



International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review

ISSN: 2347-3215 Volume 3 Number 1 (January-2015) pp. 175-191

www.ijcrar.com



Factors Affecting Music Learners' Motivation - A Study in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Tran ThienAn¹ and Mai Ngoc Khuong^{2*}

¹Academic Music of Suoi Nhap School, Ho Chi Minh City – Vietnam

²School of Business Administration, International University – VNU, HCMC, Vietnam

*Corresponding author

KEYWORDS

Music learners' motivation,
Learning motivation,
Music education in Vietnam

A B S T R A C T

This study aimed to identify factors effecting the music learners' motivation and generally to enhance music education in Ho Chi Minh City (HCMC), Vietnam. Quantitative approach was the major method used, with statistical techniques applied, including factor analysis and multiple regressions. The unit of analysis was at individual level with the target population of all students who studied in music institutions in HCMC. The empirical results of this study showed that factors of religion, age, income, inspiration, flexibility, popularity, pedagogy, physical materials, and curriculum materials were significantly positively associated with the music learners' motivation. In addition, this study argued that in order to enhance the music learners' motivation, music educational institutes in HCMC should pay a great attention to key factors of pedagogy, religion, popularity, and flexibility when these factors provided significant contributions to predict the music learners' motivation.

Introduction

Any of us who are committed to music and music education agree on the intellectual and cultural importance of music. Music joins languages, mathematics, science, the humanities, and the other arts disciplines both as a basic mode of thought and work and as an avenue for achievement. Because music is both an expression of civilization and a unique form of communication with its own body of knowledge and skills, music learning is fundamental to every education. Music learning not only does increase knowledge and enjoyment of music, it also

enables the student to gain fuller access to the world. It expands individual potential. (The Basic Value of Music Study 12/1999).

No human society has existed without music, and many people experience music as a crucial aspect of their everyday lives. Music offers numerous personal and social benefits, including improvements in cognitive-emotional awareness, enhanced self-regulating behavior, and enhanced social responsibility (Hargreaves and North, 1999; North *et al.*, 2004). Perhaps because

music is one of the most demanding tasks for the human central nervous system, we are affected by it and intrigued by it. (Davidson *et al.*, 2002).

Much more than entertainment, early musical training helps develop brain areas involved in language and reasoning. There is also a causal link between music and spatial intelligence (the ability to perceive the world accurately and to form mental pictures of things). A study of the arts provides children with an internal glimpse of other cultures and teaches them to be empathetic towards the people of these cultures. In music, a mistake is a mistake; the instrument is in tune or not, the notes are well played or not, the entrance is made or not. It is only by much hard work that a successful performance is possible. Through music study, students learn the value of sustained effort to achieve excellence and the concrete rewards of hard work. Music study develops skills that are necessary in the workplace. It focuses on "doing," as opposed to observing, and teaches students how to perform, literally, anywhere in the world. Employers are looking for multi-dimensional workers with the sort of flexible and supple intellects that music education helps to create as described above. In the music classroom, students can also learn to better communicate and cooperate with one another. With what all music bring us, music learning is really our best choice for improve ourselves physically and spiritually (Phillips, 2002).

Music education is not new; there are, in fact, some private music schools with small scale opened to meet mere entertainment demand of people. However, music education in Vietnam in general is not considered as fruitful field to explore; that's why the number of music schools and institutes invested seriously and

professionally are really rare. So, how to strategically and successfully develop music education that meets learners' learning motivation and what factors affect the learner's learning motivation are still unanswered questions; and that is what this study will try to address.

Literature Reviews

Music Learning Motivation

Motivation involves a constellation of beliefs, perceptions, values, interests, and actions that are all closely related. As a result, various approaches to motivation can focus on cognitive behaviors (such as monitoring and strategy use), non-cognitive aspects (such as perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes), or both. For example, Gottfried (1990) defines academic motivation as "enjoyment of school learning characterized by a mastery orientation; curiosity; persistence; task-endogeny; and the learning of challenging, difficult, and novel tasks". On the other hand, Turner (1995) considers motivation to be synonymous with cognitive engagement, which he defines as "voluntary uses of high-level self-regulated learning strategies, such as paying attention, connection, planning, and monitoring".

Music educators have long realized the importance of motivating students to achieve musically. However, few systematic attempts have been made to study the role of motivation in musical achievement. The study of motivation in music learning assumes that the way students perceive themselves and music influences how much they will strive to learn this art. Raynor (1981) has indicated that the importance of music activities to an individual is influenced by the same value sources that influence other human activity. The values students place on activities can

be identified from the reasons they cite for participating in an activity. A wide variety of reasons are typically cited, which has led to a variety of ways of viewing the determinants of student action (Parsons, 1983; Raynor, 1981).

Religion in Music Learning Motivation

Religion is to be comprehended as a language of a specific society/culture. Music, in the optic of the workshop, is conceived as “humanly organized sound” (Blacking, 1973) and body movement. Music thus can be approached as culturally specific acoustic speech, as a “total cultural language” (Fox and Feld, 1994) which seeks to express/ to speak out something where words end. Music as non-verbal religious communication acts as a social form of cultural consolation, commemoration, recollection and representation of ideas and values (Coppet and Zemp, 1979) as well as a marker of cultural and personal identity.

From the comparative perspective on cultures one can observe that music is used not only in religious adoration and worship but also in rituals of personal and collective crisis, as for instance in mourning, death and commemoration rituals. Music is also an expression of different religious identities such as religious chants and the sacred/ritual/liturgical music of diverse societies (Émile, 1898).

Age in Music Learning Motivation

As people get age, they move through different social settings in which different kinds of culture, including music, are more familiar and salient. Karl Schuessler (1948) found that the appeal of music goes up with increasing familiarity and that familiarity and preference for music was positively correlated. Isolation, in his study, usually

led to a negative judgment of music. If familiarity leads to acceptance and even possibly liking, it would make logical sense, then, that people would be more omnivorous in musical preferences as they age and become more familiar with a broad range of music. Furthermore, as people age the need to utilize music for social networking (e.g. to create more social networks) also occurs.

Education Level in Music Learning Motivation

In the late 1970s and eighties research suggested that schools were tending both to explicitly and implicitly place a higher value and status on classical music, whilst at the same time, giving popular music a prominent place on the curriculum (Vulliamy, 1977a, b; Green, 1988).

As Van Eijck (2001) discussed, studies have shown that people with higher educational levels and higher occupational status are, in fact, the most frequent visitors of museums, classical concerts, the theater, etc. (DiMaggio and Mohr, 1985; Harry, 1989; Volker, 1996). Additionally, as Skipper James (1973) found, the higher the social class, the higher the percentage of respondents preferring classical music. This seems logical as classical music has historically been associated with the upper classes.

Gender in Music Learning Motivation

Christenson and Peterson (1988) found that even with a relatively homogenous youth audience (college students) there were really two distinct cultures, a male and a female. They found that males and females use and respond to music in different ways. In fact, Dees and Vera (1978) found that the music and its characteristics appropriate for an all-male or an all-female gathering

differed. They found that compared to the background use of music for an all-female gathering, the music in the all-male gathering seemed to be less a screen for outside interference and more of a common source of unity and participation (Dees David and Vera Hernan, 1978).

Simon Frith (1987) also discussed gender differences in popular music. He noted that it is usually the boys that are less integrated into the home and family life. Hence, they are the one's more able to go out alone and to participate in the leisure culture (in this case music). Thus, they may be more "involved" in their music so to speak. Frith also concluded that music, for them, might be more meaningful than it is for females of the same age

Income in Music Learning Motivation

Whether income is a key factor determining educational attainment is a critical policy question. It matters for questions to do with equality of opportunity, for questions of child welfare and for broader questions of fairness in society. Yet, despite the existence of a large body of work on the role of income, we lack real insight into the extent to which income matters, and further if this has altered through time. Part of the reason for this is the emphasis of the academic work on detailed measurement questions. Another part is because the question is so closely linked to whether government should subsidize the education of children from lower income backgrounds (Blanden *et al.*, 2001). If income matters then increasing inequality of family incomes will translate into inequalities in children's educational outcomes. However, if the key determinants of educational outcomes are factors like innate ability, parental education and parenting styles then increased income inequality should not matter for children's

educational attainment, especially in music education. (Blanden *et al.*, 2001)

Marital Status in Music Learning Motivation

Generally, marital status is not associated with music preference. However, when it is, single adults are frequently more likely to enjoy a music genre as compared to their ever-married counterparts. Genres for which fans tend to be single are: blues, dance/electronica, rock/heavy metal, jazz, opera, rap and reggae. However, in only one case are ever-married adults more likely to report a preference for a particular type of music: country/western. Therefore, Single adults have a tendency to join in music class rather than ever-married adults. (Music Preferences in the US 1982-2002 by Genre, Demographics)

Inspiration in Music Learning Motivation

The word inspiration comes from Latin "inspirare" meaning to breathe spirit. To inspire another or to be inspired means to infuse with life; to stimulate or impel some creative or effective effort; to give life or courage to; to cheer; to exhilarate. One of the primary teaching objectives for instructors is to inspire students and to encourage and stimulate them to engage with the learning in such a way that they begin to generate their own enthusiasm. Instructors need to arrive on time, prepared and excited about the subject to be covered. Opening a class with music, movement, quotes and poems that support the lesson set a tone of enthusiasm. Instructors create an experience of community and trust when they listen openly, embrace and celebrate diversity, make time to answer questions, and build relevance between the subject and the practice of massage therapy. An

instructor who listens and speaks with an open mind and heart is a great source of inspiration for students (Smith, 2008).

Other students frequently serve as a catalyst for inspiration to fellow classmates. Meaningful stories of personal and professional experiences begin to build a sense of community. One student's ability to move beyond doubt and fear can inspire and catalyze an entire classroom. Case studies and the recounting of sessions with practice clients foster an experience of shared mission that is expressed uniquely through the contribution of each individual student. (Smith, 2008)

Flexibility in Music Learning Motivation

Flexibility has probably as many meanings as there are people thinking about it. Broadly, the notion has been equated with freedom. From the student's point of view, this represents the freedom: to learn whatever, whenever and wherever; to access information and communicate with others; to make one's own destiny by personalizing and pursuing one's knowledge interests; and not to follow someone else's prescribed learning. This freedom includes the ability to access continuing education while in the workforce (Koppi *et al.*, 2006).

From the teacher's point of view, the notion of flexibility may acknowledge student freedoms (or at least the desires for the realization of these freedoms) but is also constrained by the rewards, values and aspirations of the academic culture to which most teachers probably subscribe. These constraints may be fundamentally determined by the need to enroll students and provide them with structured learning programs that can be managed and assessed. (Koppi *et al.*, 2006)

Popularity in Music Learning Motivation

The task of defining popular music has always been difficult. Some researchers have tried to define it for what it is, for example: "music for common people" (Middleton, 1990); "mass art" (Denisoff and Levine, 1972); "standardized" (Adorno, 1941); and for what it is not, for example: not "art or folk" (Tagg, 1982). Others have tried to define it politically (Attali, 1985) and historically (Simmel, 1968). Many cultural theorists have found that popular music defies precise definition and origination. Shuker (1994) suggested that the term popular meant "of the ordinary people" and was first linked with music in a published title in 1855, William Chapple's "Popular Music of the Olden Times." Shuker conceded that popular music encompasses both musical and socio-economic characteristics because it "consists of a hybrid of musical traditions, styles, and influences and is an economic product which is invested with ideological significance by many of its consumers" (Shuker, 1994).

Critical pedagogy in Music Learning Motivation

Music education is a conversation. Students and their teachers pose problems and solve problems together. In music classrooms, this means composing and improvising music in styles consistent with who the students are and the contexts in which they live.

Music education broadens the student's view of reality. For CPME, the goal of music teaching and music learning is to affect a change in the way that both students and their teachers perceive the world. In this model, students and their teachers view the world through the lens of the urban

experience and the music that defines that experience.

Music education is empowering. When students and their teacher “know that they know,” one can claim that the phenomenon of “conscientization” has occurred. Conscientization (Freire, 1970) implies a knowing that has depth and goes beyond the recall of information and includes understanding and the ability to act on the learning in such a way as to affect a change. In this view, music is conceived as a verb of power (Schmidt, 2002). It evokes critical action (Regelski, 2004) and critical feeling by engaging students in musical activities that are both significant and consistent with what musicians do when they are making music.

Music education is transformative. For those teaching a CPME approach, music learning takes place when both the teachers and the students can acknowledge a change in perception. It is this change or transformation that teachers can assess.

Music education is political. There are issues of power and control inside the music classroom, inside the school building, and inside the community. Those in power make decisions about what is taught, how often classes meet, how much money is allocated to each school subject or program, and so forth. Those who teach the CPME model resist the constraints that those in power place on them. They do this first in their own classroom by acknowledging that children come to class with knowledge from the outside world and, as such, that their knowledge needs to be honored and valued.

Learning Environment in Music Learning Motivation

Learning environments in schools typically involve one or more adult teachers

connected with a number of students, usually in well-defined physical settings. These people interact and form a variety of relationships, creating what Salomon (1994) calls "a system of interrelated factors that jointly affect learning in interaction with (but separately from) relevant individual and cultural differences". This is what Wubbels *et al.* (1991) term the “relationship dimension” in learning environments at school.

The learning environment has a physical as well as a relationship dimension. Physically it may be in a room, full of particular furniture and equipment. Curriculum materials such as books and videotapes may also be present. The curriculum also has a place in the relationship dimension of the environment in that the students and teacher(s) are focused on certain processes and content in the curriculum and have a relationship with that curriculum and the methodologies that are associated with conveying the curriculum. Students and teachers may have very different relationships with different components of the curriculum (Newhouse *et al.*, 2002).

With the mentioned about literature reviews related to factors affecting music learning motivation, this study takes the following keys variables into the consideration, which include demographic factors (religion, education level, age, gender, income, marital status); teaching method (inspiration; flexibility; popularity; critical pedagogy); and learning environment. In order to find out what factors affecting music learning motivation, the hypotheses are stated as follows:

H1: Factors of sociology, demography, teaching method, and learning environment are hypothesized to be positively

associated with learners' music learning motivation.

H2: Learners' music learning motivation is well explained and predicted by factors of sociology, demography, teaching method, and learning environment.

Methodology

This Study mainly focus on music learning motivation. Therefore, the quantitative approach was the major method applied in this study. This means that this research based on questionnaire survey in which data were directly and conveniently collected from sample size of 350 respondents at six music educational institutes in Ho Chi Minh City. The major research objective was to identify the factors affecting music learning motivation. The respondents were asked to rate to which extent they agreed with the statement related to music learning motivation and other related factors. As a

result, most of measures of this study were based on a five point Likert scale in which 1 is "strongly disagree" and 5 is "strongly agree".

Dependent variable of learning motivation

Regarding the variable of music learning motivation, this measure consisted of 10 items, as shown in Table 1, was developed by adopting from previous researchers (Gottfried, 1990; Turner, 1995; Parsons, 1983; Raynor, 1981; Scheirer and Kraut 1979; Covington, 1983; Greenburg, 1970; Michel and Farrell, 1973; Nolin and Vander Ark, 1977; Vander Ark *et al.*, 1980; Wink, 1970; Wolff, 1978; Lindsay and Norman 1972; Renshaw, 2004; Holland Bernard, 2004). The item 3 "Music education brings people lots of benefits physically and spiritually" was added by researcher as it was considered important in the field of music education.

Table.1 Dependent variable of music learning motivation

Construct	Items	(Cronbach's alpha = .779; N=350)
Music learning motivation	1.	Music is very important and cannot be lack of in our lives.
	2.	For children, music plays a key role in the moral, as well as aesthetic formation of human virtue, character, and sensibility.
	3.	Music education brings people lots of benefits physically and spiritually.
	4.	Everybody should be motivated to learn music.
	5.	Motivating people to learn music is by affecting their beliefs, perceptions, values, interests, and actions.
	6.	Music education is necessary.
	7.	Music should be part of school curriculum.
	8.	Music enhances the quality and meaning of people's lives as well as enriches the musical life of society as a whole.
	9.	Music plays an important role in shaping children's characteristics.
	10.	Music, particularly classical music, upgrades people's value to a higher level, shows their wide knowledge as well as asserts their social position in collective environment.

The reliability test of this measure showed a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .779. This value was quite high, above .60, so it could be concluded that these items were internally consistent and measured the same thing.

Table 2.Summary of dependent variable with reliability coefficient

	Given Names	Number of Items	Alpha
Factors 1	Music Learning Motivation (MULEMO)	11	.779

Table.3 Summary of dependent and independent variables with reliability coefficients

	Given Names	Number of Items	Alpha
Factors 1	Religion in Music Learning Motivation (RELIGION)	4	.822
Factors 2	Age in Music Learning Motivation (AGE)	5	.610
Factors 3	Income in Music Learning Motivation (INCOME)	4	.656
Factors 4	Inspiration in Music Learning Motivation (INSPIRATION)	5	.711
Factors 5	Flexibility in Music Learning Motivation (FLEXIBILITY)	3	.732
Factors 6	Popularity in Music Learning Motivation (POPULARITY)	2	.643
Factors 7	Critical Pedagogy in Music Learning Motivation (PEDAGOGY)	3	.675
Factors 8	Physical Materials in Music Learning Motivation (PHYMAT)	3	.578
Factors 9	Curriculum Materials in Music Learning Motivation (CURMAT)	3	.604

The present three factor model and six factor model of this study were deemed the best solution because of this conceptual clarity and ease of interpretability.

The two exploratory factory analyses using the principle component extraction method, varimax rotation related to factor affecting music learning motivation were conducted on a sample of 350 people who are learning in music schools in Ho Chi Minh City. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .733 for demographic group and .750 for teaching method and learning environment group of independent variables (according to Pallant (2005), to be significant, the value has to be .60 or above) indicating that the present data were suitable for the principle components analysis. Similarly, Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($p < .001$), indicating sufficient correlation between the variables to proceed with the analysis (Bartlett *et al.*, 2001).

Using the Kaser-Guttman retention criterion of Eigenvalue greater than 1.0, for the

demographic group, factor one explains 23.4 percent, factor two explains 14.1 percent and factor three explains 10.9 percent. The Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .610 to .822, indicating good subscale reliability. For teaching method and learning environment group, factor one explains 22.1 percent, factor two explains 9 percent, factor three explains 8.2 percent, factor four explains 7.3 percent, factor five explains 6.2 percent and factor six explains 5.4 percent. The Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .578 to .732, indicating good subscale reliability (Cronbach, 1951).

Result and Discussion

Profile of Respondents involved in the Study

Profiles of Respondents (N=350) is given in Table 4.

Table.4 Profiles of Respondents (N=350)

	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
- Male	143	40.9
- Female	207	59.1
Total	350	100.0
Marital Status		
- Single	252	72
- Married	98	28
Total	350	100.0
Monthly Income		
- 0 - 5 million	50	14.3
- 5 – 10 million	150	42.9
- 10 – 15 million	82	23.4
- 15 – 20 million	62	17.7
- More than 20 million	6	1.7
Total	350	100.0
Age		
- 18 - 22	186	53.1
- 23 – 30	120	34.3
- 31 – 45	37	10.6
- 46 - 65	7	2.0
- Greater than 65	0	0
Total	350	100.0
Education Level		
- High School	0	0
- Vocational School	6	1.7
- College	124	35.4
- University	198	56.6
- Postgraduate	22	6.3
Total	350	100.0

Factor affecting Music Learning Motivation

Table 3 shows that there were significant relationships between the dependent variable, MULEMO, and the all independent variables, RELIGION, AGE, INCOME, INSPIRATION, FLEXIBILITY, POOPULARITY, PEDAGOGY, PHYMAT, CURMAT. Among the significant relationships, the MULEMO was modestly

correlated with the CURMAT ($r=.096$, $p<.05$); PHYMAT ($r=.129$, $p<.01$); INCOME ($r=.151$, $p<.01$); AGE ($r=.274$, $p<.01$), and moderately correlation with the INSPIRATION ($r=.310$, $p<.01$); FLEXIBILITY ($r=.345$, $p<.01$); POPULARITY ($r=.366$, $p<.01$); RELIGION ($r=.385$, $p<.01$); PEDAGOGY ($r=.497$, $p<.01$)

Table.5 Descriptions and variables' Correlation of the MULEMO Model

	MULEMO	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. RELIGION	.385**	1.00							
2. AGE	.274**	.239**	1.00						
3. INCOME	.151**	.149**	.245**	1.00					
4. POPULARITY	.366**	.238**	.209**	.100*	1.00				
5. PHYSIMAT	.129**	.096*	.130**	.120*	.138**	1.00			
6. PEDAGOGY	.497**	.283**	.286**	.164**	.384**	.173**	1.00		
7. CURIMAT	.096*	.081	.148**	.188**	.086	.144**	.213**	1.00	
8. FLEXIBILITY	.345**	.146**	.235**	.163**	.253**	.142**	.413**	.217**	1.00
9. INSPIRATION	.310**	.197**	.254**	.096**	.236**	.138**	.369**	.173**	.457**
Mean	38.81	14.81	19.37	14.62	7.28	9.89	11.84	11.73	12.53
SD	5.56	3.13	3.05	2.99	1.61	2.56	1.87	2.11	1.82

Note: * significant level at p<.05, ** significant level at p<.01

Table.6 Coefficients between Independent Variables and MULEMO

Variables	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	Sig.	Correlation (Part)
RELIGION	.394	.000	.207
AGE	.117	.178	.059
INCOME	.042	.624	.201
INSPIRATION	.114	.257	.049
FLEXIBILITY	.361	.023	.099
POPULARITY	.485	.004	.127
PEDAGOGY	.881	.000	.243
PHYMAT	.018	.849	.008
CURMAT	-.126	.295	-.045

Note: - Dependent Variable: MULEMO: Music Learning Motivation

- Predictors: RELIGION, AGE, INCOME, INSPIRATION, FLEXIBILITY, POOPULARITY, PEDAGOGY, PHYMAT, CURMAT

- ANOVA: F (9, 349) = 21.268, Sig. = 000, p<.0005 - Model Summary: R² = .360

The model was statistically significant at p<.0005 with F (9,349) = 21.268 and had an R squared value of .360, which explains 36 percent of the variance in the MULEMO. This indicates that, as a whole, all of the independent variables contributed to explaining 36 percent of the variance of the MULEMO.

Factor well explaining and predicting Music Learning Motivation

The Table 4 shows that among nine factors, there are four important factors,

PEDAGOGY, RELIGION, POPULARITY, and FLEXIBILITY, were significant in making a unique contribution to the prediction of the MULEMO and contributed positive scores to the MULEMO. This means that 1-standard deviation increase in the PEDAGOGY, RELIGION, POPULARITY, and FLEXIBILITY is associated with an increase of the score of the MULEMO equal to the amount of the coefficient in front of it, while others factors are controlled for. In this case, every 1-standard deviation increase in the

PEDAGOGY, RELIGION, POPULARITY, and FLEXIBILITY will yield an increase of score of .881, .394, .485, .361, respectively, in the MULEMO while other variables are kept as constants.

It was concluded that 36 percent of the variance in the MULEMO could be explained by RELIGION, AGE, INCOME, INSPIRATION, FLEXIBILITY, POPULARITY, PEDAGOGY, PHYMAT, and CURMAT as independent variables of the model, and the MULEMO was mainly affected by four important predictors: the PEDAGOGY ($\beta = .881, p < .005$); RELIGION ($\beta = .394, p < .005$); POPULARITY ($\beta = .485, p < .005$); and FLEXIBILITY ($\beta = .361, p < .05$).

Implications of Study

This study found that factors of PEDAGOGY, RELIGION, POPULARITY, and FLEXIBILITY significantly affect Music Learning Motivation and have important implication for enhancing music education in Ho Chi Minh City particularly and in Vietnam in general.

Practical Implications and Contributions

The practical implications to be drawn from this study have to do with the manner in which managers should face the future of their management. First, the findings of this study, based on the significant correlations between the independent and dependent variables, suggest that in order to encourage music learning, a music school should: 1) develop and broaden religious music program to meet the demand of using music for worship, religious practices etc.; 2) Any period of age, people will respond to music in different way; but a certain thing that the high level of age is associated with the high level of music learning motivation.

Therefore, music programs for people who in difference of age are necessary to develop further; 3) Income is always a problem and starting point of many obstacles, people will get more difficulties to pursue their dream without money. So, in order to help people do their dream as well as bring music closely to people in different social classes, it is essential to govern supporting policies in terms of finance for students who love to learn music.

This is possible for music schools which aims for value bringing to students; because the real profit is what the customers achieve; 4) in term of teaching method, inspiration should be consider as an important factor to motivate music learning. The nature of music is an inspiration, without it, people get nothing. This makes music different from other subject. In fact, all of subjects are considered to be inspired to get good score or something like that; that means the pressure itself makes us to learn or will get bad results. Conversely, music and pressure are not going along with each other, the inspiration herein must be from the bottom of the heart, that is why it is said that music can bridge every heart over the world without words. As a music teacher, inspiration should be generated during the class is very important. It is not something very large or abstract, but comes from the simplest things such as a song, poem, a story related to music, especially let the students themselves feel what benefit music bring to their life. At the end of class, students come back home with a fresh, leisure, and good mood and expect to the next class soon, this is the main purpose of any real music teacher.

The factor number 5) flexibility is also an important dimension for music learning motivation that music teachers should pay attention. Teachers should understand what

their students need, what their strong points, weak points are etc., so they will know ways to approach any students. Music learning is not a duty like mathematics or physics in which students forced to follow their teachers, but a combination between teachers and students to achieve goals together. It is required experience as well as educational psychology to make “flexibility” significant; 6) popularity should also be considered in teaching method. How to make music, especially academic music, common to people? How to make people think that music is for ordinary human-being, not only for pianist, drummer, piper etc., who are specialists, professors in music? It is whether classical music is not to subliminal to feel and understand as people always thought. Researcher mention so much about classical music because this kind of music is the fundamental as well as the cradle of all kind of music, we cannot learn contemporary music without mentioning classical music. Therefore, things to change people’s attitude on classical music is very important to encourage them come to music. As a manager, it is vital to launch campaigns to bring people to academic music through exhibits, concerts, commercials etc., when people are familiar and love to classical music; they will know what to do next. Besides, in terms of teaching method, students should be taught in popular way so that everyone can learn music easily. Our target aims for common people, not specialist or professors, so adjusting the “popularity” teaching method is necessary to motivate music learning; 7) the most important factor for music learning motivation is critical pedagogy in music teaching. Any subjects are required critical pedagogies in order to make students understand lessons the best. In terms of music education, critical pedagogy is a postmodern teaching model that views

teaching and learning as a conversation among teachers and their students (Abrahams, 2005). A critical pedagogy approach seeks to break down the barriers that exist between the music students hear and love outside the classroom, with the music their teachers want them to learn. There are several key principles define critical pedagogy for music education which teachers should follow: a) music education is a conversation, that means students and their teachers pose problems and solve problems together. In music classrooms, this means composing and improvising music in styles consistent with who the students are and the contexts in which they live; b) music education broadens the student’s view of reality. For music schools, the goal of music teaching and music learning is to affect a change in the way that both students and their teachers perceive the world. In this model, students and their teachers view the world through the lens of the urban experience and the music that defines that experience; c) music education is transformative, that means music learning takes place when both the teachers and the students can acknowledge a change in perception. It is this change or transformation that teachers can assess. These key principles are quite abstract to follow; however, in the easier way, teachers need to turn their classes to be spaces for music stories, music conversations and this will lead student a correct way to feel.

The last two factors are related to learning environment such as 7) physical materials and 8) curriculum materials. It is not refused that they are not only important factors to motivate people learn music, but also advantageousness which differentiates among other music schools. For physical materials such as infrastructure, classrooms, light, and instruments etc., these things contribute to make professional

environments for student to learn. Therefore, the rooms should be clean, tidy, bright and music-like; instruments should be updated and regularly maintenance. On the other hand, the quality of music schools is also displayed through curriculum materials such as staff, teachers, textbooks, and teaching methods, etc.. If physical materials ensure productive learning environment, curriculum materials help student achieve best results for music learning. So, music schools should pay more attention to both physical and curriculum materials for a stable development.

Theoretical Implications

In terms of determinants of music learning motivation, the significant model for measuring the music learning motivation of this study shows that the determinants of religion in music learning motivation, flexibility in music learning motivation, popularity in music learning motivation, and critical pedagogy in music learning motivation provide significant contributions in predicting the music learning motivation. Other determinants of music learning motivation, even though having positively significant correlation with the music learning motivation, but did not provide significant power to predict the music learning motivation. This can be explained that there are some overlapping and confusion between items affecting the validity of all construct of the study as discussed in the limitation section of this study. It is concluded that the music learning motivation model of this study is substantially supported by the literature and setting an initial step for measuring the music learning motivation with a more comprehensive model. There is a great potential to develop the model to be a perfect one with more specific items and higher validity that theoretically contributes

to the development of the theory of music learning motivation as mentioned in the section of suggestions for future research of this thesis.

Furthermore, this study provides a comprehensive research methodology that has been developed and that can be used in the study of any identifying determinants of other subjects' learning motivation. Researchers may utilize this methodology for future studies.

Finally, one of the objectives of this study was to apply music learning motivation model to the music education context with a more comprehensive conceptual framework drawn from the literature on music learning motivation and to provide a better understanding of enhancing and developing music education in Ho Chi Minh City and generally in Vietnam.

Research implication

This study makes an effort to identify the determinants which affect music learning motivation for enhancing music education in Vietnam. All of the variables were drawn from the literatures on music learning motivation by various researchers for further study. In addition, this study uses multivariate analysis to empirically substantiate the linkages between the determinants and music learning motivation.

From the results of this study, there is evidence that all of the determinants of music learning motivation identified from the theoretical and empirical literatures on music learning motivation were significantly associated with the music learning motivation. In terms of correlation, this study is supported by literatures with four out of nine independent variables in the model have positively strong and significant

relationships with the music learning motivation at the 99 percent confident level, namely, religion in music learning motivation; flexibility in music learning motivation; popularity in music learning motivation; and critical pedagogy in music learning motivation.

Conclusion

All the objectives of this study have been successfully obtained: firstly to identify the factors affecting of music learning motivation in the context of music education in Vietnam. Secondly to build, and put the music learning motivation model into practice with empirical research and hypothesis testing. The results will contribute to asserting factors affecting music learning motivation and making them more applicable in the field of music education. And thirdly provide development suggestions based on the empirical research findings and the scientific framework of the research for enhancing contemporary music in Vietnam.

In terms of significant relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable regarding music learning motivation, bivariate correlations and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were employed to explore the relationships and the strength of the relationship between each independent variables and the dependent variable of music learning motivation of the study.

The implications of this study focus on providing evidence that all of the objectives of the study were successfully obtained with both theoretical and practical contributions to the field of music education. Although this study is considered as an initiation to measuring music learning motivation in Vietnam, the results showed that all factors had a positive relationship with music learning motivation in this study for many

reasons mentioned in this chapter. The question is whether these entire factors really affect music learning motivation, or whether there is any factor that does not support the results due insufficient sample size, or lack of factor, or so on. Future research should test the model with more meaningful statements for each factor or determinant of music learning motivation. Importantly this study shows that there is great potential for successfully building a more comprehensive model for measuring music learning motivation.

References

- Abrahams, F. 2005. Critical pedagogy for music education editorial. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 6.
- Adorno, T.W. 1941. On popular music. *Study in Phylosophy and Social Sciences*, 9: 17–48.
- Attali, J. 1985. *Noise: The political economic of music*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bartlett, James E., Kotrlik, Joe W. and Higgins, Chadwick C., 2001. Organizational research: determining appropriate sample size. *Survey Research Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 19(1): 43–50.
- Blacking, J. 1973. *How musical is man?* Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Blanden, J., Gregg, P., Goodman, A., Machin, S. 2001. Changes in intergenerational mobility in Britain, Centre for Economic Performance Discussion Paper 517, forthcoming in M. Corak (Ed.) *Generational Income Mobility*, Cambridge University Press.
- Christenson, P., Peterson, J.B. 1988. Genre and gender in the structure of music preferences. *Communication Research*, 15 (3): 282–301.

- Coppet, D., Zemp, H. 1979, *AréAré. Unpeuplélanésien et samusique*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Covington, M.V. 1983. Musical chairs: who drops out of music instruction and why? In K. Dean (Ed.), *Documentary report of the Ann Arbor Symposium in the application of psychology to the teaching of and learning of music: Session III motivation and creativity*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Cronbach, L.J. 1951. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Davidson J.W., Borthwick, S.J. 2002. Family dynamics and family scripts: a case study of musical development. *Psychology of music*, 30: 121-136.
- Dees David, R., Vera Hernan, 1978. Soundtracking everyday life: the use of music in redefining situations. *Sociological Inquiry*, 48(2): 133-141.
- Denisoff, R.S., Levine, M.H. 1972. Youth and popular music: a test of the taste culture hypothesis. *Youth and Society*, 4: 237-255.
- DiMaggio, P., Mohr, J. 1985. Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection. *Am. J. Sociol.*, 90: 1231-61.
- Émile, D. 1898. Zur definition religiöserphänomene. In J. Matthes (Hg), *Religion und Gesellschaft Bd. 1*, Hamburg: Rowohlt (org. 1898, *De la Définition des Phénomènes Religieux*. In *L'Année Sociologique. Première Partie*).
- Fox, A.A., Feld, S. 1994. Music and language. In *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 23, Pp. 25-53.
- Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum, New York.
- Gottfried A.E. 1990. *Academic intrinsic motivation in young elementary school children. Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(3): 525-538.
- Green, L. 1988. Music on deaf ears: musical meaning, ideology and education. Manchester University Press, Manchester, New York.
- Greenburg, M. 1970. Musical achievement and the self- concept. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 18: 57-64.
- Hargreaves, D.J., North, A.C. 1999. The functions of music in everyday life: Redefining the social in music psychology. *Psychology of Music*, 27: 71-83.
- Harry, G. 1989. Cultural participation in the Netherlands. Van Gorcum.
- Holland Bernard, 2004. When love can't be learned. *International Herald Tribune*, January 28, p.10; reprinted and retitled from *Why you can't learn to love it*, *The New York Times*, January 25, 2004.
- Karl Schuessler, 1948. Social background and musical taste. *American Sociological Review*, 13: 330-35.
- Koppi, A.J., Chaloupka, M.J., Llewellyn, R., Cheney, G., Clark, S., Fenton-Kerr, T. 2006. Academic culture, flexibility And the national teaching and learning database. *New Technologies in Teaching and Learning*, University of Sydney, Australia.
- Lindsay, P.H., Norman, D.A. 1972. *Human information processing: an introduction to psychology*, Academic Press, New York.
- Michel, D.E., Farrell, D.M. 1973. Music and self- esteem: Disadvantaged problem boys in an all-black elementary school. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 21: 80-84.
- Middleton, R. 1990. *Studying popular music*. Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
- Music Preferences in the US, 1982-2002 (by genre, demographics) from

- <http://www.emo.org/Publish/document/45/AppendixIMusicPreferences.pdf>
Music Preferences of U.S. Adult Population, 2008. Survey of public participation in the arts, Office of Research and Analysis, National Endowment for the Arts, June 2009.
- Newhouse, C.P., Trinidad, S., Clarkson, B. 2002. Quality pedagogy and effective learning with information and communications technologies (ICT): a review of the literature. A Teacher Professional ICT Attributes Framework – Outcomes, Guidelines, Equipment and Processes. Specialist Educational Services, Perth, Western Australia.
- Nolin, W.H., Vander Ark, S.D. 1977. A pilot study of patterns of attitudes toward school music experiences, self-esteem, and socio-economic status in elementary and junior high students. *Contributions to Music Education*, 5: 31–46.
- North, A.C., Hargreaves, D.J., Hargreaves, J.J. 2004. Uses of music in everyday life. *Music Perception, Fall*, 22(1): 41–77.
- Pallant, J. 2005. SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using SPSS version 12 (2nd edn). Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Parsons, J.E. 1983. Children's motivation to study music. In: Motivation and creativity. Music Educators National Conference, Reston, VA.
- Phillips, C. 2002. Twelve benefits of music education. Online: <http://www.childrensmusicworkshop.com/advocacy/12benefits.html>
- Raynor, J.O. 1981. Response. In: documentary report of the Ann Arbor symposium: National symposium on the applications of psychology to the teaching and learning of music. Music Educators National Conference, Reston, VA.
- Regelski, T.A. 2004. Teaching general music in grades 4 - 8: A musicianship approach. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Renshaw, P. 2004. Musical Futures. Best musical practice in non-formal learning contexts. Paul Hamlyn Foundation, London.
- Salomon, G. 1994. Differences in patterns: Studying computer enhanced learning environments. In: S. Vosniadou and E. DeCorte and H. Mandl (Eds.), Technology-based learning environments, Pp. 79–88. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg.
- Scheirer, M.A., Kraut, R.E. 1979. Increasing educational achievement via self-concept change. *Review of Educational Research*, 49: 131–150.
- Schmidt, P. 2002. Looking for a broader road: College music education curriculum through social lenses. Paper presented at the Mayday Group, Columbus, OH.
- Shuker, R. 1994. Understanding popular music. Routledge, New York.
- Simmel, G. 1968. The conflict in modern culture and other essays. Teacher College Press, New York.
- Simon Frith 1987. Towards an aesthetic of popular music. In music and society: the politics of consumption, performance, and reception (Eds. Richard Leppert and Susan McClary) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skipper James K., Jr. 1973. How popular is popular music? youth and diversification of musical preferences. *Popular Music and Society*, 2(3): 145–154.
- Smith, C.E. 2008. The role of motivation and inspiration in learning, from <http://www.bti.edu/articles/pdfs/Smith>

- _Role-of-Inspiration-and-motiviation.pdf
- Tagg, P. 1982. Analysing popular music. *Popular Music*, 2: 37–67.
- The Basic Value of Music Study - Ideas for Spreading the Word, National Association of Schools of Music, 12/1999.
- Turner, J.C. 1995. The influence of classroom contexts on young children's motivation for literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(3): 410–441.
- Van Eijck, 2001. Social differentiation in musical taste patterns. *Social Forces*, 79(3): 1163–1184.
- Vander Ark, S.D., Nolin, W.H., Newman, I. 1980. Relationship between musical attitudes, self-esteem, social status, and grade level of elementary children. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 62: 31–41.
- Volker, V. 1996. Museum visitors and non-visitors in germany: arepresentative survey. *Poetics*, 24: 239–258.
- Vulliamy G. 1977b. *Music as a case study in "The new sociology of education"*. In: J. Shepherd, P. Virden, T. Wishart, and G. Vulliamy (Eds.), *Whose Music: A Sociology of Music Language*. London: Latimer New Dimensions.
- Vulliamy, G. 1977a. Music and the mass culture debate. In: J. Shepherd, P. Virden, T. Wishart, and G. Vulliamy (Eds.), *Whose Music: A Sociology of Music Language*. London: Latimer New Dimensions.
- Wink, R.L. 1970. The relationship of self-concept and selected personality variables to achievement in music student teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 18: 234–241.
- Wolff, K. 1978. The nonmusical outcomes of music education: A review of the literature. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 55: 1–27.
- Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., Hooymayers, H. 1991. Interpersonal teacher behavior in the classroom. In: B. J. Fraser & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational environments*. Pergamon Press, Oxford. Pp. 141–160.