysis extended to the specific state of South Carolina which remained within the microeconomic state barrier.⁷⁷
- 10) State-wide Data Research: Statistical data was used involving state-level and local level events, laws, and mindsets, to analyze the operations and effects on a microeconomic level of study.⁷⁸
- 11) Impoverished: a specific group category that encompasses any student or individual pertaining to the study that lived at or below the state poverty line in South Carolina,

⁷⁴ Creswell and Creswell, *Research*, 180.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Bulgozdy, 2020, 1-16.

⁷⁷ Creswell and Creswell, *Research*, 180-182.

⁷⁸ "Income Guidelines," *South Carolina Legal Services*, 2022, 1.

- includes total household income that aligned with the state assumed poverty level as delegated by the federal poverty level based on household size.⁷⁹
- 12) Federal Poverty Level: designated poverty level was the superseding methodology for designating income level poverty within each state. The research method involved a tiered approach to various levels of impoverishment based on the foundation of total household income, relative to the size of household. Regarding the size of household, the data included minors and adult age individuals. The analysis of poverty line delegation was domestically universal in application to race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and education for the household members.⁸⁰
- 13) Household poverty: includes any individual spending the majority of time within the house of primary residence listed at or below national poverty level.⁸¹
- 14) Socioeconomic: A traditional approach was taken to the definition of socioeconomic. The application and term was used in relation to different social classes, cultural mindsets relating to the subcategorized social groups, and overall wealth levels. The rank from at or below poverty level within South Carolina with the option of no wealth ceiling to analysis was used to gather a more conclusive application to the term. The term was also not biased in application to research based on wealth levels of overall financial standing among different nationalities, ethnicities, sexual orientation, or state-based student segregation methodology.⁸²

⁷⁹ “Income Guidelines,” *South Carolina Legal Services*, 1.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

Chapter Summary

Through statistical and behavioral analysis of social and resource-based barriers, the research revealed a historical trend of low participation rates for many students living in poverty within South Carolina. Since the onset of formalized music education in the United States, music education outreach and methodology has undergone many different changes to accommodate the modernization of music education practices.⁸³ Although these practices and curriculum have included more diverse materials in recent years, many historically negative mindsets against the participation in optional music study have resulted in the overall low participation rates.⁸⁴ The social attitudes were found to be rooted in historically negative perceptions from lower socioeconomic groups' exclusivity of music culture, as well as higher wealth classes' legislative actions. Both initiatives and socioeconomic classes increased resource and funding barriers to music education in poverty level areas in South Carolina.

The perception of music education as a luxury and wasteful subject for study among various microeconomic groups in South Carolina directly worked to increase physical barriers to funding and resources when advancing music education outreach.⁸⁵ Through understanding the barriers to participation in funding and general resources, the patterns of low participation could be changeable to recruit new participants and alter social perceptions of the social culture associated with formal music study. As a result, many social attitudes and resource barriers within microeconomic South Carolina impoverished areas have ongoing negative historical trends. While the historical data is predominately negative for increasing new outreach

⁸³ Moore, *Journal*, 112-114.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Newman, *Teach*, 26-29.

opportunities, new studies show promising results for changing future data trends in outreach and student participation.⁸⁶ Through music education outreach programs within South Carolina universities and schools, in addition to private music education outreach, the barriers to participation have decreased in recent years.⁸⁷ As a result, many future generations can actively access music education programs across many different socioeconomic and microeconomic subgroups within the State of South Carolina.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ Barnes, *International*, 23-31.

⁸⁷ Ibid, 23-31.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Poverty Patterns since the Great Depression in South Carolina

The barriers to outreach efforts for music participation across generations of poverty level areas in South Carolina have historically intensified since the Great Depression. Prior to the great economic downfall, the impoverished areas were less economically susceptible to monetary and resource barriers for common necessities.⁸⁹ After the Great Depression and downfall of uninsured funds within financial institutions across the United States, much of the wealth accumulated within rural South Carolina was lost.⁹⁰ Research discovered that particular individuals were more likely to be affected by financial loss and lack of resources post-recession. Children, elderly, and those living in households with fewer individuals are previously and currently more prone to experiencing barriers to economic advancement in impoverished areas of South Carolina after the Great Depression.⁹¹

While individuals who live with more members in a single home dwelling site experience slightly higher economic standing due to multiple member income participation, the earnings rate per household member still remains historically lower than the poverty level in South Carolina.⁹² Within these subsections of various counties across the state, the additional element of race contributes the connectivity of economic impoverishment and resource opportunities for all ages. Specifically, African Americans are more susceptible to negative economic patterns due

⁸⁹ Willis Lewis and Ferdinand DiFurio, "Using a SLX Model to Examine the Impact of the Great Recession on Poverty in South Carolina," *Journal of Poverty* 26 no. 7, 2022, 1-2.

⁹⁰ Ibid, 1-4.

⁹¹ Ibid, 2-5.

⁹² Ibid, 5-6.

to the historical limits on career opportunities, wealth accumulation, and pre-civil rights movements for equality.⁹³ Impoverished individuals have been shown to often create a generational pattern of low income households, extensive barriers to escaping the negative economic trends, and a reduction in education and career opportunities as young adults.⁹⁴ While small differences exist regarding opportunities and wealth levels among population and household density in metropolitan and rural South Carolina, the negative impacts of low income demographical life quality, economic sustainability, and educational opportunities are still present since the Great Depression.

Research regarding barriers to opportunities and general escapism from poverty cycles shows a high variance among rural versus metropolitan South Carolina. Rural South Carolina areas historically require additional travel means to escape poverty, which directly requires a level of preexisting resources for travel. Because limited generational resources are present to assist with career opportunities and educational advancement in the younger population, the level of poverty and the lack of high school level education are historically high compared to other county areas.⁹⁵ Contextual circumstances of continuing the lack of resources to initiate a change in education and socioeconomic standing is less strong in metropolitan areas where preexisting travel accommodations, local career opportunities, and education are within foot travel distance. Students are also more socially mobile within any starting wealth class due to the proximity of resources and social programs for education and career advancement.⁹⁶

⁹³ Lewis and DiFurio, *Poverty*, 5-6. .

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid, 4-9.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 5-10.

The education system within these historically economically impoverished areas adds an additional negative element in successful outreach methods for music education. Many of the rural and underserved socioeconomic areas in South Carolina are also educationally lacking in resources and student-teacher ratios. The educational void creates a two-fold economic and subsequent education barrier from lacking resources. Many impoverished geographical areas continue to lack educational funding to resources, classroom materials, and travel accommodations for outreach opportunities. As a stem from impoverished socioeconomic standing, there are very limited state and local funding allocations to fill educational voids within these areas.

The Corridor of Shame

Specific areas of South Carolina, such as the *Corridor of Shame* for 17 school districts along the South Carolina portion of interstate I-95, have been identified as severely impoverished and needing resources to recruit students and teachers.⁹⁷ The districts include Bamberg, Beaufort, Calhoun, Clarendon, Colleton, Darlington, Dillon, Dorchester, Florence, Hampton, Jasper, Lee, Marion, Marlboro, Orangeburg, Sumter, and Williamsburg. All of the counties have the interstate I-95 running through the center and have historically impoverished populations.⁹⁸ The study group school districts and general geographical areas of South Carolina have suffered for many generations. Due to the sociological perceptions and funding challenges in music education resources within these areas, music education outreach is increasingly difficult for current and future generations. The issue of outreach efforts for participation, increasing the

⁹⁷ Donna Michelle Bryan, "Teacher Retention: A Case Study in a High-Poverty, Low-Income School in South Carolina's Corridor of Shame," *ProQuest Dissertations Publishing*, 2018, 1-14.

⁹⁸ LaRaven Temoney, and Laura D. Ullrich, "All Talk, But No Action: A Reexamination of Education in South Carolina's Corridor of Shame," *The Winthrop McNair Research Bulletin* 4, no. 1 (2018): 1-11.

sociological value of music education, and partnering with the few local entities for outreach is challenging due to the limited resources. In addition to the lack of economic resources, the corridor areas have a longstanding social devaluation of music education being necessary to basic economic sustainability in these conditions.

Variations Among Counties in the Corridor

The poverty levels among these different county areas in South Carolina are strongly rooted in educational analysis and historical patterns for economic opportunity in different counties. Over the course of forty years, research has linked certain counties to exceptionally high poverty and low education rates. The ongoing pattern of low education and high poverty does not have a statistically larger population percentage in areas of South Carolina that are in poverty but also have higher opportunities for economic growth due to the close proximity of resources.⁹⁹ As a result, funding for education and opportunities to escape sociological trends are strongly tied to the surrounding opportunities and resources provided within the geographical vicinity of students and caregivers. Patterns of educational and social mobility within low economic opportunity areas has continued to negatively impact students for many generations.¹⁰⁰

Origins of Music Education Outreach in South Carolina Church-based Programs

The issue of division and exclusivity among generational students traces back to the state's early history of music education in the 1800s.¹⁰¹ Early efforts to provide equal opportunities for minority students stemmed from church-based music lessons and choir classes

⁹⁹ D. Tomaskovic-Devey, "Labor Markets, Industrial Structure, and Poverty: A Theoretical Discussion and Empirical Example," *Rural Sociology* 52, no. 1 (1987): 56-74.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, 58-62.

¹⁰¹ Jeffrey P. Green, "Edmund Jenkins of South Carolina," *Black Music Research Journal* 30, no. 1 (2010): 183-195.

for African American students in the late 1800s.¹⁰² Edmund Jenkins was a pastor of a local church and grew up as an African American son of labor workers in Charleston, South Carolina.¹⁰³ Jenkins realized the void for music education in the 1800s for both private and public offerings for classes. Jenkins especially wanted to provide African American students the opportunity to gain a well-rounded music education and began forming partnerships with other local and regional musicians of all ethnicities and origins.¹⁰⁴

Jenkins, in an era of high segregation and limited opportunities for impoverished South Carolina minority students to gain access to music education, began providing free opportunities for young students to participate in music training.¹⁰⁵ The partnerships that Jenkins provided for music education to minority and impoverished students was one of the first examples of successful outreach efforts to poor students in South Carolina. Jenkins personally went on to participate in orchestra training and performances as well as regional training partnerships with professional musicians in an era of high segregation and inequality.¹⁰⁶ Later in Jenkins' personal career, he was able to professionally travel abroad for training as well as performing in England.¹⁰⁷ The church-based opportunities he created and participated in as a young African American student in an impoverished South Carolina area were able to prove that generational segregation and even legislative inequality could not stop a determined music student in the early

¹⁰² Green, *Black*, 184-190.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, 185-189.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, 183-195.

1800s.¹⁰⁸ With the resources and current legislation since Jenkins' life, modern students in the same impoverished areas have new equal opportunities for music education outreach but still struggling to provide some of the necessities for proper learning environments in the facilities.

The advancement of music education and performance-based programs within church walls for the outside public stems back to the early settlement of the Anglican Church in South Carolina.¹⁰⁹ When the early American settlers arrived in the state, the Church worked to advance the printing of psalmist music for a larger audience to participate in services.¹¹⁰ Because the public education system was in the very early stages of development, much of the music performances and educational activities stemmed from the local churches. The ability to teach choir members, psalmists, and general congregations how to sing with the new printing abilities for sheet music was a very early step in music outreach in South Carolina.¹¹¹ Through the ability to print psalmist music for services, the local Anglican Church began one of the first known forms of private-based music education in South Carolina.¹¹²

The efforts to create literature that was accommodating to the large number of singers stemmed from the resources that the settlers held within the natural ecosystem of the region. Because the LowCountry region of South Carolina had the ample soil nutrients necessary for growing and harvesting indigo and rice crops, the church took advantage of the natural resources

¹⁰⁸ Green, *Black*, 1-3.

¹⁰⁹ Charles King, "The Cashaway Psalmody: Transatlantic Religion and Music in Colonial Carolina," *Fides Et Historia* 52, no. 2 (2020): 136-137.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 137.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 136-137.

and began using the indigo dye and grains from rice to print music literature for church music.¹¹³ The ability to use local resources for music education outreach kept supply costs low while also recirculating the funds into the local economy to support fellow artisans and farmers.¹¹⁴ The effort of the Anglican Church is a very early development in the process of music education outreach in South Carolina, and the historical context provides a successful example of positive outreach results. By using local resources and working within a small community, current and future music education efforts can have a large impact on the surrounding community and culture to include all groups of people.¹¹⁵

The local efforts to continue the success of church-based music education have experienced a positive impact on students in higher education programs.¹¹⁶ Because much of the old religious music literature also holds a historical and social value, many higher education institutions have partnered with churches to provide a stronger fulfillment of the course offering for historical music selections in higher education. The partnerships with local religious institutions allow higher education institutions to properly expose young students to early western musical instruments, such as the harpsichord and pipe organ.¹¹⁷ The partnerships also allow students the opportunity to perform musical selections from early church music and gain access to sacred applied music instruction that are not easily accessible to many students in

¹¹³ King, *Fides*, 136-137.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Timothy W. Sharp, "Hallelujah! Next Church Music: A Renewed Vision for Church Music in Higher Education," *The Choral Journal* 38, no. 7 (1998): 51-54.

impoverished areas.¹¹⁸ While the higher education partnerships with churches or religious organizations are in the early stages, the partnerships of church-based music education outreach efforts date back several centuries and provide valuable opportunities for poor students' musical advancement.

Educational Rank Analysis and Curriculum Review for Improved Outreach

Many organizations have established different measures for student evaluations and ranking, in addition to the church-based non-traditional forms of music education outreach. Within South Carolina schools, many teachers have used a new ranking method to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and methods of outreach.¹¹⁹ In addition to standard metrics of evaluating students and classroom effectiveness based on a graded system or scale, teachers have experienced, with more personal feedback, to understand how to better serve students in rural and specifically low income communities.¹²⁰ Through understanding a more personal approach and feedback from student and families, educational entities can better fill community voids in music education. By learning how to better accommodate the cultural desires and perspectives that pose barriers to participation in music education through non-traditional analysis, arts organizations and schools alike can foster a more inclusive and diverse learning experience.

Many music curriculum development programs have recently understood the barriers to participation and outreach efforts from a cultural perspective in a non-traditional setting. Many curriculum evaluations reveal a dated and exclusive selection of music that aligns with previous

¹¹⁸ Sharp, Choral, 51-54.

¹¹⁹ Brooke O'Neal, "Nontraditional Forms of Assessment." *Educational Horizons* 93, no. 3 (2015): 18-19.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

generational selection of popular and classic music.¹²¹ Curriculum developers for school music education have avoided addressing the necessity of more modern music selections in school curriculum due to the common theme of hyper sexuality in modern music.¹²² However, curriculum developers are working to create a age appropriate curriculum for the respective grade levels that more closely align with familiar music styles and songs. By creating a culturally modern and age inclusive curriculum, private and public music education outreach efforts to align with modern students can create a more welcoming and inclusive classroom environment.

The efforts to modernize music education curriculum for higher outreach success also extends to the medium in which materials are delivered to students.¹²³ Traditional means of classroom music education involves physical materials and instrumental learning that typically involves limited technology.¹²⁴ Because the younger generation of students have grown up in a technological environment outside of the classroom, curriculum developers are working to develop a more hybrid approach to provide additional technology resources within music education courses.¹²⁵ The new classroom technology includes providing tutorials online, videos during live presentations, and providing students with additional learning materials in a online setting.¹²⁶ The modernization of curriculum to include a higher level of technology during

¹²¹ Chrysalis L. Wright, Francesca Dillman Carpentier, Lesley-Ann Ey, Cougar Hall, K Megan Hopper, and Wayne Warburton, "Popular Music Media Literacy: Recommendations for the Education Curriculum," *Policy insights from the behavioral and brain sciences*. 6, no. 2 (2019): 186–193.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid, 186.

¹²⁴ Ibid, 189-192.

¹²⁵ Wright, et. Al., *Policy*, 186.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

instruction provides a more familiar form of personal learning and education within formal music programs.¹²⁷

Sociology of Poverty Mindsets in Generational Education

The subcategory of participation in educational opportunities, such as music education, to encourage a well-rounded education in low economic opportunity and high poverty rates are encouraged by sociological impoverished mindsets. Many young students and adult caregivers within poverty-level areas across the state have consistently grown up in an impoverished environment. This impoverished mindset leads many of the previous and upcoming generations to create a strong social bond with likeminded values during sociological suffering. These actions are a result of lacking basic necessities for daily life, poor education options, and social values for non-traditional opportunities outside of culturally traditional fields of employment or study. While many arts and music education programs might be able to extend funding for participation in off-site education, the patterns of low valuation for certain items and opportunities remains a barrier to participation in social education programs. This ideology of not valuing certain lifestyle amenities and educational topics, such as music education or general value for education, creates an added sociological barrier to outreach in areas that already experience high economic barriers to arts initiatives.¹²⁸

Professional Musician Experiences in South Carolina's Poverty Areas

Within the barriers to music education and sociological trends for low participation, many historic professional musicians have struggled to escape low income areas prior to national fame. The jazz musician, Eartha Kitt, was born in the small town of Saint Matthews, South Carolina.

¹²⁷ Wright, et. Al., *Policy*, 186.

¹²⁸ Tomaskovic-Devey, *Rural*, 59-70.

Saint Matthews is part of the historical Corridor of Shame because the town is located in Calhoun County and has a high poverty rate.¹²⁹ Kitt struggled to find financial, educational, and social stability in St. Matthews as a child. Kitt was born to a single mother who reaped the negative patterns of social misfortunes with lacking resources and finances to escape poverty in the early 1900s.¹³⁰ When Kitt's single mother abandoned her to pursue a romantic interest, Kitt was later sent to live with other family and friends throughout her life as a poor, black student in the rural South Carolina education system. She also felt social exclusion as a young student and musician due to the social perception of her lighter skin color. The negative social perceptions of Kitt's background and social perception among different cultural communities created many boundaries to musical and social advancement from generational poverty.¹³¹

Musical Development and Historical Contributions from South Carolina Artists

South Carolina native, James Brown, also grew up in a rural area and contributed a significant amount of musical development to modern jazz, funk, and rhythm and blues standards.¹³² Brown's early upbringing and cultural development in rural South Carolina helped to contribute to the development of a new subcategory of jazz music called Afrobeat. Brown recalled how he did not like the shuffling of simple subdivided beats in early radio standards as a young musician and wanted to create a more syncopated, raw timbre of pop-jazz music

¹²⁹ Adam Luck, "Eartha Kitt's Life Was Scarred by Failure to Learn the Identity of Her White Father, Says Daughter." *The Observer*. (2013): 33.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Alexander Stewart, "Make it Funky: Fela Kuti, James Brown and the Invention of Afrobeat," *American Studies (Lawrence)* 52, no. 4 (2013): 99-118.

standards.¹³³ Through his influence of early jazz and blues musicians, the South Carolina native was able to create an entire career centered around a new form of composition and tonality for radio standards in the mid-1900s.¹³⁴

At a young age, Brown showed exceptional rhythm and technical abilities as a South Carolina student. His early mentors recalled Brown as having a strong level of physical control over his instrument, whether performing on the drums or vocally. While other artists, such as Herbie Hancock, attempted to recreate the syncopation and counter-beats developed by Brown, Brown was still credited as one of the founding figures of Afrobeat music. He extended his musical education and performance developments by visiting Africa and gaining a significant amount of cultural influence from traditional African beats. By traveling to different cultures, Brown was able to seamlessly blend southern blues, standard jazz, and his own version of syncopation into a completely new genre of music.¹³⁵

Although Brown was one of the few musicians of impoverished South Carolina areas to find fame and success as a professional, his younger years were troubled. Brown recalled growing up in very promiscuous settings and experienced a high level of instability in his education and personal life. Brown's educational background is inconsistent due to poor records and his moving around frequently as a young student. His family were descendants of Barnwell and Charleston county slaves, and Brown's family pursued farming help as the primary means of economic sustainability. Although very poor, his father and paternal side of the family were very musical.

¹³³ Stewart, *American*, 99-118.

¹³⁴ Ibid, P. 105-111.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

Brown's family exposure to music had a major influence on his interest in musical tonality and the drums. Throughout his early education, there is no mention of the opportunity for public music education courses within the school system due to poor record keeping and the legislative segregation of races in the public school system. During this time, many people of color were prohibited from certain opportunities for education and could not afford private music education due to the generational economic impoverishment.¹³⁶ The result of segregation and economic exclusivity in many impoverished populations was the inability for students to participate in opportunities to develop music talents. Although some private study options might have been available, many of the caregivers and families of musical students in underserved and historically impoverished areas were not able to afford such options. As a result, the negative patterns of social inclusivity, participation rates, and music education expansion in poor areas has continued for several generations.

Generational Perception of Music Outreach and Education

The generational continuation of barriers to participation in music education opportunities, whether in famous musicians' lives or the current generation, is encouraged by the academic perception of school officials. Because many school officials and music instructors view music courses as simply a fun activity and less important than core courses, funding and outreach methods for music education has been a generational struggle.¹³⁷ The inability to credit music education courses and outreach as equally important to other subjects in early childhood education is an issue that stems from the onset of public education system accreditation. As a

¹³⁶ Ronald Johannes Smith, *The One: The life and music of James Brown*, Penguin, 2012.

¹³⁷ Richard Weerts, "Dissertation Reviews: 'Perceptions of Selected Public School Personnel Concerning the Value of Teaching Music in the Public Schools of South Carolina' by Edward Wayne Lord," *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* (1998): 86-88.

result of less valued social perceptions of music education opportunities, arguments in favor of funding and outreach efforts in the performing arts have been neglected or perceived with lesser importance than core subjects.¹³⁸ Although there have been ongoing efforts to change the social perception of music education as a solely extracurricular activity, barriers to rebranding the value and outreach of music programs in South Carolina are still high. The ongoing perception of music education being an optional or socially unnecessary subject for academic or professional success also draws a correlation to financial status within demographic groups.¹³⁹ A national study in various geographical regions of the United States found that a high association exists between low income levels nationally and low participation rates in artistic subjects, particularly music education.¹⁴⁰

Political and Social Culture Impacts Generational Trends

While many opportunities within these regions are currently made possible for particularly underprivileged or impoverished students, the generational views from caregivers have a drastic impact on the participation rates for young students. The norms of political culture provide a sociological perception of varying subjects' categorization of being more liberal or conservative. Lauren Kapalka Richerme's music education study on sociological relationships between political views and music participation revealed that students who grow up in very strict households were less likely to participate in music education and less likely to view music

¹³⁸ Weerts, *Bulletin*, 86-88.

¹³⁹ Adria R. Hoffman, "Compelling Questions about Music, Education, and Socioeconomic Status," *Music Educators Journal* 100, no. 1 (2013), 63-68.

¹⁴⁰ Hoffman, *Music*, 63-68..

education with high importance in adulthood.¹⁴¹ The idea of participation in music education is perceptive to not provide a socially competitive advantage against other peers in the group. Parents with this view are also more likely to raise highly competitive and traditional children, including competitiveness in non-core subjects like music.¹⁴²

The subsequent low levels of involvement in music education programs is a consequence of sociological “closed forms” within environmental structures.¹⁴³ The closed forms of cultural, political, and social patterns rely on the security of viewing a subject or activity as providing competitive gains against other members of the social group. The form views the practice of continuing social traditions as a means of adhering to the cultural moral constructs of security within a social group. Such principles of relating social conservatism through the creation of tradition does not imply the deviation of the social group into the political spheres of conservative verses liberal ideologies in popular discussions. The constructs are evident in all politically identified groups because social competitiveness and security from acceptance into the cultural group is rooted in sociological morals in the student and caregiver’s social environment.

Music education participation rates remain historically low in social environments that view music as providing a low social competitive value to excel past other social players, disrupt patterns of tradition, and violate the group’s social conservatism.¹⁴⁴ The political impacts of closed social pattern forms continue to negatively affect the next generation in music education

¹⁴¹ Lauren Kapalka Richerme, "Naming Moral-Political Discourses in Music Education: A Philosophical Investigation," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 70, no. 1 (2022): 48-65.

¹⁴² Ibid., 15.

¹⁴³ Ibid, 6.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, 4-13.

participation. While external organizations or governmental entities often provide opportunities that are free of charge and provide transportation, participation remains low due to sociological closed forms in traditionalism. The efforts to increase participation and generational education is partially rooted in the necessity to educate older social players on the competitive value and inclusion of music education into traditional social values.¹⁴⁵

Sociological Perception and Players in South Carolina Music Education

The closed forms of sociological perception of music education extends to the traditions within South Carolina schools and geographical groups.¹⁴⁶ Older generations in South Carolina continue to foster a strong sense of closed forms with indirectly contributing to low participation rates in music education.¹⁴⁷ The forms of traditional habits often include participation in activities such as sports or STEM subjects, because these subjects hold a higher degree of social value. Subjects such as sports and science in the South Carolina region hold a higher social value, because these subjects seem to increase the competitiveness of social players against one another's success in the social hierarchy system.¹⁴⁸

Many of the personnel involved in education and the disbursement of funding also hold to the same social traditions that create a strong sense of competition among social players when participating in non-musical subjects. The social undervaluation of music education leads to the perception of the subject study to provide lower levels of competitive gains, such as scholarships

¹⁴⁵Richerme, *Journal*, 48-65.

¹⁴⁶ Weerts, *Bulletin*, 86-88.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, 87-88.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

and college admissions.¹⁴⁹ The social value of subjects in relation to competitiveness also enhances the social valuation of nonmusical subjects against without directly making a social effort to increase value. As a result, the gap of participation levels among music and non-musical subjects continues to widen in relation to breaking patterns of tradition within closed forms of sociology groups. The tradition and generational pattern negatively affect participation rates for younger students and the next generation of students.

Quality of Music Education Variances in South Carolina Areas

Another major variation in historical participation rates for students and general musical success is dependent upon the methodologies employed by the assigned instructor and school district. Historically, instrumental teachers in all South Carolina school districts are more likely to provide specialized instruction and course materials that relate to a specific instrument or subtopic within general music education courses.¹⁵⁰ Likewise, historical trends in curriculum creation and chorus participation within general music courses showed a higher level of diversity in topic discussion and course content. Choir instructors that also taught general music courses showed the highest level of diversity among topics covered in general music courses. The high diversity level in chorus teachers' general music classes resulted in better preparation for students upon entering higher education programs and admissions exams.¹⁵¹

The variance in topic coverage among South Carolina instructors leads to a strong correlation between academic achievement and proper forms of music preparation within the

¹⁴⁹ Weerts, *Bulletin*, 86-88.

¹⁵⁰ David A Franklin, "The Relationship Between Academic Preparation and Professional Responsibilities of Secondary School Music Teachers in South Carolina," *Journal of research in music education*. 19, no. 4 (1971): 460.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

classroom prior to auditioning for higher education programs. Because many music instructors are collegiately trained in a specific instrument, the redistribution of knowledge is often biased on the instructor's area of focus study in college.¹⁵² As a result, the music education quality across South Carolina classrooms is often skewed in diverse material discussion, thus reducing the effectiveness of properly preparing students for long term musical success. While many schools in South Carolina are not able to provide full time music education due to funding, the preexisting music education programs are simultaneously not fully designed to create a strong musical foundation for current participants. The curriculum and instructors of preexisting music classes are negatively contributing to the historical trend of ineffective instruction and residual low continuing participation rates in current programs.¹⁵³

Legislation and Educational Patterns of Music Education in South Carolina

Historical education trends prior to inclusive legislation contributed to low education and participation rates in such programs. During the music education efforts in segregated school systems, many students in minority or non-white communities had very limited resources for quality formal music education programs.¹⁵⁴ Because people of color were unable to attend non-negro educational institutions prior to legislation that prohibited segregation and discrimination practices in education, educational options for teachers and students were extremely limited.¹⁵⁵ Research on the educational qualifications for negro schools prior to full integration revealed that most music educators in the segregated schools did not major in music and only 10% of

¹⁵² Franklin, Journal, 460.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Laurence C. Bryant and John Henry Deloach, "The Status of Music in the Negro High Schools in South Carolina," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 12, no. 2 (1964): 177-179.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

teachers minored in music.¹⁵⁶ Additionally, the music instructors in negro schools were primarily graduates of South Carolina State University, a historically black university according to national classifications.¹⁵⁷

The poor quality and access to music education among minorities has contributed to the negative trends in participation and sociological views of participating in music education programs after desegregation actions. Because many minorities are also geographically included in historically impoverished areas, such as the counties in the Corridor of Shame, students did not have generational access to quality music education pre-desegregation and continue to have barriers to music education access afterwards.¹⁵⁸ While desegregation has been a major action to dissolve education barriers for all students, generational trends in social values, poor economic growth, and historical trends of failing school programs have continued to pose barriers for South Carolina students that are historically underserved and impoverished.

Historical Outreach Efforts for Music Education in South Carolina

For specific areas of historically underrepresented and impoverished areas, many private organizations and school districts have partnered together to create specific programs to provide additional music education programs to students. The Charleston County School District partnered with local blues musicians to provide young students with a creative outlet to grow musical talents.¹⁵⁹ The program began as a four-week spring music intensive for inner city

¹⁵⁶ Bryant and Deloach, *Journal*, 177-179.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 178.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 177-179.

¹⁵⁹ Jerelyn Eddings, "Charleston's Education Tool: The Blues, (Blues Musicians Teach Music to Inner-City Children in Charleston, South Carolina, During Four-Week Blues in the Schools Program)," *U.S. News & World Report*, 118, no. 14 (1995).

students that did not have access to higher forms of music education and for students who might be labeled troublesome students from middle school and above.¹⁶⁰ The program's director aimed to keep inner-city students off the street or avoid expelling students by engaging their time with positive music education efforts. The program offers high quality music classes from professional blues musicians and is completely free of charge for students.¹⁶¹

The program began over 30 years ago and has expanded music outreach to many different students within a historically impoverished region of education within Charleston County. While the program reaches a very small group of approximately 200 students, efforts to expand education opportunities have been an ongoing process to get more local students to participate in music education courses. The program also includes a high level of studies that have previously been under corrective action or on probation for violations of school policies. The program works to help all students, including problematic students, find a healthy outlet to grow their musical talents. The program simultaneously aids in keeping students with behavioral history issues from engaging in negative activities or behaviors and helps improve their artistic expression in a constructive environment for music learning.¹⁶²

Additional efforts to increase the overall quality of music education in South Carolina private and public schools included a statistical analysis of the overall national accreditation requirements set forth by the National Board of Education and the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).¹⁶³ While many South Carolina districts do have a option for music

¹⁶⁰ Eddings, *U.S. News*, 1.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² *Ibid.*

¹⁶³ Cecil Adderley, "Preparation of Future K-4 Music Teachers Relative to the National Standards--Goals 2000," *Contributions to Music Education* 27, no. 2 (2000): 59-70.

education courses in some variety, the majority of the programs are not in accordance with the national accredited standards for k-12 education or the NASM standards. While there are many current efforts to provide additional funding and music staffing to change the statistical trend, the majority of school districts in South Carolina are still struggling to meet accreditation and music curriculum standards for quality education.¹⁶⁴ Within the higher education realm, collegiate staff and faculty have worked diligently to prepare future teachers for how to accommodate these deficiencies and how to create a more effective curriculum that aligns with national standards. The higher education system is working with local South Carolina entities and districts to increase the quality of music education offerings through curriculum revitalization and course offerings.¹⁶⁵

Right to Education Legalities for Music Education Students

An ongoing conflict between the legal right to a well-rounded education and the failing quality of educational institutions in South Carolina poses significant challenges to current and future generations. Within severely impoverished districts that offer extremely limited education, the barrier to access is primarily the failing quality of facilities. Although a course for music education might be offered, oftentimes no budget is provided for supplies or the tools necessary to conduct the required course material or activities.¹⁶⁶ Many of the facilities along the Corridor of Shame and other poverty level district schools are suffering from inadequate facilities, including severe problems like sewage leaks in the school hallways and failing roof systems.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴ Adderley, *Contributions*, P. 60-69.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Robert Kim, "Under the Law: The Rights of Rural Students," *The Phi Delta Kappan*. 103, no. 4 (2021): 64-65.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

Within the schools, the districts often do not budget for music education resources and are struggling to meet the minimum safety code inspections to remain open.¹⁶⁸

The issue of funding for facilities and maintenance to provide a safe and fully equitable environment for students dates back over 30 years in the South Carolina state budget.¹⁶⁹ Over 30 years ago, the state needed over 1 billion dollars to bring school facilities up to modern standards and provide the proper resources for effective student learning environments for all subjects, including non-core subjects like music and the arts.¹⁷⁰ While the state made legislation in the early 1700s that provided funding sources for education from state property tax revenue, the reserve funds needed to rehabilitate the district facilities to accommodate proper learning environments has dwindled significantly.¹⁷¹ The rising inflation costs for repair and supplies to rebuild the schools have annually surpassed the tax percentage revenue increases on funding sources with local and state property taxation. As a result, building conditions and the supplies necessary for proper education and music program advancement has become an increasingly difficult task due to the widening gap between tax revenues and state economic inflation rates.¹⁷²

The second effort to improve the outreach and overall quality of education in South Carolina resulted in the districts selling government bonds to create fiscal value. The activity generated a social sense of offering the public long-term assets with investment power to fund the necessary capital needed for repairs, supplies, and maintenance for failing school

¹⁶⁸ Kim, *Phi*, 64–65.

¹⁶⁹ Kenneth R. Stevenson and Leonard O. Pellicer, "The Funding of School Facilities in South Carolina," *Journal of Education Finance* 13, no. 4 (1988): 405-411.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 405-406.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 405-409.

infrastructure projects.¹⁷³ These efforts did bring a substantial amount of support for investments to help with repairs. However, the activity led to an inflated market value of the respective bonds and no limits on the asset percentage of bonds to the property value was present. After the 1970s, the South Carolina legislature passed an amendment that only allowed a total of 8% of the total school's asset value to be sold in the form of bonds. The new legislation did stop the negative trend of inflated asset values, but the law also economically decreased the projected revenue from bonds and contributed to the needed repairs to provide all districts with a more adequate learning environment. The economic revenues experienced a decrease in expected growth and further extended the ongoing problems of physically failing school environments in South Carolina.¹⁷⁴

The legislature further expanded new tax regulations to attempt to improve the quality of education and facilitates for all subjects, including non-core subjects like music education, by passing a 3% sales tax.¹⁷⁵ The tax included all sales in the state and remained in effect from 1951 until new actions were taken in 1984. Throughout the thirty years of sales tax and added fees for each student, the state still struggled to provide adequate funding. Within the budget deficit, resources for music education programs in all areas, specifically high poverty districts, are bearing a significant burden on providing mandatory music courses without funding or resources for teachers and the facility.¹⁷⁶ Since the tax addition over 50 years ago, the budget deficit was

¹⁷³ Stevenson and Pellicer, *Journal*, 406.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, 407.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

still over 1 billion dollars in the early 1990s, and many schools are still not meeting national standards for curriculum and modern facility requirements.¹⁷⁷

Learning Benefits for Music Education Program Participation

Many facilities are failing to provide adequate resources and inhabitable on-site learning environments, but modern research provides substantial evidence for positive investing activities and growing outreach efforts for music education programs in all of South Carolina. From the onset of offering music education in fourth grade for most South Carolina schools, research shows that students develop a stronger likelihood of attain a higher GPA and experience a greater growth of the prefrontal cortex according to neuroscientists.¹⁷⁸ The control group research from the South Carolina Arts Assessment Program (SCAAP) is currently working alongside federal and state government and organizations thereof to provide outlets for student participation.¹⁷⁹ Through gathering data on current school music education programs' participation rates, extracurricular music programs, and parental involvement, the SCAAP create a modern analysis of music education programs in South Carolina.¹⁸⁰

The positive neurological development and core subject benefits of studying music has been overshadowed by cultural misevaluation of subject participation. Fan and fellow researchers' study reveals that studying music is a vital element in psychological development in building social relationships among peers and creating a strong sense of respect for fellow

¹⁷⁷ Stevenson and Pellicer, *Journal*, 406.

¹⁷⁸ Xumei Fan, Ning Jiang, and Ashlee Lewis, "Factors Associated with Fourth Graders' Music Knowledge Assessed by SCAAP," *International Journal of Music Education* 38, no. 4 (2020): 644-656.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 644-646.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

students.¹⁸¹ The study also revealed that a small percentage of the elementary school music education students also experienced higher math grades even through high school studies.¹⁸² the social and academic benefits of music study are present in the control group study, but several ongoing issues of low participation rates and failing facilities are historical barriers to outreach.

Demographic Influences on Music Participation Rates and Outreach Efforts

Fan and fellow researchers' study also revealed a significant difference in music education participation rates among male and female students in South Carolina arts programs.¹⁸³ Within South Carolina k-12 music education programs, female students were much more likely to participate in music classes at all stages as opposed to their male peers.¹⁸⁴ The social context and historical southern culture has shown to associate certain subjects with feminine attributes, such as music education. Likewise, male students in the control group were less likely to participate in music education due to cultural norms of participating in more masculine labeled activities and courses, such as science and sports.¹⁸⁵ Traditional music education and outreach programs for music does not academically hold a masculine or feminine curriculum or activities. However, generational norms have constructed the subject of music education into a sociologically closed form group of feminine subjects.¹⁸⁶

A significant difference in participation rates and overall ranking of student likelihood to participate in music education courses showed a significant difference between poverty level

¹⁸¹ Fan, et. al., *International*, 644-656.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, 647-649.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

schools and higher ranking school districts areas.¹⁸⁷ While higher socioeconomic schools and geographical regions of privately owned music education facilities had a higher percentage of student participation, the outreach opportunities were not positively correlated. Within the low income South Carolina areas in the study, a higher level of outreach opportunities to participate in music education exists outside of school music education programs.¹⁸⁸ However, the abundance of outreach programs for music education did not show a higher participation rate than other areas. As a result, the socioeconomic status and participation rates were not consistent among geographical areas.

The students with the most opportunities to learn about music still choose to not participate in the programs available due to the poverty level culture of not participating in music education as a result of parental and elder influences.¹⁸⁹ The trend of cultural influences holding a stronger value than outreach program offerings for young music participants is also evident in the higher level socioeconomic cultures. Because the study's higher socioeconomic class participants historically value music as equal or higher than other subjects, the participation rates on these high income areas remain high amidst limited outreach programs.¹⁹⁰ The variation in participation rates of both socioeconomic groups in relation to program outreach efforts exemplifies the importance of social norms and cultural impacts on the educational development and value for students in different areas of South Carolina.

Variations in participation among all social classes exist when analyzing the race and ethnicity of students. Fan's study also reveals that predominantly white male and female students

¹⁸⁷ Fan, et. al., *International*, 654-656.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, 645-647.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

were the most likely to participate in music education programs within school and as extracurricular activities.¹⁹¹ Among other ethnicities, African American students were among the least likely to participate in music education programs, regardless of the social class of their elders or social norms.¹⁹² The researchers credit social norms and the historical exclusion of culturally aligned music selections from non-western genres as another potential reason for the low music participation rates among. The general sociology feelings of cultural exclusion from teaching methods and music selections also contributes to the ongoing low participation rates among minorities and non-white students.¹⁹³

Efforts that create a more inclusive environment for a diverse student body can possibly increase student participation rates for especially young minority students in low income South Carolina schools.¹⁹⁴ According to Fan and fellow researchers' quantitative study, evidence showed that male students and particularly minority male students were among the most likely to not participate in music classes. The exclusion of culturally similar music selections to the popular music within the geographical region creates a strong social barrier for gaining parental and caregivers' support of their students' participation in the music programs. Because younger generations are highly influenced from historical patterns of closed sociological forms of activity, stepping outside of norms without the emotional and social support of peers and caregivers is against the historical patterns of group behavior.¹⁹⁵ Educating caregivers on the benefits of providing exposure to the new diverse curriculum, outreach programs and music

¹⁹¹ Fan, et. al., *International*, 645-647.

¹⁹² Ibid, 656.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, 647-649.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

organization opportunities can subsequently improve the enrollment rates and possibly increase qualifications for larger funding opportunities.

Conclusion

The data for the development and expansion of outreach efforts in impoverished South Carolina areas has made progress but still shows ongoing struggles. Since the beginning of public education in the state, various facilities have not acquired or maintained the resources and funding to provide adequate and safe learning environments. The data trends show historically ongoing issues in poor areas regarding resources, funding, and general participation rates from cultural barriers in music studies. Such negative state fiscal and sociological patterns have created low participation rates, even when funding and resources are adequate. By understanding the role of sociology and outreach patterns, many organizations have attempted to create an inclusive and welcoming music education classroom for students of all backgrounds, cultures, and ethnicities. While progress is evident from landmark education legislation and personal success examples of famous musicians, South Carolina educators are continuing to struggle with the ongoing trend of low social value of music education and low participation rates for music education programs.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether a correlation of sociological attitudes, in addition to changes in funding opportunities, exists in impoverished South Carolina music programs participation rates for public and private organizations. The quantitative data for numerical funding levels and enrollment trends for students in subsequent outreach or preexisting music programs drew a statistical connection to the social impacts of funding and support. The study gathered data from prior years as well as current budgets and funding allocations to provide a historical trend of participation and funding patterns. The study also extended to enrollment levels and community support to the same previous years as fiscal data collection for funding. The data collection provided a broad range of social and fiscal perspectives in all impoverished regions within the State of South Carolina.

General Participant Overview and Qualifications

The barriers for research analysis and data collection extended to the complete state of South Carolina and entities who reside within the state. The data included a small percentage of non-South Carolina residents in the samples due to travel, proximity to other states for the respective organization, or social factors. Although a small percentage of non-state residents might have been included in the data, the predominant data pool remained confined to current participants in the state's geographical sphere. The participants also included a non-statistically significant or very small percentage of unclassified state transits. Such barriers for data collection will also include all counties within the state geographical lines of both public and private organizations.

The research aimed to draw a quantitative approach to barriers in participation from students, caregivers, and music staff at a variety of levels. Through providing a ranking system

via surveys to local arts staff, music students, and the relative caregivers, the study revealed how music funding and social barriers can affect participation levels. The data was gathered using the Protection of Minors Act for students' identity under the age of 18 in order to comply with state and federal legislation. No IRB was needed due to the prohibition of data acceptance into the study results for minor age students if the response was "yes" to a participant below the age of 18. The data collection results were also blind to participants' financial standing with regards to debt-to-income ratio or personal assets of caregivers. Survey input from secondary siblings, social acquaintances, parents, or caregivers of survey participants was not taken into statistical consideration or counted as part of the data pool.

The data collection included a focus on the funding and social impacts of numerical data as it pertained to the respective impoverished levels within the same counties, despite some counties having above-poverty level ranges and higher funding opportunities,. The poverty level in South Carolina was defined as a specific group category that encompasses any student or individual pertaining to the study that lived at or below the state poverty line in South Carolina.¹⁹⁶ The term included total household income that aligned with the state assumed poverty level chart at each household level, as delegated by the federal poverty level based on household size.¹⁹⁷ In some overall high income counties or geographical regions, an accompanying presence of poverty-level and below communities existed within different local neighborhoods but was constant across the local geographical region. The state-wide county inclusivity for data collection for impoverished areas in the state provided a variety of numerical results from

¹⁹⁶ "Income Guidelines," *South*, 1.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

income levels, governmental funding, and community perceptions. The research also provided inclusivity of higher income level counties in the state but focused on microeconomic poverty-level subgroups within the same region. The social considerations and subsidiary funding included higher fiscally funded budgets as delegated to lower income areas within counties and geographical areas.

Regarding age range and academic achievement for the data collection of participants, the research extended the age range to all ages above the age of 18 and encompassed a variety of subcategories. The inclusion of all ages allowed the evidence of any generational trends to be exemplified during data collection and relevant generation participation trends from childhood to current periods. The data collection of specifically district or public education-based programs provided a hypersegregation approach to student age ranges and subsequent grade levels. This data included students who academically failed and excelled past the traditional grade level of education in k-12 settings. The definition of academic failure pertained to students who have failed a full grade level and were required to re-enroll in the same grade level. The inclusion of private organization data of all age ranges provides a strong social connection of generational patterns of arts participation stemming from old caregivers or paternal values. The variation of ages and inclusivity of all numerical trends provided a stronger participation group for exemplifying any potential social or cultural mindset influences and generational support for leakage among generations.

To address the first research question and hypothesis, participants from each region of the state designated as upstate, midlands, and low country regions completed a survey ranking the social and cultural attitudes of various age groups and education levels. The study exemplified the following: the participants' previous education or lack thereof in music education; family

patterns with attitudes towards music education; age category; current education level; income level category; geographical location among the three categories in the study; and questions regarding the overall importance of music education in South Carolina. The study also remained blind to the race, gender, and nationality of the South Carolina-based participants. The ranking system was provided in an online format and ranking of answer importance was on a scale of 1-5 multiple choice options. The data collection also allowed participants to designate whether or not they are a resident of one of the outlined counties in South Carolina

Within specifically impoverished South Carolina geographical regions, data collection included funding reports from state and federal budgets and privately funded arts organizations. The data included the annual fiscal budget for different performing arts organizations and school districts in the three listed regions of the upstate, midlands, and low country. The second research data findings were compiled into the sociological analysis of attitudes from the first research question. The fiscal data for the school district also included non-musical funding in state and federal budgets as applicable to relate the total percentage of education funding dedicated to music education. The findings of fiscal data was designated over the course of recent years to exemplify any trends in fiscal funding patterns.

Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1 Survey Formation Disclaimers and Content

The first research question and hypothesis was formulated by using an online survey website for anonymous submissions as data collection. As a blind submission, participants submitted the online responses within the dates of August 1, 2023 to September 1, 2023. Any submissions prior or after the established dates for submission were not included to maintain the integrity for study boundaries. The format used to exemplify the survey study included a free

online survey creation through Survey Monkey. The number of survey responses was limited to one account submission per individual within the allowed software. Information gathered within the responses remained anonymous and confidential for the sole purpose of analysis within the quantitative study group. The study group was not subject to potential legal disclosure of personal or professional survey information due to the confidentiality and anonymous establishment of survey responses.

Research Question 2 Funding Analysis and Content

The discussion for the funding analysis portion of the assignment extended to contacting school and private organization officials for data on the funding levels over recent years. Once these numerical statistics and financial status reports were submitted to the researcher, the researcher combined the data from different fiscal years and the origins of each source of funds. After gathering the data independently or from professional contacts for each of the public and private institutions of arts funding, the entities were provided a disclaimer for usage of the findings in the study. The data from each organization was not blind in the submission of financial reports and overall information pertaining to the funding operation of each organization. The disclosure of each organization's funding levels within each region or outreach community assisted the researcher with aligning the statistical reports of community survey perceptions to the funding and outreach levels within the respective geographical region.

Instrumentation

The survey was established through online social media posts from the researcher, emails to arts administrators, contact with public and private music educators, and school board administrative staff who served as third-party facilitators. The survey link was included in the respective contact to the officials. The third-party facilitators sent the link to the potential

participant pools as a voluntary survey option and exemplify the goals to understand participation and cultural mindsets towards music education. The contacts with the participant pools did not include current responses from the third party facilitators or employees of the institutions used as gateway contacts to avoid obvious bias within the responses. The contact from third party entities with links to the survey disclosed the purpose of the responses, institution for the study, name of student conducting research, contact information of the doctoral student, and disclosure that all information and responses within the survey are completely anonymous and responses were blind to the researcher's side of answer submission.¹⁹⁸

The research was also available for participants in hard copy form for participants who choose to not use an online platform. The written responses provided the same format as the survey questions and setting of the online format. The name and blind survey responses remained un-compromised between both forms of surveys. The hard copy requested response did not contain any information that varied from the online survey and responses. Complete confidentiality remained because the researchers and collectors of surveys did not know the information on each sample.¹⁹⁹

Procedures

The hard copy surveys were distributed to the willing and consented individuals through the same individuals who acted as third-party facilitators with the online format of the survey. The third-party facilitators then collected the responses from the survey within the allotted period of the study and returned the results to the researcher. The results were sealed in an envelope and initialed by the third party to personally verify the results were not compromised or altered. Once

¹⁹⁸ See Appendix A

¹⁹⁹ Appendix A.

the hard copies of any responses were received by the researcher, software compiled the data together into the appropriate category of region, response levels, age range, and other category responses. The study compiled both virtual and hard copy replies into a single data pool.

Differentiation or subject segregation between online or written copy responses was not created as different submission pools in the final results and findings of the study.

The distribution methods for both the hard copies and online survey link provided the same consensus of volunteers for the survey and willingness to provide replies that were confidential and anonymous. The participants in the survey were not provided with any form of personal benefit or compensation as a result of completing the survey. The participants were also not provided with any form of personal recognition during or after the participation in the survey. The participants did not reap negatively upon providing low scores or submitting certain replies or comments within the survey. The disclaimer of no personal gains or influences upon completion of the survey in either hard copy or online formats was administered to participants. The participants were also limited to a single response in either format to avoid potential perception of non-disclosed benefits to providing biased multiples responses.

Participants

The participants extended to the geographical regions for any age individual for both hard copy and online responses. For response recordings, only surveys that had been fully completed to answer each question was compiled in the total final data pool for analysis. The online format also had a setting on the survey link which required all participants to answer each question before being able to submit the responses. Hard copies were physically returned to the third-party facilitators with unanswered questions or multiple questions with duplicate answers. The hard copies that contained errors with single answers per question, and those that contained

unanswered questions were discarded and no part of the unanswered survey were included in the results for any of the final data. Surveys with incomplete data were numerically accounted for in participant response statistics but were segregated as incomplete survey responses and not counted towards the total statistical volume of responses for the survey.

For the completion of in person hard copy surveys, the facilitator were present to verify that only one submission per person were administered. The participants had to fill out the survey completely while on site. The surveys had to be completed without the assistance of answering the survey questions with the third-party facilitators to ensure the research collectors remain blind to responses. The hard copy surveys were also written in ink, rather than pencil or other written mediums, to ensure the integrity of the responses was not compromised. The surveys were submitted by folding the surveys in half to close the answers and submitted them into a locked box that compiled all hard copy responses for the respective location.

Collection Compilation

The locked boxes of hard copy responses were returned to the researcher for an on-site compilation and analysis. The boxes remained closed until arrival at the collection center. The researcher then opened the boxes of responses and sorted through survey results to create a pool of fully completed surveys and responses that were not filled in to correctly answer the questions. Additionally, hard copy surveys that include any personal information written on the survey, such as any comments, name, or similar information, were discarded to ensure the blind survey responses were not compromised. The written survey responses were kept as hard copies until the data collection for the entire research is complete and fully analyzed.

The data from both forms of survey responses were compiled into an Excel document for analysis. The findings were segregated into responses for both forms of survey submissions as

ratios as well as percentages. The analyses were placed into columns and rows within excel, and a graphical representation of the data was created. These numbers were used in conjunction to the funding levels of the state private and public sector to reveal any connections between social perceptions in responses from various areas and the relative funding support present in the geographical areas. Both sectors of data were used to reveal any connections or direct influences of funding or personal perceptions within these areas as the result of the research.

Setting

The response of funding data for all organizations and subsequent budget itemization were inclusive of all fundings prefaces for each organization. The data did not exclude items of expense, non-outreach efforts budgets, maintenance for facilities, or other institutional budgeting within the overall budget. The inclusive approach to budgeting provided a well-rounded approach to understanding how each geographical region and organization designates outreach funding efforts. The inclusive approach also revealed how each organization prioritizes the funding of each need in order of approved importance. By including a full financial standing report for each organization, state, or federal funded budget for arts and outreach, the data was able to show any parallels between public support and subsequent funding efforts.

The collection of funding data was opened in collection for research purposes between the institutions and the research development. The ability to not retain a blind account of each institution further aided research in developing an accurate assumption and depiction of each area of participant surveys in the state. This ability to hold a blind approach to the participant survey while also holding an open view of each organization avoided additional bias between assumptions of influence and sociological mindsets among the general public and each organization. Additionally, the knowledge of each financial institution of arts funding for both

public and private organizations provided the research with a stronger analysis of the variances between public and private funding. The overall impacts of both forms of funding within each area of geographical focus for surveys was subcategorized between opportunities created through public funding verses outreach efforts that were funded through private initiatives.

Data Analysis

The segregation between public funding through the school districts and general county budget verses the budget allocations of the private funding also revealed any institutional bias present within each sector. Within the public funding allocations, analysis determined which areas of government spending were prioritized as designated for education, arts, and non-subject specific line items. The analysis of public budgeting extended to the respective areas of funding for each survey region within the state of South Carolina. The analysis of state and federal designation of funds within each area provided a revelation of higher levels of institutional favoritism among each region or county if the statistics reveal such results. The government sponsored funding allocations also were accounted for upon the county designation of such funds to private organizations as trickle-down cash flow analysis.

Within the private organizations, analysis of the budgets in congruence with the respective blind survey responses revealed any connections between sociological perceptions and funding initiatives. In some organizations for arts and music outreach programs, public funds were allocated to the respective private organization as determined by the proper governmental delegation. The approval of such funding for privately designated funds from public origins were traditionally approved and advocated first by the federal representatives for the state of South Carolina. After federally approved, government funds for arts initiatives were traditionally designated to state level elected officials for review and approval to provide each county with the

respective funds. Funds allocation after the state level of analysis and approval were subject to designation amounts based on population, need, and elements of economic welfare necessity for specific funding requests from lower level officials.

By analyzing the official mix of public and privately designated funds for each county and subsidiary of private organizational outreach efforts, the research was able to provide a more holistic approach to the mixed use of public funds. Because many of the private organizations and music education nonprofits within South Carolina receive some level of public funding and budget support to continue outreach programs, the research had to account for the mixture in order to avoid unnecessary blind analysis of funding sources. The private organizations may or may not have chosen to hyper segregate the support as public funding sources within the state or county budget allocations. As a result, the funds analysis and budget data for private organizations may or may not have chosen to reveal public funding as specifically a designated cash flow item in the budget. The private organizations accounted for the public influx of funding sources but may choose to label the sources as other budgeting items, rather than a macro-view of public funds received in the budget.

The complexities and choice of budget analysis for data collection worked to reduce bias in funding analysis by compiling a single blind approach for survey participant responses that align with the funding compilations. The effort to expose variances in budgets without creating bias in survey results from geographic participants remained in effect until the data analysis was complete. The data analysis for both funding and survey responses was conducted separately before attempting to draw conclusions or show correlations between both subsections of the research. The focus on data collection for the participant survey responses that are separately compiled from the funding analysis worked to maintain the integrity of research quality and

blind approach to survey feedback. Once data for both survey responses and funding allocations was completed separately, a separate analysis was conducted to determine if a relationship exists between the two data sets.

Chapter Summary

The completed study provided substantial analysis of data collection to best exemplify any connections between sociological mindsets and funding levels within the respective state. Through creating specific protocol and survey data collection boundaries, the research provided results that are representative of the complete data set without unnecessary bias. The results of participant responses were collected and analyzed alongside the results of the financial data provided from public and privately funded institutions within South Carolina. The financial information gathering also followed the protocol of guidelines adherence for data submissions to reduce bias and increase accountability for funding levels within each institution. Both participant surveys and financial funding level data was used to compile a research conclusion and analysis on the primary research questions and hypothesis.

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS

Results were gathered within the survey from the data collection of multiple choice and write in categories of the blind survey. The results revealed a categorical and parallel connection to the application of the findings of both entities. The data of both the survey and funding analysis provide a broader view of how the online software and responses shaped the answers to both research questions. Through compilation and data collection of both survey responses and the funding analysis, the results were unified to create a single conclusion and findings. The study results demonstrate a connection between sociological and generational trends in music education perceptions as well as provide a historical background on the funding trends that parallel the South Carolina education systems for outreach.²⁰⁰

²⁰⁰ Appendix B.

Results

Location

The first question regarding geographical location exemplified the generational patterns of sociological trends discussed in the following survey investigation. The geographical question was not bound to a single education level, demographic, or age parameters. The total number of volunteer participants for completed surveys within the approved time period of collection was 634.²⁰¹ In regard to age, a higher level of participants responded from the Lowcountry and Midlands region.²⁰² The Upstate area had fewer response rates from any age group, and most upstate participants were outside of the average participant age range from the pool majority of responses.²⁰³ The participants of each geographical location were predominately online responses, with less than 10% of the responses being in-person hard copy submissions.²⁰⁴ The hard copy submissions were predominately from Midlands region participants that were in older age categories.²⁰⁵

The subcategory of location choices of residency within or outside of the labeled categories of counties, the results revealed slightly lower response rates in poverty-level counties from the gathered completed surveys.²⁰⁶ While this is not a mandatory survey to account for all constituencies in the counties' population, a parallel of lower response rates to lower population rates exists in the findings.²⁰⁷ The completed and accepted surveys will be used as representatives

²⁰¹ Appendix B.

²⁰² Ibid.

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

for each population of every county, regardless of size or population that is not inclusive of the total population percentages.²⁰⁸ The lower response rates results from higher poverty level counties also exemplifies potential barriers to travel to on-site music facilities or technology barriers to survey submissions from online participants. South Carolina counties that were not labeled high poverty levels revealed a higher response rate. The data from the higher economic counties resulted in a parallel data set to exemplify differences between impoverished and non-impoverished South Carolina districts and counties.²⁰⁹

Age

The survey included a variety of age range categories to exemplify generational boundaries of labeled generations, such as Gen Z or Gen X.²¹⁰ The average age range segregations of the majority of participants was from Millennials generation which includes people between the ages of 27-42 years old.²¹¹ The highest participation rate for in-person participants with hard copy submissions was for the Boomer generation, which included participants within the age range of 59-77 years old.²¹² No responses from generations older than Boomers were received.²¹³ The highest level of young participants were Millennials and Gen Z who were in the LowCountry and Midlands regions of the study parameters. The upstate had fewer responses overall from all age groups.²¹⁴ The generational differences exemplified a potential barrier for travel to in-person submissions or technology skills barrier for online survey

²⁰⁸ Appendix B.

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ Ibid.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

participation. The specific barriers to survey participation were not included in the results or potential analysis of the above data.

Historical Background

The findings of the results revealed that participants who had a history of known family involvement, education, or support of music education were also found to participate in music education programs more often than those without generational involvement in the arts.²¹⁵ The data revealed, in all regions, a close tie between previous artistic involvement in the arts from elders of the participants and current students' choice of involvement in public and privately funded music education programs.²¹⁶ The total responses revealed approximately 51% of the total participants had previous historical backgrounds through generational caregivers or parents who actively participated in music education currently or in previous years.²¹⁷ Approximately 37% of participants had no generational connections to music education exposure through caregiver or parental guidance or influence.²¹⁸ The remaining 12% of the completed responses were not clear on whether or not their generational circle had actively participated in music education of any kind.²¹⁹

Participant Involvement in Music Education

The results and findings of the involvement of study participants within any form of music education revealed that younger participants were more likely to be currently involved in music programs of any kind, compared to older participants.²²⁰ The study results showed that

²¹⁵ Appendix B.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

²¹⁷ Ibid.

²¹⁸ Ibid.

²¹⁹ Ibid.

²²⁰ Ibid.

younger participants in the Gen Z generational age category were more likely to currently be involved in a music education program, regardless of the generational trends of previous caregivers or parental involvement in music education programs.²²¹ Approximately 64% of participants had been part of a music education program, whereas approximately 37% said they had not participated in music education opportunities. The older generational categories revealed a lower participation rate in any form of music education programs, regardless of historical influences from previous generations as well. The results draw a contrast to the higher level of potential influence from older generation's parental and caregiver sociological patterns and cultural influences.

Younger generations are potentially less influenced by previous social patterns of absent involvement in music education programs.²²² While this age category is ranked as less likely to identify as being highly influenced by previous generations, the resources for these younger individuals to participate in public or private school music education programs and outreach stemmed somewhat from the generational willingness to allow the younger generations to voluntarily participate in such programs.²²³ The older generations might not have directly supported or rejected the younger generational involvement in music education.²²⁴ The neutrality of young students' parents or caregivers consequentially could have allowed the younger generations to become actively involved with music participation.²²⁵ The mentor or parenting

²²¹ Appendix B.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ Ibid.

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ Ibid.

style of neutrality could also be perceived as a non-influencing factor of involvement from the participant response rate of low generational influence from younger age categories.²²⁶

Poverty Level

The results showed that younger age range category participants were more likely to align their income and economic standing with the suggested poverty level for the study bounds. The differences in income could be a result of wage lags in recent generations in relation to economic inflation and the overall rise of price levels in recent decades.²²⁷ While the survey question did not require the participants to enter a specific amount of income, the cumulative analysis revealed that elders are also among poverty level income recipients as well.²²⁸ A cumulative rate of 26% of total responses for individuals and 19% of households surveyed were at or below the poverty level.²²⁹ Approximately 18% of individual income responses were at or below the poverty level but had a total household income above the poverty ranges for the study.²³⁰ The connection between income and participation levels is not definitive because younger age categories showed higher participation rates than elders that also identified as at or below poverty level income.²³¹ Whether or not external barriers to participation in music courses due to solely poverty level income among different age categories is unclear due to external factors, such as travel means, health issues, and other potential barriers outside of income alone.²³²

²²⁶ Appendix B.

²²⁷ Mark J. Holmes and Jesús Otero, "The Wage Curve within and Across Regions: New Insights from a Pairwise View of US States," *Empirical Economics* 62, no. 5 (2022): 2069-2089.

²²⁸ Appendix B.

²²⁹ Ibid.

²³⁰ Ibid.

²³¹ Ibid.

²³² Ibid.

Within the age category for Millennials and Gen X participants, these categories revealed a lower level of poverty-level income. From a life cycle perspective, this could show the family unit development and explain reasonings behind younger generational involvement within the arts as a result of higher income as a unified household from the Millennial and Gen X household level. While the levels of participation do not directly correlate to income in a consistent manner for the data between Gen Z, Millennials, and Gen X, career progression and a unification of partnerships through marriage or a higher household count expands income levels within active young and middle-aged adults.²³³ Because the study did not analyze the overall employment or career status for the participants, historical trends in age range could align with college students or lower salaried employees as entry level for the Gen Z generation. The Millennial age gap can be a result of differences from historical wage gap lags and potential placement in geographical locations that are lower in economic revenue levels and historically exhibit lower wages.²³⁴

Because a larger portion of participants were not from a historically impoverished county, many of the responses to poverty levels were within the negative category. Within the higher response rates from the Midlands and LowCounty area of the state, some of these regions are also aligned with lower general levels of poverty.²³⁵ As a result of low cyclical poverty levels, as exhibited in the literature review and funding analysis, many of the residents within these areas are also living above the poverty level.²³⁶ Many of the responses from the third answer regarding being above the poverty level for overall household but below the individual income

²³³ Appendix B.

²³⁴ Holmes and Otero, *Empirical*, 2069-2089.

²³⁵ Appendix B.

²³⁶ Ibid.

threshold could be partners, spouses, or household members that are in school, part-time workers, homemakers, or in other alternative income paths that provide a lower pay range.²³⁷ The individuals who chose the household income level were kept separate from the other answers to ensure the data and results were not skewed or bias with respect to poverty levels or income ranking.²³⁸

The results also discovered that the majority of participants surveyed within the household income threshold were living above the range set forth in the study to be considered poverty-level.²³⁹ Because much of the data within the financial analysis also relates the findings of the two highest survey response areas also have historically lower levels of poverty, the household findings aligns with the economic standing and funding adequacy of state and federal budgeting trends. The findings of household majority surveys being above the poverty level exemplify an overall higher socioeconomic and microeconomic standing²⁴⁰. The higher economic monetary levels in specific regions of the state exemplify the availability of personal resources to actively participate in music education.²⁴¹ The higher income results indicate that poverty cycles are not as strong even within more impoverished areas for participants in other subset regions identified in the survey, such as the specified county responses for question 4.²⁴²

²³⁷ Appendix B.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Ibid.

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² Ibid.

Generational Education Levels

The individual participant generational levels revealed a variation in ratios to the level to involvement in music education.²⁴³ The responses revealed that the majority of all participants had attained a high school level education as the largest data pool category response, compared to the other education levels.²⁴⁴ The responses did not reveal a direct correlation between education level and willingness or historical trend of participation in music education opportunities in public or private organizations.²⁴⁵ The positive response to historical and generational participation for the majority of responses did provide a parallel in high school or above education categories for the majority of participant surveys.²⁴⁶ The trend in data that positively parallels education advancements to participation in music education courses at all stages provides limited support to validate arts funding for the advancement of education through music outreach initiatives.

The historical perspective on sociological trends within generational trends of education achievement can provide insight into the results of the survey analysis. Many of the same participants within the support for music involvement or that expressed previous history with music education experiences also were among the High School Diploma/GED educational ranking in the survey.²⁴⁷ The background of support could stem from the previous public or private educational involvement as a young student or not having a barrier to participation due to being above the poverty line in economic standing results.²⁴⁸ The data for education also revealed

²⁴³ Appendix B.

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

that any age category at the level of “Did not graduate high school” was less likely to have participated in any form of music education in both a public or private education setting.²⁴⁹ The highest level responses with a music education history or prior life experience was among older age categories who also aligned with the bachelors or above education level on the total survey results.²⁵⁰

Participant Caregiver and Parental History of Education Levels

The results for the education levels of the primary caregivers or parents of the survey revealed a similarity in generational trends for education levels.²⁵¹ The generational similarity also aligned with similar response rates to educational participation in music education courses over all age categories.²⁵² As with the primary participant trends of responses, the category of failing to finish high school was also among the least likely to participate in music education courses currently or in the past from caregivers or parents of the survey participants. While some of the data for the knowledgeable education level of the primary caregiver or parent was entered for the education levels, approximately 4% of the data for music participation was “not sure.” The majority of participants who reported that their primary caregiver or parent attained a High School/GED level education or higher education categories also reported that their caregiver had participated in music education courses or programs in the past.²⁵³ The data also revealed that primary survey participants who reported that their caregiver or parent had achieved a High

²⁴⁹ Appendix B.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

²⁵² Ibid.

²⁵³ Ibid.

School/GED level education and participated in music education courses were also the majority of participants who were above poverty level definitions.²⁵⁴

Parental and Caregiver Support of Participant Involvement in Music Education

A strong supportive narrative was present for the majority of participants with response to involvement in music education support from parents and caregivers.²⁵⁵ The data revealed that participants with and without parental experience with music education in the past were generally supportive of the involvement in music education. Because the term supportive was left to be generalized, including moral and any financial support, the participants' positive response to this question includes a broad approach.²⁵⁶ These results reveal a sociological trend of general support of music education regardless of whether the participants answered as the highest or second highest option of support in the survey.²⁵⁷ A connection between higher support of music education involvement was seen in the participants who also reported that their caregivers or parents attained a High School/GED level or higher education level in the survey results.²⁵⁸

The participant results also revealed that the caregiver or parents that were at or below the poverty level individual or household income ranking were still highly likely to support participation in music education programs in all forms.²⁵⁹ Because the survey took a microeconomic and sociological approach to community perceptions, the variance in high support from poverty level and below could be attributed to social resources. Within high

²⁵⁴ Appendix B.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Ibid.

²⁵⁹ Ibid.

poverty level analysis, the correlating financial data also revealed that the grant opportunities and public funding is sometimes higher in low income areas to ensure modern students have the ability to participate in music education without additional financial and resource burdens.²⁶⁰ Because of the trends of high grant qualifications and social funding for arts outreach for poverty level individuals, the survey results of low-income and alternatively high support of music education could be explained from a fiscal perspective.²⁶¹

Social Peer Influence of Music Education Participation

The survey revealed less strong data for the influence of social support among young learners and the relative peer involvement in music education programs for public and private organizations.²⁶² The response rate for personal involvement in music education did not show a direct correlation between positive participation responses from survey submissions and parallel positive answers from participants regarding the caregiver and parental involvement in music education.²⁶³ Because of the lacking response parallels between the two sectional questions, no definitive connection between a hierarchy of parental and caregiver involvement as superior or inferior to the social influence of young peers was evident.²⁶⁴ The survey revealed that the majority of survey respondents who aligned with their personal education levels as being below High School/GED achievement selected the options of low or no involvement in music education courses from peers as a young students.²⁶⁵ The participants who selected the positive

²⁶⁰ Appendix B.

²⁶¹ Ibid.

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ Ibid.

²⁶⁵ Ibid.

option of social involvement with peers in music education were predominantly among the High School/GED or above education levels.²⁶⁶

The influence of peer economic levels outside of personal, caregiver and parents, and the overall economic standing of the respective regions of the study did not include the requirement of reporting or perspective income levels from the peer groups. The data was gathered among each region of the state and county level to analyze a portion of the population from the responses and primary generational influences, rather than create a census of the total population from additional peer groups of participants. Because of this design, the results revealed a weak connection between peer-age participant involvement in music education and relative achievement of education levels as adults.²⁶⁷ A stronger connection to generational trends in education, support of music education involvement, and patterns of older generational influences was evident in the results.²⁶⁸

The data also revealed that a small percentage of respondents of varying backgrounds chose “neutral.” The small percentage of response rate for this category did not reveal any direct influence from a particular age group, education level, generational trends, or income categories.²⁶⁹ No definitive correlation was identified among “neutral” answers for these participants with respect to geographical location, funding trends, sociological funding perceptions, and peer involvement in music education.²⁷⁰ The results of the neutrality could relate

²⁶⁶ Appendix B.

²⁶⁷ Ibid.

²⁶⁸ Ibid.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Ibid.

participants that were not able to adequately and definitely choose and positive or negative answer or participants who chose to not voice a personal stance on the subject.

Social Perception of the Value of Music Education

The results of the data regarding social perception of music being equally important to other subjects in student education revealed a parallel between state funding for arts in different regions and the results of support for music equality. The survey results revealed that over half of respondents believed that music education was equal to importance compared to other core subjects in the current education curriculum and accreditation guidelines.²⁷¹ Over half of these respondents that were supportive also identified outside of the counties listed for the lower economic standing analysis in the part 1 of the survey.²⁷² Because the supportive results for participants also reveals that the respondents were predominantly in the Midlands and LowCountry regions and outside of the historically high impoverishment rate counties, these geographical data also shows higher grant and overall arts funding in the respondents' locations.²⁷³ Many of the participant results for equal value of music education to other subjects originated from counties that also receive higher levels of grant and state funding to advance arts outreach efforts to all students and community members.²⁷⁴

The majority of grants that align with these geographical responses of music education support are aimed towards microeconomic community and individual outreach initiatives for state-wide arts advancement in the respective regions of survey results support.²⁷⁵ The artistic

²⁷¹ Appendix B.

²⁷² Ibid.

²⁷³ Appendix C.

²⁷⁴ Ibid.

²⁷⁵ Ibid.

funding data revealed a major focus on community and locally centered initiatives for outreach grants from 2022 to present.²⁷⁶ The survey and funding analysis results showed that the study's categorized impoverished counties were lower in funding support overall and many of the counties did not receive any form of cultural or historical grant funding for arts heritage, disability options, or cultural advancement from specific grants.²⁷⁷ Because the impoverished counties were historically not recipients for bigger grant funding categories, efforts to music education outreach were limited for all age categories for each generation.²⁷⁸

A positive correlation between funding and low perception of music education was evident in the outlined counties of residences in the survey. Participants who were residents of the economically low income labeled counties in the survey were among the majority of participants who responded with low to no support of music education begin equal to other subjects' educational value.²⁷⁹ From a funding perspective of the participant results of both topics, these counties were also among the lowest forms of grant and government-funded arts initiatives, including COVID-19 relief funds.²⁸⁰ The resource options showed historically low rates of overall fundings and opportunities in the public and private settings in these areas to pursue any forms of music education interests.²⁸¹ The result of non-exposure to music education options during early education years and growing up in an artistically impoverished environment might explain the lacking support of music education from the survey results in this category.²⁸²

²⁷⁶ Appendix B.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

²⁷⁸ Ibid.

²⁷⁹ Ibid.

²⁸⁰ Appendix C.

²⁸¹ Ibid.

²⁸² Appendix B.

Funding and Subsequent Music Education Involvement Level

The results also find parallels between the lower music education participation rates of the survey results, the generational history of music involvement results, and specified funding allocation of artistic and community-based grants for the low economic standing counties within the data. The data also revealed that the counties that were outlined in the survey as predominately impoverished also were among the few counties in the state to also not receive South Carolina Arts Commission Arts Emergency Relief Grants as a part of the COVID-19 package of federal and state-based relief.²⁸³ The survey counties also received the most response rates for low to no participation of music from the respondent or the results from generational involvement in music education, the areas that potentially qualified for application funding from the state, federal, or private arts organizations are not fully using potential resources.²⁸⁴ The origins of low funding and resources, compared to higher economic standing and music education involvement regions, are not definitive in the findings.²⁸⁵ The historical resource and funding barriers within the corridor of shame and fellow low-income majority counties experienced the highest rate of high school dropout rates, low or no music education participation rates, and high rates of at or below the individual or household poverty line results.²⁸⁶

Population

Significant variances existed among funding ratios and population differences for each region and outlined county results for sociological music education support, education level, and

²⁸³ Appendix C.

²⁸⁴ Ibid.

²⁸⁵ Appendix B.

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

generational trends. 6 counties from the outlined 17 counties in the survey question have been labeled rural counties, according to the South Carolina Arts Commission and state funding of the House of Representatives, Ways and Means Committee.²⁸⁷ These counties experience lower population levels in comparison to other regional counties in the study, such as Dorchester, Richland, and Greenville County. The rural counties also have lower microeconomic development and are typically faced with more instances of low resources for art development and outreach initiatives.²⁸⁸ The education data from these rural counties also reveal a relatively high dropout rate, compared to other higher populated counties.²⁸⁹

The survey participants that were residents in the impoverished and SC Arts Commission labeled rural counties also reported higher levels of not participating in music education and not viewing music as an equal value subject to other core education subjects.²⁹⁰ The subset of impoverished rural participants reported that they felt as if music education was somewhat easily accessible.²⁹¹ Although the counties of residence from the survey respondents were some of the lowest grant funded regions of the state and experienced higher level of non-participation in music education compared to other regions and counties, the respondents sociological unification in adequate access to quality music education courses remained consistent.²⁹²

The population of all areas, including the rural counties, regarding perception of free music education opportunities was positive.²⁹³ Variation in funding levels according to state,

²⁸⁷ Art of Community – Rural SC

²⁸⁸ Ibid.

²⁸⁹ Ibid.

²⁹⁰ Ibid.

²⁹¹ Ibid.

²⁹² Appendix B.

²⁹³ Ibid.

federal, and grant-based programs to provide a variety of free music and arts education were identified in all three regions of the study.²⁹⁴ Regardless of the regions of residency for the participants, the overall willingness to participate in music education programs that were provided as a free public good received positive sociological support from all groups.²⁹⁵ The results exemplify a microeconomic principle of an inverse relationship for movement along the demand curve. The survey results and microeconomic principle detail how any decrease in price level will result in a market increase in population demand for the relative good.

A stronger argument for lacking resources to participate in free music within rural impoverished counties was evident after analyzing the demand fluctuations with price barriers discussed previously.²⁹⁶ The large majority was supportive and willing to participate in free music education programs. However, participants that were at or below the poverty analysis questions and were primary residents in the outlined survey counties for impoverishment were the minority in actively or previously participating in any form of music education program.²⁹⁷ The counties with grants for local, microeconomic arts outreach grants and state funding for free music education courses still experienced generationally low participation results from the population survey.²⁹⁸ The results exemplify the microeconomic possibility of resource barriers, such as travel, for lower income categories of the populations within lower income counties for the study.

²⁹⁴ Appendix C.

²⁹⁵ Appendix B.

²⁹⁶ Ibid.

²⁹⁷ Ibid.

²⁹⁸ Ibid.

Generational Perception of Music Education Tax Funding

Variances in income categories, education levels, and tax funding of music education among different ages exemplified political perceptions in each age group.²⁹⁹ Participants who identified at or below the poverty level in the individual income category were the majority of respondents to believe taxpayer funding should not be used to fund music education programs.³⁰⁰ The sociological barriers to support of music education from tax dollars could be perceived as continuing the impoverishment and low income for presently low economic standing participants by withholding income for nonessential goods for basic needs. To remain within boundaries of participant procedures and analysis, the origins of low support were confined to generational and peer influences for the study. The participant pool revealed that all generations in the age category who also were within the individual poverty level or below were neutral or against tax dollars being used for music education advancements in South Carolina.³⁰¹

Low income respondents who also lived in the categorized low income counties within each region revealed a slight variance in generational perceptions of political funding of music education.³⁰² At or below poverty level income participants who also resided in counties that were designed impoverished showed a higher percentage of potential generational continuance of low support of tax dollars based on the range of age category responses.³⁰³ The connection between generational trends can be seen with the results of low support from the older generations and consequential continuation of the majority of response selections from younger

²⁹⁹ Appendix B.

³⁰⁰ Ibid.

³⁰¹ Ibid.

³⁰² Ibid.

³⁰³ Ibid.

generations in the same income category and geographical locations.³⁰⁴ While a small percentage of the population for low income participants chose “neutral” regarding tax funding of music education, the exemplification of additional underlined sociological or political motivations for not choosing a definitive answer was not included in the survey analysis.³⁰⁵

In all age categories that also responded to above the individual or family poverty level of income, the pool of respondents perceived tax funding for music education as neutral or on the positive spectrum of response rate.³⁰⁶ Participants above the individual poverty level income responded with “neutral” more than household income participants who identified above the poverty level.³⁰⁷ The results of a higher neutral response rate from the individual income data pool could exemplify other geopolitical, microeconomic, or sociological mindsets against income distribution, according to the percentage results of adequate funding and resources for the next generation in the survey results.³⁰⁸ Individuals who identified above the household poverty level who were also at or above the High School/GED education level were supportive of tax funds being used to expand or sustain music education programs in South Carolina.³⁰⁹ The fueling support of contrasting higher approval of tax dollars from higher education and income categories was confined to the generational and peer-level analysis of sociological influence.³¹⁰

³⁰⁴ Appendix B.

³⁰⁵ Ibid.

³⁰⁶ Ibid.

³⁰⁷ Ibid.

³⁰⁸ Ibid.

³⁰⁹ Ibid.

³¹⁰ Ibid.

Generational Perception of Long Term Music Education Sustainability

A mixed variance of different age categories revealed different results when discussing the perception of adequate music education funding and resource for long-term sustainability.³¹¹ Over half of the total respondents of the survey believed that there currently were adequate resources and funding available to sustain South Carolina music education efforts in the long-term economic plan.³¹² The variance in age categories provided a wide analysis of each generational perception of resource adequacy; the subcategories of age in relation to positive or negative perceptions of continuing music education long term provides a wide range of applicable analysis. The results revealed strong variances especially among Gen Z and Boomers with regard to outlook and future funding of music education outreach in South Carolina.³¹³

The positive perceptions of long-term music education were predominantly from the age categories of Millennial and Boomer generations in the survey.³¹⁴ In comparison to other age categories, these age categories were residual generations of economic periods of hardship and high inflation rates from the previous generations of the participants' caregivers or parents. Because of the historical endurance of additional hardships and accommodation of financial sustainability during periods of high inflation, these generations might have provided positive fiscal survey results due to previous sustainability through these economic hardships.³¹⁵ The specific Millennial and Boomer generations might have both experienced higher levels of inflation, but the wage rate influence was lagging more for young generations. Millennials

³¹¹ Appendix B.

³¹² Ibid.

³¹³ Ibid.

³¹⁴ Ibid.

³¹⁵ Ibid.

experienced a higher rate of inflation and consequential higher lags in wage rates to cost of living means.³¹⁶ As a result of an ongoing decrease of earnings value as this age group progressed in career hierarchy, these individuals have learned to sustain through extremely different economic periods.³¹⁷ The residual positive outlook and perception of economic sustainability for future music education outreach could be a residual effect of the Millennial age category experiencing unique financial sustainability challenges due to economic cycles through their lifetime.³¹⁸

The Boomers were also among one of the highest age categories to positively predict long-term sustainability of music education outreach efforts in South Carolina.³¹⁹ The positive outlook of arts funding and fiscal resources to sustain long-term development of music education closely aligns with the results of the Millennial age category.³²⁰ Boomers' mindsets towards fiscal and financial sustainability could also result from additional life experiences through difficult economic periods, high inflation, and wage variances in comparison to cost-of-living expenses.³²¹ Although the age categories of Millennials and Boomers received both positive outlook perceptions for funding, Boomers have a generalized higher net worth and salary point as a unified age category.³²² The Boomers age category began as early professionals during a economic period with a higher entry-level salary valuation compared to lower cost-of-living as young professionals many decades ago.³²³

³¹⁶ Holmes and Otero, *Empirical*, 2069-2089.

³¹⁷ Ibid.

³¹⁸ Appendix B.

³¹⁹ Ibid.

³²⁰ Ibid.

³²¹ Holmes and Otero, *Empirical*, 2069-2089.

³²² Ibid. 2069-2089.

³²³ Ibid.

The higher economic valuation of salary compared to investment at the start of the Boomer's career era resulted in a overall higher rank of individual worth and economic sustainability as a whole generational trend.³²⁴ The higher valuation of income and personal net worth at the start of their career led to many Boomers having higher net worth and less poverty-level retirees in the age category.³²⁵ The personal experience of financial security and higher net worth as a general population during a period of lower economic inflation could result in overly optimistic or positive perceptions about long-term sustainability of music education for the future from this age category.³²⁶ As a result of the combined life experience and early shaping of monetary stability, Boomers' perception of funding could be much different than younger generations. The results for this sociological impact were supported by the analysis of income perspective and primary residence location within the data collection for all age categories.³²⁷

General Perceptions of Music Education Resources for Future Generations

The final finding of the results indicated that a sociological variance in the long-term future outlook of resource availability for the next generation of music students existed among different age categories.³²⁸ The results of the study showed that the majority of the total population perceived the next generation as having adequate resources for music education courses in a general sense.³²⁹ There was a small percentage of the total population of respondents that did not feel there were adequate resources for music education for the next generation.³³⁰

³²⁴ Holmes and Otero, *Empirical*, 2069-2089.

³²⁵ Ibid.

³²⁶ Appendix B

³²⁷ Ibid.

³²⁸ Ibid.

³²⁹ Ibid.

³³⁰ Ibid.

Variations in age categories, wealth levels, education levels, and generational trends existed in the positive and negative results of the study.

The Gen Z age category were among the least positive responses to perceive there were adequate funding opportunities for the next generation of musicians.³³¹ This age category also was born during times of high inflation, lagging wages compared to cost-of-living expenses, and general social unrest.³³² Living through difficult economic periods through childhood can potentially impact the perception of adequate resources in this age category when asked about future outlooks of music education efforts.³³³ This age category was also higher than Millennials for alignment in income at or below the individual poverty level and was among the majority to achieve a High School/GED level diploma.³³⁴ Gen Z was more likely than other generations to have a caregiver or parent that had participated in music education, but the generational data did not seem to positively influence the perception of a positive outlook for future generations in music education programs.³³⁵

Gen X and Boomers were the two main categories of age ranges that showed a positive outlook of music education for the next generation of students.³³⁶ These generations were also the most likely to rank in above the poverty level individual and household income range. The positive financial standing of the participants within the Gen X and Boomer age categories could have influenced their positive outlook on adequate resources for the upcoming generation of music education, but no clear correlation was determined. With regard to education and

³³¹ Appendix B.

³³² Holmes and Otero, *Empirical*, 2069-2089.

³³³ Ibid.

³³⁴ Ibid.

³³⁵ Ibid.

³³⁶ Appendix B.

generational patterns, no clear correlation was identified that was specific to the outlook of the future generation as it related to older generations' perceptions.³³⁷

Summary

The findings of the study provided a wide range of insights for a variety of subtopics in music education and the potential advancement of outreach efforts among different regions in South Carolina. By including generational and wealth levels, the study provided a comprehensive analysis of the generational trends in economic and fiscal standing within various regions and counties in the state. The differences in education also aided in discovering any correlation between income level, music education involvement, and generational trends of support among various age categories. The fiscal funding data for each region and specific counties that were identified as historically impoverished counties worked to develop a diverse analysis of the regional findings among different subsects of results relative to the age, income level, political view, fiscal policy of taxation, and general perceptions of the importance of music education in the State of South Carolina.³³⁸

³³⁷ Appendix B.

³³⁸ Ibid.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Summary of Study

Many of the findings of generational trends discussed in the literature in Chapter 2 were parallel to the recent funding and participant sociological findings of the study. The research of scholarly analysis in Chapter 2 from previous generational trends in political funding and music education outreach efforts revealed that the majority of trends have continued into modern times. The study and literature review showed that some variances in education levels have altered due to various legislative changes and grant opportunities within the state, federal, and private level of fiscal policy. Although these changes have aimed to increase educational involvement in the arts and specifically music education programs, the participant survey results showed that several of the music education and a portion of the population in the state have remained similar over the course of many years.

Summary of Findings and Prior Research

Funding Trends

A large proportion of the population in the identified impoverished counties, including the counties listed in Chapter 2 as the Corridor of Shame, continue to experience low funding.³³⁹ The literature review revealed that a large number of schools within the outlined counties within the study were not adequately staffed or funded to provide the necessary resources to conduct quality music education for students.³⁴⁰ The trends in low educational resources and funding also directly aligned with the low individual and household income level reports from the survey

³³⁹ Bryan, *ProQuest*, 1-15.

³⁴⁰ Ibid.

results.³⁴¹ The trend of continuing lack of resources within the historically impoverished areas in South Carolina has continued amidst generational efforts to advance arts outreach in the study regions.³⁴² The barriers to music education outreach involvement and participation rates within the low income labeled counties has historically been a result of low funding and resources from state, federal, and private budgeting.

The study results of Arts Commission Funding efforts reveal that the counties outlined in the survey were still among the few areas in South Carolina to receive limited categories of grants within the total funding allocations of state and federal budgeting.³⁴³ Current residents in the areas are still lacking in resources and necessary funding levels to provide the necessary salary levels to accommodate the cost of living, advance supplies necessary for music education, provide a building-code certified location for on-site music education initiatives, and provide necessary curriculum for students of all ages and skill levels in the impoverished areas.³⁴⁴ Economically, the continuation of negative cyclical trends of poverty and low funding in these areas provide a poor platform for sociological advancement of music and general education for the current and future generation.

Income Level and Music Education Participation

The study results revealed a correlating trend in music education participation and historical reviews of low participation in the regions and counties discussed in the literature review of the subtopics. Chapter 2 discussed the specific low participation of students in the

³⁴¹ Appendix B.

³⁴² Ibid.

³⁴³ Appendix C.

³⁴⁴ Ibid.

outlined regions of the state and how poverty cycles in the regions negatively influence the participation rates in extracurricular or elective-style courses for individuals of all ages, including participants outside of the k-12 education age.³⁴⁵ In comparison to the historical outlook of the data trends in low participation from low income communities from the preexisting literature, the study results also aligned with the historical trends for current ratios of music education involvement as it corresponds to income levels.³⁴⁶ The study results showed that individuals who were at or below the individual poverty level were also low in participation ratings for music education.³⁴⁷

The variance in age range regarding participation in music education at each poverty level was congruent with the data findings and research from previous literature. Although the survey did not directly address poverty cycle options through questionnaires on family history of poverty, the survey of each age category provided insight into the sociological trends of music education participation in impoverished and above poverty level participants.³⁴⁸ The previous literature reviews of the correlation between low income and low participation dated back several decades and is consistent with the findings of the survey results. Although the survey results showed that areas of respondents that were at or below the poverty level did have selective options to participate in music education outreach programs free of charge, the generational trends of low income and low participation rates in music education in these areas were positively correlated.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁵ Beveridge, *Applications*, 10-18.

³⁴⁶ Appendix B.

³⁴⁷ Ibid.

³⁴⁸ Ibid.

³⁴⁹ Ibid.

In comparison to higher income levels and participation rates of music education participants for the survey, the regions revealed that the higher income regions and counties within the regions aligned with the previous literature findings. The findings of generational participation in music education at higher income levels from the economic and sociological findings of cultural closed forms in Chapter 2 directly correspond to the results in the survey.³⁵⁰ Because the economic and sociological perception of music education value is not in a sociological closed form of poverty cycles for higher income communities, individuals in previous literature studies as well as the current survey results were more likely to value music education and participation in outreach programs.³⁵¹ The current results aligned with the literature review data trends for the sociologically and economically low acceptance rates of music education as a part of the cultural and education system in the impoverished areas.³⁵² The findings of this analysis were based on the contrasting findings from non-poverty level respondents in the survey and varying polarity in respondent perceptions towards involvement in music education and non-poverty level income.³⁵³

Generational Influences in Low Participation Trends

The data of generational trends in participation directly exemplify the sociological history of rejection on activities based on communal “closed forms.”³⁵⁴ Historical research from literature reviews exemplified that many younger generations are predominantly influenced by the cultural and moral characteristics of their primary caregivers or parents, rather than friends,

³⁵⁰ Harrison, *Yearbook*, 1-12.

³⁵¹ Appendix B.

³⁵² Ibid.

³⁵³ Ibid.

³⁵⁴ Harrison, *Yearbook*, 1-12

teachers, and other social players.³⁵⁵ The recent study also supported the previous data findings from the literature review. The large majority of the respondents who had parents or primary caregivers to participate in music education at any income or education level reported a higher personal involvement in music education themselves and visa verse.³⁵⁶ A strong correlation between peer influences in music education participation and the survey participants' involvement in music education was not directly evident.³⁵⁷ These findings exemplify and support the sociological trend of varying participation rates, social perceptions of music in different communities, and the overall likelihood that an individual will attend a music education event based on generational and sociological influences.

Social Setting and Perceptions of Adequate Resources

A sociological theme of impoverishment acceptance within the survey results as well as previous literature was evident. The previous literature exemplified a trend in positive reports of adequate education opportunities and general resources in the historically impoverished counties in South Carolina.³⁵⁸ A connection of the sufficient resource theme was also evident in the data results from the survey.³⁵⁹ Both the literature and survey results exemplified less resources and historical trends of impoverishment of these subsect counties or communities. The participants in previous studies and the current survey both felt the music education options and education efforts were sufficient for the next generation.

³⁵⁵ Harrison, *Yearbook*, 1-12.

³⁵⁶ Appendix B.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Bryan, *ProQuest*, 1-5.

³⁵⁹ Appendix B.

The findings and parallel of historical observations could exemplify the sociological blindness to the current state of underserved, underfunded, and historically poor resourced areas.³⁶⁰ The sociological education on the current state of underserved populations and music education programs remains consistent with previous study findings and perceptions of economic standing on a micro level.³⁶¹ From an economic perspective, the lack of wealth could exemplify a false sense of future sustainability for long-term music education resources and funding for future generations of students. As a result of acceptance and potential blindness to the generational deficits in resources, the residents in impoverished areas feel the lifestyle, cultural norms, and education options are sufficient.

Significance

Social Value Placement

The first discovery of significance is the valuation of subjects based on cultural placement in South Carolina. From a sociological perspective, the study groups in different locations, income levels, and education all revealed various views on the value of music education. The subjective view of music education being not important in areas and for participants who did not participate in music showed lower value of music education in a variety of categories. This negative view of music education being of lesser value was more present in lower income counties that historically lacked resources yet felt their funding and sustainability long-term was positive.³⁶² The contrary findings for participants in above poverty level areas who also ranked higher in education and income levels showed higher support levels.³⁶³ As a result of

³⁶⁰ Appendix B.

³⁶¹ Ibid.

³⁶² Ibid.

³⁶³ Ibid.

these findings, the variation in social value is highly dependent upon the setting in which the subject and individual are placed to create community worth.

The variances in value exemplify the different qualities associated with historical markers of closed forms of communities in historical sociology.³⁶⁴ Previous studies show how research and understanding of different cultural actions, mindsets, and norms as depicting actions to different groups of society within a small scale can identify certain cultural markers of inclusivity.³⁶⁵ Music, clothing, décor, and general personal styles are all significant markers to accept new individuals into a cultural closed form, commonly called social circles.³⁶⁶ When attempting to influence new individuals to try an action or participate in a subject that is not highly valued within the social group or family history, the likelihood of them supporting and actively participating in the free opportunity is still low. The results of the survey, as well as previous data trends that demonstrate the strong connection between closed social forms in sociology and the relationship between music education and poverty, exemplified a statistically significant connection. The ability to have an individual actively participate in free programs in music education is extremely difficult when their upbringing and current social group does not value music education culturally.³⁶⁷

Parental and Caregiver Influence

The study revealed a very strong historical connection between children and their parents or primary caregivers. The survey revealed that students are more likely to follow generational

³⁶⁴ Budoiu, *Review*, 95-104.

³⁶⁵ Ibid.

³⁶⁶ Ibid.

³⁶⁷ Ibid.

patterns of thought and actions associated with the norms and patterns of their primary role models from a young age.³⁶⁸ The signification connection among young generations and passing down mindsets and personal beliefs was exemplified in all generations of the survey results.³⁶⁹ Historical research also shows a generational connection of educational and sociological patterns of achievements.³⁷⁰ The generational mindsets of the younger generation are often not as heavily influenced by the peer group or other social players but predominantly from the parents and primary caregivers.³⁷¹

The significance of primary caregiver support also solidified the principles of parental and caregiver influences across all socioeconomic classes. Within the study, all age categories with identified income levels at, below, or above the poverty level for individual or household still showed significant influence from parental mindsets and valuation of music education.³⁷² The ability to pass down the cultural norms of academic subject value to younger generations has been an ongoing trend for many decades in statistical and sociological studies.³⁷³ These social mindsets have often been the source of cultural barriers to advance music education in many areas of the nation, including low income and historically impoverished geographical areas.³⁷⁴ Although generational transfer of music education participation is a positive element when the elder parent or caregiver are music education supporters, the contrary of poor support is still an

³⁶⁸ Appendix B.

³⁶⁹ Ibid.

³⁷⁰ Franklin, *Journal*, 460–460.

³⁷¹ Ibid.

³⁷² Appendix B.

³⁷³ Budoiu, *Review*, 95-104.

³⁷⁴ Ibid.

ongoing issue in previous literature and the current survey results. By understanding the social mindsets and generational trends of subject valuation, music education programs can better understand the root barriers to participation in available outreach programs.

Sociological Resource Adequacy Barriers

A large significant finding of the research involved the discovery of continuing generational barriers of various qualities that transcended non-poverty perceptions of resource adequacy. The principle of acceptance and contentment with less than adequate resources as a generational and cultural norm was evident across the age categories who identified at or below the poverty level for individual or household rankings.³⁷⁵ The principle of accepting below necessary resources, education quality, and overall funding needs in impoverished areas has been a significant micro and macroeconomic issue from previous socio-economic research studies.³⁷⁶ By historically living in conditions and overall social communities that are lacking basic resources, the relative population of the areas also view lower quality music education and resources for the courses as being sufficient.³⁷⁷ The principle of underfunded resources was equally evident in the positive results of adequacy responses from individuals who were at or below the poverty level individually or as a household.³⁷⁸

The responses of higher, non-poverty level respondents also show how socioeconomic groups who are outside of the poor resource conditions are historically able to better identify a resource or funding need. Many respondents who were above the poverty level had a higher

³⁷⁵ Appendix B.

³⁷⁶ Beveridge, *Applications*, 10-18.

³⁷⁷ Ibid.

³⁷⁸ Appendix B.

percentage of poor outlook on resource and funding for South Carolina music education in the long term economic prospective budget.³⁷⁹ The significant of this finding was to validate how individuals who were not current in a poverty cycle might be able to identify economic issues more clearly and not perceive the poor music education facility conditions as acceptable and sufficient.³⁸⁰ The principle of using non-poverty level respondents aided in revealing how historically different socioeconomic classes of wealth and income levels perceive qualifications for social adequacy.³⁸¹ The findings of the study and previous literature showed how social valuation and relative income levels can contribute to generational poverty and cultural mindsets that foster negative education patterns.³⁸²

Non-Musical Education Achievement Variances

Individuals of all age groups that studied music in some forms were aligned with higher educational achievements. The principle of significant educational contributions and acceleration outside of becoming a professional musician from early music study has been explored in previous literature.³⁸³ The current study results align with previous statistically significant findings in case studies where students who actively participated in music education within the k-12 learning program were also more likely to excel in other subjects and gain a higher education level.³⁸⁴ This ability to connect various skills embedded in music education, such as fractions that align with math and pronunciation of words in choral studies, directly influences

³⁷⁹ Appendix B.

³⁸⁰ Ibid.

³⁸¹ Beveridge, *Applications*, 10-18.

³⁸² Ibid.

³⁸³ Hoffman, *Music*, 63-68.

³⁸⁴ Ibid.

the ability of students to translate the skills to non-musical subjects.³⁸⁵ The findings in the study results directly connect the educational advancement of music to the common core subjects in modern accredited k-12 curriculum.

The findings also align with the development of lower education levels where music education is not as prevalent or accessible. The findings align with the literature review data that showed how music education resources were parallel to the overall deficit of educational achievement and outreach participation levels in low income counties and areas in South Carolina.³⁸⁶ The areas highly impacted with low educational achievement in the survey results also historically experienced low options for students to participate in music education in the public school system or in any form of private education outreach program.³⁸⁷ The results align with significant historical findings of correlating low education and low music program efforts in low income areas for students of all ages and skill levels.³⁸⁸ The ongoing deficit of music education options and adequate resources, as evident in the study results and other previous study findings, exemplified an ongoing trend of socioeconomic cycles of poverty and low educational achievement.³⁸⁹

The variations as it relates to music education accessibility, adequacy in resources, and state funding efforts are an ongoing and historical issue. The ability to adequately meet resource necessities in general education, and specifically music education, still is a significant finding

³⁸⁵ Hoffman, *Music*, 63-68.

³⁸⁶ Bulgozdy, *ProQuest*, 1-7.

³⁸⁷ Ibid.

³⁸⁸ Culp and Clauhs, *Music*, 43-49.

³⁸⁹ Appendix B.

from the current study and previous music education studies from other research and data collection.³⁹⁰ While many legislative efforts have been passed to provide adequate resources and facilities for music education in all state areas, generational trends in poor educational environments and lacking resources is an ongoing issue.³⁹¹ Many private organizations have attempted to find non-governmental means and grant opportunities to fill the educational void and assist with outreach in poor areas but generational trends of low participation still are evident in the survey findings and outside literature.³⁹² The findings reveal that a significant amount of generational trends on a state and community-based level have continued amidst many efforts to alleviate historically negative economic and sociological patterns.

Limitations

Survey Size

The survey size was a possible limit to the findings and overall representation of the sample population for the entire state of South Carolina. Because there were only a little over 600 participants, the results could be different if a larger sample population was included in the data collection. The sample size was low due to a variety of factors, such as lack of incentive to take time to complete the survey. Because the respondents were not compensated or provided any form of reward for the completion of the survey, some respondents might have exited out of the online link completion before submitting a full response. A tangible or monetary incentive to complete the survey was not provided in order to reduce a false bias in results.

³⁹⁰ Appendix B.

³⁹¹ Bryan, *ProQuest*, 1-17.

³⁹² Barnes, *International*, 23-31.

The additional size of the survey in relation to geographical location distribution could provide limited analysis of each region. Because less individuals responded from the upstate region in the survey, less data of the sample population was received for analysis. The limited sample of the population in the upstate region may not provide a comprehensive analysis of the respective counties within the low response rate region. The two higher response rate regions were also still relatively small considering the large variations in total census population for the respective regions and counties in the Midlands and LowCountry areas.³⁹³ The total results of all regions could be different if a larger sample or total population was analyzed.

Lack of Participant Incentive

The survey did not provide any incentives for personal accommodations or rewards, outside of goodwill for community data collection aid, for the potential participants. Because the incentive offering was not present to avoid bias results, the total amount of respondents within each district was much lower than the total population.³⁹⁴ The lack of participant incentives to complete the full survey might have provided a level of regional over or under-valuation due to the total limited sample size. Although an incentive was not presented in order to avoid skewed data collection, an indirect bias may have been present as a residual effect of low participation rates in each county. The overall potential bias presented in the data collection results may or may not have been alleviated with the addition of a participant incentive to complete the survey.

Technological Barriers

The ability to complete the survey using an online hyperlink could have created technology limitations for results collection. Because the survey required each participant to

³⁹³ Appendix B.

³⁹⁴ Ibid.

manually select an answer for each question and scroll to the bottom of the online page to submit the total results, some individuals might have closed the hyperlink without submitting. The format was easy to follow but some individuals might have become confused when attempting to open and complete the process. The survey posting within social media accounts also required the participants to open a separate page that was directed outside of the home platform. The ability to successfully open the secondary link from the home platform might have been blocked due to a variety of online used security measures. As a result, the total data collection for online responses might not be a full representation of the individuals who attempted to open and complete the survey.

Participants who were predominantly in rural or remote areas in South Carolina might not have access to adequate technology for administration of the survey due to nonexistent or very limited access to cell service and broadband options. Many areas in the impoverished and rural areas do not have reliable cell service. The broadband service options for local or in-home internet service is also very scarce and is still not offered as an in-home service in some areas. Even if the participants had a mobile device within these regions, there might be no options or very limited quality of Wi-Fi to submit survey results. The limitations of cellular and internet signals within various regions in South Carolina could have contributed to the sample size and lower survey results from impoverished regions.³⁹⁵

Travel Barriers

For on-site survey responses, a possible barrier for travel to and from the on-site survey location could have been present. Low participation from on-site completed survey responses

³⁹⁵ Appendix B.

could have been a result of limited options for personal travel and public transportation.³⁹⁶ In many rural areas in the survey, public transportation is not always an option, and private transportation to and from the rural areas can be costly for participants. With the additional lack of incentive for completing a survey, the likelihood of participants willingly incurring expenses to and from the location was low. The low response rate for on-site, especially in the historically impoverished and rural areas of the state, could be an overall exemplification of physical travel barriers for the total population.³⁹⁷

Recommendations for Future Study

Incentive-Based Population Survey

The first recommendation For future research and data collection would include the ability to provide an incentive for survey completion. The incentive provided through a reward for completing a new survey might provide a higher rate of population participation for all the regions of South Carolina. The incentive might further provide population insight for the lower income areas by having a driving reward for survey completion. The potentially higher population sample could also avoid unnecessary bias in percentage results from completed surveys. The incentive would provide a better understanding of the perceptions of the representative population for all regions due to a higher sample.

Microeconomic Sub-topic Analysis

Further research on the subcommunities within the historically impoverished counties listed in the survey could further categorize areas of resource barriers and total population income levels. The smaller population density per survey response and analysis could provide a

³⁹⁶ Appendix B.

³⁹⁷ Ibid.

more definite analysis on outreach efforts for music education in the specific impoverished area. The further analysis of subpopulations in various impoverished areas could better define a connection in school district resource levels and private organizational outreach in the communities as it relates directly to the respective population group. The sub-topic analysis of primary residency for participants in each county could provide future research with a more definitive connection of the variances in other areas of impoverished populations, such as education level, generational trends, and peer influences on the relative participation in music education. Future research on the higher microeconomic area of influence that relates to poverty would expand economic and sociological findings for the representative population in the future study.

Categorial Income Structure

The categorization of income levels into low, middle, and upper income classes could provide more insight into each pool of respondents for future surveys. Although the research categorized at, below, or above poverty level for individuals and households, the income was not numerically categorized. Boundaries for income limits below and above individual and household categories could provide a more in-depth analysis of music education valuation and perceptions as income categorically increases or decreases among participant pools. The inclusion of more socioeconomically focused subcategories of music education could also reveal any strengths of generational trends from various age group participants. The identification of variances at multiple income and socioeconomic levels could provide future studies with a stronger analysis of generational and communal trends in support levels for music education across the state regions.

The additional categorization of income in relation to participant geographical location could also provide a stronger analysis of economic trends in all regions of South Carolina. The subcategorization of each income level relative to the count and region of primary residency in the state would help to identify any unknown economic trends in the county subcategories. Future analysis for particularly the counties in historical impoverishment for resources and funding could benefit from discovering any hidden trends in residency income variations. The connection of geographical location and income could also show trends in tax revenue rates and the connections of state and federal funding as cyclical trends.

Travel Resources

Future research on the undiscovered connections of travel barriers in specifically impoverished counties could help further identify reasons for low music education participation in public and private settings. The survey had limited connections of analysis for current options with regard to music education participation rates and barriers regarding travel opportunities or expenses for participant results. Future studies could examine whether or not a strong travel barrier exists in specifically impoverished and low resource communities in the state. The current survey results did show a strong connection to willingness to participate in music education programs if there was no charge in all income categories.³⁹⁸ However, the study did not discover any specific socioeconomic barriers to participation in travel accommodations.

A further study subcategory on age dependency in relation to travel barriers to and from music education opportunities could be studied to reveal generational influences and socioeconomic trends of educational achievements. The analysis of how younger age groups who are not eligible to attain driving permits or have access to public transportation could reveal

³⁹⁸ Appendix B.

indirect barriers to participation in free music education outreach programs. While some previous literature has discussed barriers to participation and the survey discussed resource funding allocations, further studies on specifically travel-based barriers could help develop microeconomic connections to education achievement levels. The usage of various age categories in specific questions regarding travel barriers could provide future studies with corresponding evidence for arts advocacy in travel-based funding opportunities. The ability to identify and correct travel needs particularly among young k-12 age students could positively impact the participation abilities of these age categories for public or private based music education programs.

Demographic Variance

The study of specific variances in ethnicity and demographic backgrounds could have a high impact on the community and income level opportunities for participating in music education programs across the state. The study examined generational trends but remained blind to ethnicity, demographics, and race as it related to music education perceptions and generational involvement.³⁹⁹ A future analysis on the specific variances among demographics as it relates to the socioeconomic generational trends, income level, and area of primary residency could reveal new connections to educational achievements within music education at all age categories. The analysis of current age categories and how various generations could be at risk for socioeconomic trends in music education participation barriers could be exemplified with demographic inclusions. As with the historical literature analysis, some ethnicities have historically been underrepresented.

³⁹⁹ Appendix B.

A further analysis could expose if any demographic or ethnic groups are continuing to reap negative economic patterns through music education barriers to participation solely based on ethnicity or race. The exemplification of ethnicity and race within cultural patterns of geographical income structures could fuel further research into funding patterns post-civil rights legislation. The state funding records for each county could aid in showing any variances of outreach and participation as it specifically relates to race and ethnicity of geographical participant pools in South Carolina. The usage of both participant demographics alongside funding patterns could exemplify any forms of poverty cycles among historically underrepresented people groups. The recommendation of future research on underrepresentation through low funding and resources across all state regions could show socioeconomic trends among generations, income levels, and geographical placement of participants.

Gender Variances

New research on the variances of gender as it relates to mindsets in both economic and sociological perceptions of music education could provide more detail on sub categorical differences. The differences in gender participation and perception of music education in all subcategories was not analyzed in the study. The ability to segregate gender responses via initial survey results in the future could provide guidance on how different genders view music education participation value and social context of the subject. By understanding the variances in geographical and gender trends, future research could reveal barriers in sociological subgroups regarding gender bias towards music education. The overall analysis of future gender perceptions of music education in all areas of South Caroline might help resolve ongoing barriers to participation as a result of social cohorts.

The variance in gender perceptions for future study should also be extended to all age categories to reveal any potential sociology pattern changes across generations. The current study showed a strong correlation of music education involvement stemming from older generational choices and subsequent parenting styles. Because of the strong parental influence connection, the subcategory of gender added to the data might reveal varying results from different gender categories. The extension of gender analysis with regard to the new study could also reveal any variances in poverty among genders. Gender analysis could provide a strong foundation to exemplify historical trends in music education support and participation rates within each gender's socioeconomics standing, geographical location, and social peer group.

Implications for Practice

The overall research and results of the study provide strong evidence in generational socioeconomic trends for music education participation in impoverished South Carolina areas. As a basis for the initial development of the study, the initial research of previous data and literature provided a strong ground for the creation of the community survey. The initial trends in literature exemplified an ongoing set of barriers to music education's perception as an equal subject to other core subjects and showed many generational economic patterns for resource funding.⁴⁰⁰ Within many areas of South Carolina's corridor of shame and surrounding counties with historically low funding, low income, and overall low socioeconomic status, the previous literature revealed an ongoing issue of low participation rates and low funding opportunities.⁴⁰¹ The initial literature of previous findings exemplified a potential ongoing historical trend of

⁴⁰⁰ Beveridge, *Applications*, 10-18.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid.

negative social perceptions of music education in these areas and potentially low funding trends at the local and state budget level.

The implications of outreach and sociological barriers from previous studies reveal an ongoing trend of low participation in rural areas. For future practice and research, additional study on the unidentified barriers, such as travel and age, should be examined. The additional depth of analysis with the deeper understanding of funding trends could provide a higher rate of support in impoverished communities. The detail and analysis could be used to alter future data trends in low participation rates as well as negative perceptions of music education valuation in low income communities. Through the connection of communities and reduction of unidentified barriers to participation, the implementation of music education outreach practices could substantially increase.

Summary

The historical analysis, current survey results, and correlating data of funding provided strong evidence of generational sociology and economic connections for participation rates in music education. The hypothesis and two research questions provided a strong basis for exploring the historical context of music education participation rates and subsequent funding of the arts within impoverished South Carolina areas. The preexisting literature revealed a generational trend of low funding and parallel low participation rates in impoverished South Carolina areas. The analysis of funding in impoverished South Carolina areas reveal an ongoing trend of low resources amid many legislative efforts to provide equal value and funding for the arts. The historical trends categorically aligned with the counties, income level, and sociological patterns that were identified in the survey results of current South Carolina participants.

The historically low participation rates in impoverished areas where limited and sometimes free opportunities were available exemplified the primary educational influence of generational mindsets about music education from parents and caregivers. Many of the perception of music education and subsequent funding of resources to advance outreach in the poor areas were highly correlated to negative social value of music education as a core subject for k-12 students. The analysis revealed how primary caregivers have a higher level of cultural influence on young generational mindsets. As a result of negative ongoing perceptions of music education in poor communities, the funding has also not equalized in support compared to other subjects. The sociological influence of mindsets has a high level of involvement for residual funding efforts for generational outreach.

The study also revealed how generational poverty can lead to a false sense of resource satisfaction and a potentially distorted view of long-term music education sustainability under current funding trends.⁴⁰² Through analysis of the findings from various cultural and economic perspectives, a trend in ongoing lacking resources for students and low participation due to generational undervaluation of music study in impoverished areas continues across the study's age categories. By further analyzing the additional variations and subcategories in topics of student-based culture cohorts, as well as additional economic factors, future researchers might better understand generational trends and origins for low participation rates for music programs in impoverished South Carolina areas. The generational literature and current survey results will aid in providing future research analysis and possibly alter the effectiveness of future music education outreach programs in the state of South Carolina.

⁴⁰² Appendix B.

Bibliography

- Adderley, Cecil. "Preparation of Future K-4 Music Teachers Relative to the National Standards—Goals 2000." *Contributions to Music Education* 27, no. 2 (2000): 59-70.
- Barnes, Gail V. "The University of South Carolina String Project: Teaching and Learning within a Community Music Programme." *International Journal of Community Music* 6, no. 1 (2013): 23-31.
- Beveridge, Tina. "Does Music Education have a Poverty Problem?" *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education* 40, no. 2. 2022. 10-18.
- Budoiu, Oana Bălan. "12. Managing the Changes in the 21st Century Performing Art. Methods of Eliminating Social Barriers in the Consumption of Classical Music Performances." *Review of Artistic Education* no. 21 (2021): 95-104.
- Bulgozdy, Felicia Denise Myers. "The Cultural Relevance of Music Education as it Relates to African American Students in South Carolina." *ProQuest Dissertations Publishing*, 2020.
- Bryan, Donna Michelle. "Teacher Retention: A Case Study in a High-Poverty, Low-Income School in South Carolina's Corridor of Shame." *ProQuest Dissertations Publishing*, 2018.
- Bryant, Lawrence C. and John Henry Deloach. "The Status of Music in the Negro High Schools in South Carolina." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 12, no. 2 (1964): 177-179.
- Byun, C. *The Economics of the Popular Music Industry: Modeling from Microeconomic Theory and Industrial Organization*. New York: Palgrave Pivot, 2015.
- Creswell, John W., and J. David Creswell. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 5th ed. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc., 2018.
- Culp, Mara E. and Matthew Clauhs. "Factors that Affect Participation in Secondary School Music: Reducing Barriers and Increasing Access." *Music Educators Journal* 106, no. 4 (2020): 43-49.
- Eddings, Jerelyn. "Charleston's Education Tool: The Blues. (Blues Musicians Teach Music to Inner-City Children in Charleston, South Carolina, During Four-Week Blues in the Schools Program)." *U.S. News & World Report*. 118, no. 14 (1995).
- "Education and Workforce Report 2021 As Required by §59-18-195," *South Caroline Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office*. 2022. 1-27.
- Fan, Xumei Ning Jiang, and Ashlee Lewis. "Factors Associated with Fourth Graders' Music Knowledge Assessed by SCAAP." *International Journal of Music Education* 38, no. 4 (2020): 644-656.

- Franklin, Benjamin. *Jazz and Blues Musicians of South Carolina: Interviews with Jabbo, Dizzy, Drink, and Others* University of South Carolina Press, 2021.
- Franklin, A David. "The Relationship Between Academic Preparation and Professional Responsibilities of Secondary School Music Teachers in South Carolina." *Journal of Research in Music Education*. 19, no. 4 (1971): 460–460.
- Green, Jeffrey P. "Edmund Jenkins of South Carolina." *Black Music Research Journal* 30, no. 1 (2010): 183-195.
- Greenblatt, Alan. "Funding the Arts: Should Government Support Artistic and Cultural Expression?" *The CQ Researcher* 27, no. 25 (2017): 581-604.
- Hammel, Alice. "Addressing Barriers to Accessibility." *School Band and Orchestra* 23, no. 4 (2020): 1-2.
- Harrison, Klisala. "the Relationship of Poverty to Music." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 45. 2013. 1-12.
- Hoffman, Adria R. "Compelling Questions about Music, Education, and Socioeconomic Status." *Music Educators Journal* 100, no. 1 (2013): 63-68.
- Holmes, Mark J. and Jesús Otero. "The Wage Curve within and Across Regions: New Insights from a Pairwise View of US States." *Empirical Economics* 62, no. 5 (2022): 2069-2089.
- Kim, Robert. "Under the Law: The Rights of Rural Students." *The Phi Delta Kappan*. 103, no. 4 (2021): 64–65.
- King, Charles. "The Cashaway Psalmody: Transatlantic Religion and Music in Colonial Carolina." *Fides Et Historia* 52, no. 2 (2020): 136-137.
- "Legal Highlight: The Civil Rights Act of 1964." *United States Department of Labor*. 2022. 1.
- Lewis, Willis and Ferdinand DiFurio. "Using a SLX Model to Examine the Impact of the Great Recession on Poverty in South Carolina." *Journal of Poverty* 26, no. 7. 2022. 1-20.
- Luck, Adam, "Eartha Kitt's Life Was Scarred by Failure to Learn the Identity of Her White Father, Says Daughter," *The Observer*. (2013): 33.
- O'Neal, Brooke. "Nontraditional Forms of Assessment." *Educational Horizons* 93, no. 3 (2015): 18-19.
- "Population with Percent in Poverty by County 2011-2020: South Carolina Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office." *South Carolina Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office*. 2020. 1.

- “Income Guidelines.” *South Carolina Legal Services*. 2022. 1.
- Moore, Marvelene C. "Guest Editorial." *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 43, no. 2. 2022. 112-114.
- Race, Richard. *Advancing Multicultural Dialogues in Education*, edited by Race, Richard. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- Rapp, Jason. “SCAC Seeking \$5 Million Increase in FY23 State Budget.” *South Carolina Arts Commission - SC Arts Hub*. 2022.
- Regelski, Thomas A. and J. Terry Gates. *Music Education for Changing Times: Guiding Visions for Practice*. Vol. 7. Dortrecht: New York, Springer, 2010.
- Richerme, Lauren Kapalka. "Naming Moral-Political Discourses in Music Education: A Philosophical Investigation." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 70, no. 1 (2022): 48-65.
- Rouse, Tedro R. "A Comparative Study Examining the Affects of Arts Curricula on Middle Level Student Achievement in Rural Schools in South Carolina." *ProQuest Dissertations Publishing*, 2018.
- Sharp, Timothy W, "Hallelujah! Next Church Music: A Renewed Vision for Church Music in Higher Education," *The Choral Journal* 38, no. 7 (1998): 51-54.
- Smith, Ronald Johannes. *The One: The life and music of James Brown*. Penguin, 2012.
- Stevenson, Kenneth R. and Leonard O. Pellicer. "The Funding of School Facilities in South Carolina." *Journal of Education Finance* 13, no. 4 (1988): 405-411.
- Stewart, Alexander. "Make it Funky: Fela Kuti, James Brown and the Invention of Afrobeat." *American Studies (Lawrence)* 52, no. 4 (2013): 99-118.
- Temoney, LaRaven, and Laura D. Ullrich. "All Talk, But No Action: A Reexamination of Education in South Carolina’s Corridor of Shame." *The Winthrop McNair Research Bulletin* 4, no. 1 (2018): 10.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D. "Labor Markets, Industrial Structure, and Poverty: A Theoretical Discussion and Empirical Example." *Rural Sociology* 52, no. 1 (1987): 56-74.
- Wasyak, Victoria. "'Designed to be Different': South Carolina's Musical Innovations Celebrates 10 Years of Serving Music Schools." *Musical Merchandise Review* 179, no. 3 (2020): 35.
- Weerts, Richard. "Dissertation Reviews: 'Perceptions of Selected Public School Personnel

Concerning the Value of Teaching Music in the Public Schools of South Carolina" by Edward Wayne Lord." *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* (1998): 86-88.

Wright, Chrysalis L, Francesca Dillman Carpentier, Lesley-Ann Ey, Cougar Hall, K Megan Hopper, and Wayne Warburton. "Popular Music Media Literacy: Recommendations for the Education Curriculum." *Policy insights from the behavioral and brain sciences*. 6, no. 2 (2019): 186–193.

Appendix A

Music Education Survey

Legal Disclaimer: By completing this form, I agree to have my responses used for statistical analysis and publication of findings. I understand that all responses are anonymous. I agree to answer the following questions to the best of my knowledge. I understand that I will not be compensated in any way for completing this survey.

1. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older.

Yes No

2. I am a primary resident of South Carolina.

Yes No

3. In which region of South Carolina is your primary residence?

Midlands LowCountry Upstate

4. Is your primary residence in Bamberg, Beaufort, Calhoun, Clarendon, Colleton, Darlington, Dillon, Dorchester, Florence, Hampton, Jasper, Lee, Marion, Marlboro, Orangeburg, Sumter, Kershaw, or Williamsburg county?

Yes No

5. To which age group do you belong?

Gen Z – 18-26

Millennials – 27-42

Gen X – 43-58

Boomers – 59-77

Post War – 78-95

6. To your knowledge, have any of your immediate family members or caregivers participated in public or private music education programs?

Yes No Not Sure

7. Have you been involved in a public or private music education course or program in the present or past?

Yes No

8. Is your income at or below the South Carolina 125% range poverty level of \$18,225.00 annual income?

Yes No Yes, but combined household income is above poverty level

9. Is your household income for an average household size of 2-5 in the 125% range of \$24,650.00-43,925.00? If you have a household size outside of the range listed, please select “not applicable.”

Yes No Not applicable

10. What is your highest education level achieved?

Did not graduate high school

High School Diploma/GED

Associates

Bachelors

Masters

Doctorate

11. What was the highest education level of your childhood primary caregiver(s) and/or parent(s) combined?

Did not graduate high school

High School Diploma/GED

Associates

Bachelors

Masters

Doctorate

Unsure

Part 2 Continued below.

The following questions are to be answered using a scale of 1-5. Please only submit one numerical answer per response for the following questions to the best of your ability.

- 1. As a child (18 years and younger), did your primary caregiver(s) and/or parent(s) support your involvement in public or private music education programs or courses as an essential part of your education?**

- 1- Yes
- 2- Somewhat
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Not really
- 5- No

- 2. As a child (18 years and younger), did your friends or social group of peers participate in music education programs in school and/or private organizations?**

- 1- Yes
- 2- Somewhat
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Not really
- 5- No

3. Do you believe that music education is equally important to an individual's education as other education subjects, such as math, reading, and science?

- 1- Yes
- 2- Somewhat
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Not really
- 5- No

4. Do you think state and federal music education funding in the State of South Carolina is enough to expand music education across the state and sustain long-term?

- 1- Yes
- 2- Somewhat
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Not really
- 5- No

5. Do you believe South Carolina tax dollars should be spent on music education programs in the public and private sectors?

- 1- Yes
- 2- Somewhat
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Not really
- 5- No

6. Do you believe South Carolina at or below the poverty level are not able to easily access music education programs in the state?

- 1- Yes
- 2- Somewhat
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Not really
- 5- No

7. Would you to currently participate in a music education program if the opportunity was free of charge?

- 1- Yes
- 2- Somewhat
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Not really
- 5- No

8. Do you believe your childhood friends and family helped to shape your current beliefs about music education?

- 1- Yes
- 2- Somewhat
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Not really
- 5- No

9. Do you think that the next generation has adequate resources to participate in music education courses and/or programs?

- 1- Yes
- 2- Somewhat
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Not really
- 5- No

Thank you for participating in this survey! Please note all responses are confidential and anonymous.

Appendix B

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------|---------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| Total completed responses: 634 | | | | | | |
| Hard Copy Responses: | | 8.33% of total | | | | |
| Response percentages were based off of the disclaimer boundaries and requirements to complete the survey entirely. The analysis percentages below are representative of these boundaries and cumulative response rate of 634 participant adherence to the guidelines. | | | | | | |
| Disclaimer: answers with "no" to question 1 and/or question 2 were not included in the statistical analysis | | | | | | |
| Analysis of Findings include the answer multiples of each responses/634 participants = total. Decimals were rounded to whole numbers. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 1 | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | | | | | |
| 100% | 0% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 2 | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | | | | | |
| 100% | 0% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 3 | | | | | | |
| Midlands | LowCountry | Upstate | | | | |
| 36% | 41% | 23% | | | | |
| Question 4 | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | | | | | |
| 37% | 63% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 5 | | | | | | |
| Gen Z | Millennials | Gen X | Boomers | Post War | | Analysis Note: 100% of hard copy surveys used in the data were from the Boomer Category |
| 27% | 33% | 26% | 14% | 0% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 6 | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | Not Sure | | | | |
| 51% | 37% | 12% | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 7 | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|---------|-----------|--|
| 64% | 37% | | | | | |
| Question 8 | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | Yes, but combined household income is above poverty level | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 26% | 56% | 18% | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 9 | | | | | | |
| yes | No | Not Applicable | | | | |
| 19% | 54% | 27% | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 10 | | | | | | |
| Did not graduate high school | High School/GED | Associates | Bachelors | Masters | Doctorate | |
| | | | | | | |
| 6% | 47% | 18% | 23% | 5% | 1% | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 11 | | | | | | |
| Did not graduate high school | High School/GED | Associates | Bachelors | Masters | Doctorate | |
| 7% | 43% | 19% | 24% | 7% | 0% | |
| | | | | | | |
| Part 2 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 1 | | | | | | |
| Yes | Somewhat | Neutral | Not Really | No | | |
| 67% | 23% | 6% | 4% | 0% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 2 | | | | | | |
| Yes | Somewhat | Neutral | Not Really | No | | |
| 38% | 46% | 2% | 9% | 5% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 3 | | | | | | |
| Yes | Somewhat | Neutral | Not Really | No | | |
| 51% | 33% | 9% | 5% | 2% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 4 | | | | | | |
| Yes | Somewhat | Neutral | Not Really | No | | |
| 56% | 28% | 9% | 1% | 6% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 5 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|---------|------------|----|--|--|
| Yes | Somewhat | Neutral | Not Really | No | | |
| 27% | 37% | 10% | 21% | 5% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 6 | | | | | | |
| Yes | Somewhat | Neutral | Not Really | No | | |
| 44% | 14% | 1% | 37% | 4% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 7 | | | | | | |
| Yes | Somewhat | Neutral | Not Really | No | | |
| 78% | 14% | 3% | 5% | 0% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 8 | | | | | | |
| Yes | Somewhat | Neutral | Not Really | No | | |
| 23% | 44% | 15% | 13% | 5% | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Question 9 | | | | | | |
| Yes | Somewhat | Neutral | Not Really | No | | |
| 58% | 34% | 1% | 7% | 0% | | |

Appendix C

South Carolina Arts Commission Funding based on 21-22 and 22-23 funding trends from Jason Rapp's SCAC cited analysis and fiscal research. Artist Development Grants are the lowest form of funding range, Community Arts Development categories are considered mid-range, and Arts Education and Additional Grants are the least commonly provided and higher funding categories. Counties with Bold headings were also recipients of COVID-19 relief grant and state-based funding during the fiscal period.

Abbeville County

- Community Arts Development Grants

Aiken County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Programs
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Allendale County

- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs

Anderson County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Accessibility Grants
- Arts Education

- Grants
- Programs
- Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Bamberg County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs

Barnwell County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs

Beaufort County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Accessibility Grants
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- South Carolina Cultural District
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Programs
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Berkeley County

- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Arts Education
 - Grants

- Programs
- Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Calhoun County

- Arts Education Grant

Charleston County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Programs
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Cherokee County

- Community Arts Development Grants

Chester County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Programs
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Chesterfield County

- Arts Education

- Programs
- Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Clarendon County

- Arts Education Grants

Colleton County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs

Darlington County

- Community Arts Development Grants
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Dillon County

- Arts Education Grants

Dorchester County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Programs
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Edgefield County

- Artist Development Grants

Fairfield County

- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Florence County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants
- South Carolina Cultural Districts
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Georgetown County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants
- Arts Education Grants

Greenville County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Programs

- Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Greenwood County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants
- South Carolina Cultural Districts

Hampton County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs

Horry County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- Arts Education
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Jasper County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs

Kershaw County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- Arts Education Grants
- South Carolina Cultural Districts

Lancaster County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- South Carolina Cultural Districts
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Programs
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Laurens County

- Artist Development Grants

Lee County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants

Lexington County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants
- Accessibility Grants
- Arts Education
 - Programs
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Marion County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs

Marlboro County

- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs

McCormick County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants

Newberry County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs

Oconee County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- Arts Education Grants

Orangeburg County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Pickens County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs

- Arts Education Grants

Richland County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- South Carolina Cultural Districts
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Programs
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Saluda County

- Community Arts Development Grants
- Arts Education Grants

Spartanburg County

- Artist Development Grants and Programs
- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Accessibility Grants
- South Carolina Cultural Districts
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Programs
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Sumter County

- Artist Development Grants
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site

Union County

- Artist Development Grants
- Community Arts Development Grants

Williamsburg County

- Arts Education Grants

York County

- Community Arts Development Grants and Programs
- Folklife and Traditional Arts Grants
- Arts Education
 - Grants
 - Arts in Basic Curriculum (ABC) Project site