Original Research Article

National Association for Music Education

Journal of Research in Music Education
2025, Vol. 73(1) 8–20

DOI: 10.1177/00224294241308354
jrme.sagepub.com

Sage

2024 Senior Researcher Award Acceptance Address: Perspectives that the Passage of Time Allows

Christopher M. Johnson[1]

It is the honor of my life to accept the NAfME Senior Researcher Award this year. I cannot tell you how grateful I am for having been awarded this recognition. I would like to first thank the National Executive Board of NAfME for its support of research in music education and for making this recognition possible. I also want to thank Wendy Sims, the chair of the Executive Committee of the Society for Research in Music Education; the entire committee; and the people who wrote in support of this award. I am most appreciative.

An honor like this allows one to reflect, and there are many people to whom I am grateful for their help, support, instruction, sage advice, and personal perspective throughout my career. In particular, I would like to recognize the University of Kansas as a supportive environment in which to begin and sustain a career. The institution and its people have made every effort to create a place where scholars can flourish, and as a result, many of my colleagues have done just that. I want to specifically thank my colleagues past and present in the Department of Music Education and Music Therapy.[1] Their endless support over the years has enabled me to pursue my professional goals. I also want to thank my students, who have inspired me, asked excellent questions, and left me continually curious.

Clearly there are many people who have been instrumental in my successes both professionally and personally. But I do want to acknowledge my family. They have listened to my ideas, argued often, served as guinea pigs for piloting procedures, played for stimulus tapes, and edited and critiqued my work. Through it all, they have always shown love and support.

When I arrived at the University of Kansas, my good friend, Alice-Ann Darrow, sat me down and told me that I was the luckiest guy anywhere. I had a network of connections from my alma mater, Florida State University, and now I had another from the University of Kansas. When you expand just a couple of degrees beyond that, you

[1]University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA

Corresponding Author:
Christopher M. Johnson, The University of Kansas, School of Music, 410 Murphy Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045-3102, USA
Email: cmj@ku.edu.

realize that nearly everyone in the profession is already linked to you. You simply need to get to know the friends you do not even realize you have. And of course, she was right. Over the years, I have built a network of colleagues who have been a source of endless inspiration and support.

As I am certain my predecessors have done before me, I went back and reviewed what others have spoken about in their Senior Researcher Award addresses. The first thing I realized was that I was present at all but two of the addresses—so maybe I am beginning to be "senior." As I read through these talks, I was reminded of just how brilliant my colleagues are. It is a bit intimidating, but I feel incredibly fortunate to have this opportunity. I do have a few thoughts I would like to share with you. I have settled on three issues that I find particularly interesting, and I hope there might be something in these topics that will be of interest to you as well. The first concerns the impact of our collective research on the overall field of music education. The second is how I think we should consider advancing and growing our research efforts into the future. For the third topic, I will look at the inevitable changes that are on the horizon for the profession.

The Evolutionary Impact of Research Over Time

I started my teaching career 39 years ago, in 1985, just 91 miles from Atlanta in Milledgeville, Georgia. While some aspects of what music teachers do today are the same as they were back then, many others have changed quite a bit. To be fair, change itself is inevitable. But it is heartening to see that many of the changes we have experienced over these years have been driven in the direction that aligns with research-based recommendations: research done by people in this room. I take pride in knowing that many of you have been so positively influential.

Several of my brilliant predecessors for this award have addressed the issue of whether research is making its way into practice. They have pointed out the common complaint that research is not the basis for decisions that educators make or that practitioners do not read research. However, a few of my colleagues have taken issue with that premise and asserted that research does get to practice. In his address, Webster (2014) went so far as to list 34 of our research colleagues and challenged us to consider whether or not their students had known about and utilized their work. In my estimation, that's a fair challenge—worth pondering. However, the belief that research does not affect best practices because there are findings in the extant literature that are not being read by everyday teachers still percolates. I believe, however, that Peter was right in his claim. I do not suffer the illusion that every public school teacher is waiting by their mailbox for the next print edition of the *Journal of Research in Music Education* (*JRME*). I would like to argue that research does find its way into practice…eventually. But it generally does so slowly. And I think that is perhaps a good thing.

I do believe that teachers like "tricks that click"—research or best practices that promise results based on a few easy-to-follow instructions. If you look through the programs at your state conferences for the "tricks that click" sessions being offered,

you will see practitioners flock to them. Let's be fair: The same might be true if someone offered a session here titled "Discriminant Analysis Made Clear: Three Easy Steps to a Flawless Publication." I am not sure that there is anything wrong with this, except I think almost everything is more complex than that. But those complexities do not draw the crowd much of the time. As Geringer (2000) astutely pointed out, many people prefer simple lies to complex truths. And our research is full of complex truths. As my good friend Radocy (1998) pointed out in his Senior Researcher Address, research goals are by necessity very narrow; they are tiny pieces of a complex problem. Selling these tiny, complex pieces to busy practitioners is not always easy.

For example, I arrived at the University of Kansas in 1992. During my first year, Francis Rauscher et al. (1993) published the paper titled "Music and Spatial Task Performance" in the journal *Nature*. It was pretty easy to start feeling like the research I had just completed—a passable dissertation—was pretty weak in light of the firestorm her paper created. All of a sudden, there was an entire industry based on "Music Makes You Smarter." For example, in 1998, the governor of Georgia, Miller (1998), created an executive initiative that every baby was to go home from the hospital with a CD of Mozart music. Why? To raise the K–12 test scores in Georgia. To be clear, Rauscher's paper made no claims beyond her data. A few years later, I shared a session with her at a conference, where she was reporting on a follow-up study. Rauscher stayed strictly within her data. But while she did, the public did not, resulting in the dubious "Mozart Effect" that swept the nation. To me, this is a prime example of a time when we all would have preferred a slower, more rigorous approach by the profession before educators, parents, and even government officials began adopting large-scale policies.

As researchers, we ask specific questions as we try to complete a little piece of the picture. This method sometimes gives us a clear answer, but more often, it gives us part of an answer and many more questions. For example, does a certain type of music education, occurring in either specific or less controlled settings, help people with skills or learning that are extramusical? Or does music make you smarter in mathematics? Nobody doing research in the area of music and other academic subject matter wants music ever to become the handmaiden for other academic subjects. But examining relationships might unlock a new level of understanding of the human condition. There are as many answers to these questions as there are studies—each one looking at different questions using different methodologies. If one reads the works of Catterall et al. (1999), Cobb (1997), Costa-Giomi (1999), Elpus (2013), Fitzpatrick (2006), Kinney (2008), Mahoney et al. (2003), Miksza (2007), Miranda (2001), Perry (1993), Rauscher et al. (1995), Schneider (2000), Trent (1996), Underwood (2000), and Zanutto (1997) (among others), then one can begin to understand the complexities of the overarching questions regarding musical involvement and overall academic achievement.

Unlike jumping on the "Music Makes You Smarter" bandwagon, it is the duty of educated professionals to put together the bigger cogent picture formed by these studies, but that picture will still have gaping holes and suppositions. And hence the need for more studies. This pattern is true across virtually all of our fields of

research—there is always a need to examine the gaps to be filled and the subtleties to be explored. What we need to do is take what is there and connect the dots. We need to make transfers. Madsen (1988) spoke about that in the first Senior Researcher Address, and Yarbrough (1996) spoke about that again 8 years later. Making logical connections from one study to another is not only an enormous task, but it is also what all educated people need to do. It is a significant aspect of what it means to be educated. It is the heart of critical thinking.

Because we each look at different facets of related problems, our profession requires that we work to put many disparate ideas together and make as complete a picture as possible at any given time. But this type of thinking is hard. How many graduate students get paralyzed by dissertation Chapter 2? Knowing that, we should consider Bertrand Russell's eloquent lesson[2]: "Most people would sooner die than think; and in fact, they do so." Certainly, the art of transfer is not the only definition of critical thinking, but it is one of its most important applications. I think that is why people continue wrestling with it.

In contrast to examining many different people's take on a single topic, there are researchers who have published several articles in lines of research in our profession. A few that I have enjoyed are expressive conducting, music festival evaluation patterns, memory consolidation, and performer attractiveness, just to name a few. There are many more I should acknowledge, but I will stop here for expediency's sake. For the last 34 years, I have been examining the use of rubato in high-level music performance and its impact on the perceived musical affect of the performance in question. Building on the extended work of Gabrielsson, Repp, Palmer, Sloboda, and Pankaskie (among many others), I believe I can make certain statements about this topic with some level of authority and certainty:

- The most musical performances of specific pieces of music have different rhythmic fingerprints than average performances (Johnson, 1996b).
- The timings of the two levels of performance are similar to each other in their rubato patterns (Johnson, 1997).
- These findings imply that there is indeed some common practice with regard to rhythmic performance that is inherent to Western Art Music (Johnson, 1996a).
- It seems that people can hear whether or not rubato is being used during a performance even when they cannot define it or track exactly what is happening (Johnson, 1999).
- This common practice can be analyzed, and it can be defined using empirical terms (Johnson, 2000).
- It appears that these defined practices can be directly linked to what is considered to be a more musical performance (Johnson, 1997).
- It seems that these common practices of rhythmic nuance (rubato), once clearly defined, can be taught (Johnson, 1998).
- The amount of rubato appropriate for any given piece, although regulated by some unidentified common practice, is idiosyncratic, at least to the specific genre (Johnson, 2003).

- It appears that rubato is consistently occurring simultaneously in performances by musical ensembles (Johnson & Geringer, 2023).
- Rubato even happens when people are steadily marching (Johnson et al., 2024).

While I have conducted many projects in other areas of study, focusing on the topic of rubato for an extended period has contributed to the profession having a coherent line of investigation upon which to draw. My main point is that the passage of time has provided this research line with a solid foundation, making it appropriate to be used now to influence decisions on a larger scale, something that would not have been appropriate right after my first *JRME* publication in 1996. To reiterate, research does provide usable results, but it often takes a body of work over time for the applications to be robust enough to make substantial changes in the world of practice.

How Research Has Advanced Over Time

I used the impending deadline of this speech as motivation to revisit 39 years of research published in our profession, and it has been a deeply satisfying experience. I went back to look at the Journal of Research in Music Education from 1985, the year I started teaching. What shocked me most was that the first copy of the journal I had received was marked up with my notes and comments. I vividly recall Bob Spradling's article from that issue, which was published just as I started as a high school band director. It influenced how I taught my classes from then on. At the time, I had no idea I would eventually become a researcher; I wanted to be a great band director. Yet the research found its way into my classroom long before I realized the significance of these issues. I do not think I was particularly unique in this regard, and my initial point stands—our work is reaching teachers.

As for Volume 33 itself, it has 22 articles, covering 288 pages. Four of those articles were historical, 4 were descriptive, and the other 14 were experimental. Of these 14, there were all varieties of analysis of variance but also one set of *t* tests, a chi-square, one multiple regression, and one factor analysis. However, even a cursory perusal through a current issue of *JRME* shows differences that should be immediately recognized. While we still have about 22 articles per volume, we are publishing them in 488 pages. Qualitative research has come from nonexistent in music education to the point that it is sophisticated, rigorous, and answers important questions. Mixed-method research has become more common, and now that many researchers are fluent in many more methods of analysis, they have the freedom to expand how we methodologically approach our research purposes. Follow-up questions are not just unanalyzed "discussion fodder" at the end of a study. And not all independent variables are categorical. We have come a long way in 39 very short years.

While our profession has been able to incorporate more complex research designs, it feels to me that we have not lost sight of the importance of the purpose of the project. My mentor, Cliff Madsen, told me early on that no important decision has ever been made by a statistical test. I believed that then, and I believe it just as strongly now. While I embrace and enjoy the freedom that more sophisticated analysis procedures

allow in designing projects, I have never forgotten that every important decision is made long before any data are analyzed. The purpose statement is still the most important aspect of any piece of research. So, while the *Journal* has changed a great deal over the years, the centering of that truth has not.

However, I am not here to say that everything is perfect in Fantasyland. In his address to this body, Al LeBlanc (1992) stated, "One of the great purposes of the *Journal of Research in Music Education* is to encourage students to publish their dissertations." This sentiment was once reflected by many other senior researchers in their addresses over the years. Senior researchers have also shown concern that early academics get off to a good start and learn how to be productive members of the academy. I strongly agree with my colleagues. If our young colleagues are unsuccessful in publishing early in their career, they are not likely to stay on the research path for long. Wendy Sims (2016) gave sage advice in her address on how to increase the odds of successfully navigating the publication task. Two of her points have long since become part of my advising process: (1) If a bright young student cannot understand what you did or found, you need another edit, and (2) if the journal to which you are submitting your article does not appear in your reference section, perhaps you need to consider submitting the article somewhere else.

Now, to my issue. As I look out into this room, I know I am seeing the most successful academics in our profession. We have all received accolades from our professors, colleagues, and friends. Most of us excelled from the beginning of our music study. We went on to grad school and probably experienced much of that same success. It occurs to me that we probably were not the students who struggled. In all probability, most of the feedback we have received along our journey has been at least constructive and likely very positive. We probably did not get a lot of that negative feedback that some of the people—who are not here—got along the way.

From my earliest days trying to get published, I always had the same approach: On any day that I got "the envelope" (the submission reviews in the old-fashioned mail), I would leave it unopened, and as soon as I taught my last class for the day, open it and read the whole thing. I would go home and try not to think about it (or try to get over it). I would leave it alone for 3 days. Dickens (1860–1861/1979) said it best: "Nothing is so finely perceived and so finely felt, as injustice" (p. 66). Of course, the comments I received were not unjust. Mostly, they were spot on. It just sometimes took a couple of days to see that. But regardless, often, the reviewer comments were really helpful, and sometimes, they were a bit hurtful.

Let me be clear, I believe that the rigor of the *Journal of Research in Music Education* is exactly what it should be. I believe that professional journals in music education across the board are doing an extraordinary job of maintaining high standards and thoroughness. I think that the people who review for those journals are giving of their time and their souls to make sure that our profession continues to have its best material represented. I believe that the editors are giving more to the profession than most people who have never been an editor will ever know. I thank them all for their hard work and their dedication to our profession and to truth. I think they are doing a fantastic job, and I believe that every issue of the journal reflects that.

However, every author who submits a piece of work to a journal is going to get feedback. That feedback is extremely important. Doing research is difficult, and it can feel thankless to put so much time and effort into a project and get feedback that is dismissive, flippant, or unkind. Reviewer comments may not necessarily be intended as punishing, but perception is reality. In the words of Fischer (2012): "An unkind remark is like a killing frost - no matter how much it warms up, the damage is already done" (p. 67).

In my 39 years of publishing in the profession, I have certainly experienced the barbs of reviewers firsthand. I have also received reviews where the reviewer really did not carefully read the article. Based on my experience, as well as those of colleagues whom I have mentored over the years, my recommendation is that while editors should not be able to change the content of reviews, they should be given the latitude or even encouragement to have reviewers rewrite their work or to personally modify the tone of the review when appropriate. Editors and reviewers (of all our journals) should remember that there is a live person at the other end of their review. That person likely worked hard on this paper, and they should make sure that their feedback is constructive and supportive instead of punishing. Reviewers should give the kind of feedback they would give their mother, or their kid, or their favorite student. Further, editors should be able to ask reviewers to reread research submissions when it was evident that they did not have time to thoroughly process the article in question.

Although editors might look at a set of reviews and assume that if someone has been in the profession for a long time that they can endure the comments, they need to remember that any committed researcher will still very deeply feel whatever feedback they receive. In her address, Estelle Jorgenson (2021) specifically mentioned persisting through dismaying and disheartening reviews. Those comments stick. It does not matter if the author is just starting out or has been in the field for decades. Some of us can take the barbs and move on, but others will just find something else to do. That some colleagues might move on from research to focus on other activities does not bother me in general, but the idea that someone would do this because "doing that publication thing is just too mean" bothers me a lot. To be clear, I am not saying that we should change the rigor of our reviews or that we should not tell people what they need to hear. I am saying that all researchers deserve to hear this feedback in the most constructive way possible, especially when we are going to reject their paper. I think that a positive and productive experience is valuable for someone at any point in their career. Demoralizing someone out of the research field is a shame. We should treat everybody with respect for their work and appreciation for their efforts.

As for the collective whole, what new knowledge might we have now if people who left the research path had stayed with it and continued to follow their curiosities?

Thoughts Regarding the Future

Of course, I am always thinking about the wonders of the future. In his address, Peter Webster (2014) talked about the excitement that his first personal computer offered to

his ability to teach and do research. I know that many people in this room cannot remember a time before easy access to computers, but to some of us, it was not that long ago. I first touched a computer in my first year teaching high school—an Apple 2c. I later bought a computer in grad school with a 76 MB hard drive, and my mentor, Bentley Shellahamer, told me I was silly to have purchased that much storage and I would not fill that up in a lifetime!

In Geringer's (2000) Senior Researcher Address in 2000, he courageously jumped into the prognostication pool. He forecasted some interesting ideas regarding the emerging internet. To paraphrase a couple of his predictions:

> Electronic versions of books and journals could be delivered at virtually no cost to readers anywhere and as distribution costs would vanish, but acknowledged that many of us do not want to read even short articles on screen, let alone entire books—of course, screens have changed since then.

> He also pointed out that some regarded electronic media as inherently unstable and short-lived, not suitable for long-term storage and preservation of the scholarly record, but he thought that there were possibilities that there might be electronic repositories that would archive papers.

I remember that Geringer's comments seemed a little unreal at the time he made them. Now many of his "wild ideas" have come to pass.

Several senior researchers' addresses barely touched on the changes technology brings to our world. Some have decidedly avoided the topic. There may be good reasons to do that because none of us can truly predict the future, and prognosticating in print can make us look very silly very soon. On the other hand, not acknowledging some facets of technology is ignoring something that is impacting our lives and professions. Case in point: the *JRME* of 1985. The statistical analyses were what they were in that issue not because researchers lacked skills and knowledge but because the tools they had available at the time could not do what our tools can do today. Running an analysis through SPSS is a dream compared to the efforts of our colleagues 40 years ago.

So, what is the new frontier today? The headlines now all seem to focus on artificial intelligence (AI). AI has had an incredible impact on higher education in a very short amount of time. Just a year ago, informal discussions with professors around the country indicated that while they were aware of AI, the general consensus was that it would not significantly affect them for a long time. What a difference a year can make. The implications of AI now extend into every aspect of the Academy. Whether we like it or not, we probably need to cultivate an understanding of AI and explore how we are going to adapt to what we do with this new technology. Several sessions at this very conference were truly eye-opening.

Two things I think I can say with certainty are that AI is going to grow and develop and that it is here to stay.

The real issue pertinent to this address is how AI will move into our research lives. I know that AI can help write a sentence or paragraph, and for the most part, it will do

a mediocre job. I have never had an AI-generated sentence that I did not have to edit. But that is ok. It is just a tool. What it can do for analysis is amazing. And it is improving seemingly every day. There are real questions here for us in academia. If you use ChatGPT to write a sentence and you do not alter it, do you credit the machine? How different is it from if Microsoft Word corrects your spelling or gives you a good synonym? Do you include Microsoft Word in the acknowledgments? Does Grammarly editing get a footnote? If AI gives you a reference and you use it, only to find out that AI made it up, can you attribute the mistakes to the machine, or do you have to own it? (I think you need to own it.)

Given the present circumstances, I believe that it is time for the Academy to start considering AI and its appropriate/acceptable use in the research community. I am uncertain whether we in music education should create our own guidelines or draw insight from our peers in the larger academic community. However, one thing is clear to me: We need to give this tool appropriate consideration. It has to be better if we are proactive rather than reactive.

I will not pretend to know the future of where AI is going. I do take some comfort in the thought that there are wise people out there who think that AI will not be able to replace us. They have said that AI will only be able to complement our efforts and might even free us to be MORE human. The future worlds of *Wall-E* and *Terminator* are not our fait accompli. I believe we are more than what AI might become.

I do not know what our profession should do about this new tool, but I do think that we have arrived at the time where we should start to make some decisions. If we do not begin contemplating this, I believe that time will make decisions for us.

Summary

In summary, my first point today is that publishing research does matter to practitioners. While the impact may not always be immediately visible, over time, if we keep a long-term perspective, our work does make a difference in students' lives.

Second, as a profession I look forward to what will happen as we continue to advance our sophistication and skills as researchers. I hope we all choose to take the position of encouraging and helping each other in our best research efforts so that we can all continue to participate in that progress.

Finally, our world is going to continue to change. There is ample data indicating that the speed of this change is only accelerating (e.g., Carroll, 2023). Change can be hard. Change can be scary. I encourage us to not fear change but to embrace it and view the future as opportunity.

Conclusion

Being presented with this award has given me the opportunity to do some personal searching, to settle down and take some time to simply ponder. I know I should do that more than I have, but I am still hopeful for developing a few new habits. I am always the optimist.

I want to conclude this afternoon by expressing my gratitude to the people in my life. My day-to-day life has been exceptional because of the people in it. I have always wanted to be a college professor. But my job is better than I had ever hoped. I work in a beautiful place and am surrounded by astonishing people, both colleagues and students. I cannot remember the last time I did not want to go to school.

But I want to recognize the larger community as well. Sir Isaac Newton (1675) once stated so eloquently, "If I have seen further, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants." I believe that is so true for me. My gains in life from my own devices have always seemed incremental and a bit small. But then I come to places like this and hear you speak, and my whole world grows. From a casual comment in the hall to a well-timed statement in a session. Hearing all of the insightful questions makes me recognize that I very much appreciate you, my colleagues, for all you have offered to me.

I do research partially so I can come see all of you but also because doing research is fun. As an optimist, I also know that our research will continue to make music education just a little better for students still to come. Doing research gives me a way to give a little back to that which has enriched me and so many of us in so many ways.

Thank you so very much.

Notes

1. I would like to name the distinguished group of faculty I have had the privilege with which to work. Alphabetically, my colleagues in the Department of Music Education and Music Therapy are or have been: Martin Bergee, Alicia Clair, Cynthia Colwell, Jacob Dakon, Alice Ann Darrow, James Daugherty, George Duerksen, Abby Dvorak, CharCarol Fisher, Melissa Grady, Deanna Hanson-Abromeit, Debra Hedden, Steven Hedden, George Heller, Julius Kyakuwa, William Matney, Rudy Radocy, Dena Register, and Emily Rossin.
2. The referenced quote is often attributed to Bertrand Russell, but it's important to note that while the quote encapsulates his general views on critical thinking and the tendency of people to avoid intellectual effort, it is not from a specific, well-known published work.

References

Carroll, J. (2023). *23 Trends for 2023: #8 – Knowledge velocity*. https://www.jimcarroll.com/2023/01/23-trends-for-2023-8-knowledge-velocity/

Catterall, J. S., Chapleau, R., & Iwanaga, R. (1999). Involvement in the arts and human development: General involvement and intensive involvement in music and theater arts. In E. B. Fiske (Ed.), *Champions of change: The impact of the arts on learning* (pp. 1–18). The Arts Education Partnership, The President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the GE Fund.

Cobb, T. A. (1997). A comparison of the academic achievement of students who have a musical background versus students who do not have a musical background [Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *58*(11A), 4134.

Costa-Giomi, E. (1999). The effects of three years of piano instruction on children's cognitive development. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *47*(3), 198–212. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345779

Dickens, C. (1979). *Great expectations*. The Easton Press. (Original work published 1860–1861)

Elpus, K. (2013). Is it music or is it selection bias? A nationwide analysis of music and non-music students' SAT scores. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *61*(2), 175–194. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429413485601

Fischer, S. W. (2012). *Amish proverbs: Words of wisdom from the simple life*. Revell.

Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2006). The effect of instrumental music participation and socioeconomic status on Ohio fourth-, sixth-, and ninth-grade proficiency test performance. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *54*(1), 73–84. https://doi.org/10.1177/002242940605400106

Geringer, J. M. (2000). On publishing, pluralism, and pitching. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *48*(3), 191–205. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345393

Johnson, C. M. (1996a). Musicians' and nonmusicians' assessment of perceived rubato in musical performance. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *44*(1), 84–96. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345415

Johnson, C. M. (1996b). The performance of Mozart: Study of rhythmic timing by skilled musicians. *Psychomusicology*, *15*(1–2), 87–109. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0094077

Johnson, C. M. (1997). A comparison of the perceived musicianship of skilled musicians and their respective rhythmic timings in performances of Mozart. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *133*, 45–51.

Johnson, C. M. (1998). Effect of instruction in appropriate rubato usage on the onset timings and perceived musicianship of musical performances. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *46*(3), 436–445. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345555

Johnson, C. M. (1999). The performance of Bach: Study of rhythmic timing by skilled professionals. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *141*, 66–71.

Johnson, C. M. (2000). The effect of instruction in the appropriate rubato usage on the onset timings of performances of Bach. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *48*(1), 78–84. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345458

Johnson, C. M. (2003). Effect of rubato magnitude on the perception of musicianship in musical performance. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *51*(2), 115–123. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345845

Johnson, C. M., Brittin, R. V., Biggs, W. R., McKeithan Jensen, M. N., Baker, K. M., Confredo, D. A., Parisi, J., Geringer, J. M., & Weingarten, K. (2024, July). *Effects of movement on ensembles' performance of march tempo stability* [Paper presentation]. The 30th International Society for Music Education Seminar on Research in Music Education, Jyväskylä, Finland.

Johnson, C. M., & Geringer, J. M. (2023). Conducting timing patterns of undergraduate student, graduate student, and professional conductors of a common band composition. *Journal of Band Research*, *59*(1), 1–11.

Jorgenson, E. (2021). Senior Researcher Award acceptance address: Reflections on a scholar's life in music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *69*(3), 250–257. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224294211006330

Kinney, D. W. (2008). Selected demographic variables, school music participation, and achievement test scores of urban middle school students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *56*(2), 145–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429408322530

LeBlanc, A. (1992). 1992 Senior Researcher Award acceptance address. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *40*(3), 180–184. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345679

Madsen, C. K. (1988). Senior Researcher Award acceptance address. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *36*(3), 133–139. https://doi.org/10.2307/3344635

Mahoney, J. L., Cairns, B., D., & Farmer, T. W. (2003). Promoting interpersonal competence and educational success through extracurricular activity participation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *95*(2), 409–418. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.2.409

Miksza, P. (2007). Music participation and socioeconomic status as correlates of change: A longitudinal analysis of academic achievement. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *172*, 41–58.

Miller, Z. (1998, January 14). *State of the state address* [Speech]. Georgia Governor's Office. https://www.c-span.org/program/state-legislature/georgia-state-of-the-state-address/42636

Miranda, J. Y. (2001). *A study of the effect of school-sponsored, extra-curricular activities on high school students' cumulative grade point average, SAT score, ACT score, and core curriculum subject grade point average* [Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas]. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(11A), 3843.

Newton, I. (1675). Letter to Robert Hooke. In H. W. Turnbull (Ed.), *The correspondence of Isaac Newton* (Vol. 2, pp. 286–287). Cambridge University Press.

Perry, R. (1993). Comparing two approaches to increasing academic achievement through providing structured parental support, one involving a beginning instrumental music program [Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts]. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *54*(06A), 2085.

Radocy, R. E. (1998). Personal perspectives on research: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *46*(3), 342–350. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345546

Rauscher, F., Shaw, G., & Ky, K. (1993). Music and spatial task performance. *Nature*, *365*, Article 611. https://doi.org/10.1038/365611a0

Rauscher, F., Shaw, G., & Ky, K. (1995). Listening to Mozart enhances spatial-temporal reasoning: Towards a neurophysiological basis. *Neuroscience Letters*, *185*(1), 44–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3940(94)11221-4

Schneider, T. W. (2000). The effects of music education on academic achievement. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *61*(09A), 3429.

Sims, W. L. (2016). 2016 Senior Researcher Award acceptance address: Developing productive researchers through mentoring, rethinking doctoral dissertations, and facilitating positive publishing experiences. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *64*(3), 262–273. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429416667507

Trent, D. E. (1996). The impact of instrumental music education on academic achievement [Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University]. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(07A), 2933.

Underwood, E. B. (2000). An analysis of the achievement patterns of high school students who participate in instrumental music and those who do not participate in instrumental music [Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign]. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *61*(05A), 1735.

Webster, P. R. (2014). 2014 Senior Researcher Award acceptance address: Cautious optimism for the future of research in music teaching and learning. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *62*(3), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429414542834

Yarbrough, C. (1996). "The future of scholarly inquiry in music education": 1996 Senior Researcher Award acceptance address. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *44*(3), 190–203. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345593

Zanutto, D. R. (1997). The effect of instrumental music instruction on academic achievement (high school students) [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Davis]. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *58*(10A), 3871.

Author Biography

Christopher M. Johnson is professor of music education and music therapy and director of the Music Research Institute in the School of Music at The University of Kansas. His research interests are in perception, cognition, and effective music teaching and learning.

Submitted December 5, 2024; accepted December 5, 2024.