

Article

The Intersection of Music Learning, Artificial Intelligence, and Occupational Health: A Job Demands-Resources Analysis of Technostress, Burnout, and Engagement Among Music Students

Tiange Zhou 

School of Future Design, Beijing Normal University, Zhuhai 519087, China; tiangezhoumusic@gmail.com

Abstract

This study applies Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory to music student psychology, with particular attention to the differentiated impacts of artificial intelligence across music student subgroups. Background: Music education requires intensive cognitive, motor, emotional, and social training. Methods: Employing a narrative literature review and conceptual framework approach, this paper draws on JD-R theory, technostress research, and cross-cultural scholarship to identify demands and resources in music education and examine their relationships with burnout and engagement. Results: Seven demands: technical, physical, temporal, performance, social-emotional, technostress, cultural identity. Resources: teacher support, peer collaboration, instruments, AI tools, curricula, and intrinsic motivation. Critically, AI-related demands and resources differ substantially across subgroups: composers face direct demand shocks (job displacement) and resource opportunities (creative augmentation) that vary by career stage, while performers experience more indirect impacts through recording market disruption and emerging self-media opportunities. Singers face a unique paradox whereby AI voice cloning creates short-term recording opportunities while potentially enabling long-term vocal replacement. Cultural identity demands arise from heritage-Western tensions in East Asia. Conclusions: This JD-R framework provides a nuanced lens for understanding music students' well-being that accounts for subgroup-specific vulnerabilities and opportunities.

Keywords: Job Demands-Resources; music education; technostress; cultural identity; burnout; engagement; AI differentiation; music student subgroups



Academic Editors: Wai-Chung Ho
and Siu Hang Eric Kong

Received: 28 April 2026

Revised: 28 June 2026

Accepted: 2 July 2026

Published: 12 July 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author.

Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

1. Introduction

Music education represents one of the most demanding forms of learning, requiring years of intensive training that combines cognitive, motor, emotional, and social dimensions (Ericsson et al., 1993). Unlike many academic disciplines, music learning involves public performance evaluation, physical manipulation of instruments, and constant exposure to aesthetic judgment, creating a unique psychological environment that differs substantially from traditional educational contexts. Despite the widespread prevalence of music education worldwide, from conservatory training to community music programs, the psychological well-being of music learners has received insufficient theoretical attention from occupational health perspectives.

The psychological challenges of music learning have been documented across multiple dimensions. Performance anxiety affects a substantial proportion of music students, with some estimates suggesting that up to 50% of professional musicians experience

performance-related anxiety severe enough to impair their functioning (Kenny & Ackermann, 2011). Beyond performance anxiety, music students face physical demands, including repetitive strain injuries, postural problems, and embouchure disorders that can compromise their health and career sustainability (Wristen, 2013).

While these challenges are well-recognized in the music education literature, theoretical frameworks for understanding how these various demands interact to affect student outcomes remain underdeveloped. Most existing research has examined individual stressors in isolation, rather than considering the systemic interactions between multiple demands and resources that shape psychological outcomes. This fragmented approach limits both theoretical understanding and practical intervention strategies.

The contemporary landscape of music education is undergoing a profound transformation driven by both artificial intelligence technologies and globalization forces. AI-powered tools are increasingly integrated into music learning environments, from intelligent practice assistants and automated feedback systems to AI-composed music and algorithmic recommendation engines (Herremans et al., 2017). Simultaneously, the globalization of music education has created unprecedented cross-cultural exchanges, where students from diverse musical traditions navigate the dominance of Western classical music frameworks while maintaining their cultural identities (Kallio, 2020). This dual transformation creates both unprecedented opportunities and novel challenges for music students.

The intersection of cultural context and music education deserves particular attention in contemporary theoretical frameworks. Music learning does not occur in a cultural vacuum; rather, it is deeply embedded in cultural systems that shape what instruments students choose, what repertoire they study, what performance practices they adopt, and how they understand their identities as musicians (Ho & Law, 2006). In many parts of the world, particularly in East Asia, music education involves navigating between Western classical music traditions—which often carry perceived prestige and educational value—and rich heritage musical traditions, including Chinese classical music, Cantonese opera, Taiwanese folk music, and various regional folk traditions (Ho & Law, 2006). This cultural negotiation creates additional psychological demands that interact with the technical, physical, and performance demands characteristic of music training.

Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory offers a promising theoretical lens for this integration (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Demerouti et al., 2001). Originally developed in occupational health psychology to explain employee burnout and engagement, JD-R theory posits that job characteristics can be categorized as either demands (physical, psychological, organizational aspects requiring sustained effort) or resources (aspects that facilitate goal achievement, reduce demands, or stimulate personal growth). The theory proposes two competing processes: a health impairment process whereby high demands combined with insufficient resources lead to burnout, and a motivational process whereby abundant resources promote work engagement.

The extension of JD-R theory to music education is particularly timely given the emergence of technostress as a significant construct in occupational health research. Technostress refers to the stress experienced by individuals who are compelled to adapt to new technologies in their work or learning environments (Tarafdar et al., 2007). Research has identified multiple dimensions of technostress, including techno-overload (feeling compelled to work faster due to technology), techno-invasion (technology blurring boundaries between work and personal life), techno-complexity (difficulty understanding and using technology), techno-insecurity (fear of being replaced by technology), and techno-uncertainty (continual technology changes creating instability).

The purpose of this paper is to develop a comprehensive theoretical framework applying JD-R theory to music education contexts, examining how specific demands and

resources characteristic of music training—including AI-related stressors and resources as well as cultural identity negotiations—predict burnout, technostress, and engagement outcomes among music students. This analysis proceeds in several stages. First, the paper establishes the theoretical foundations by reviewing JD-R theory, its extensions to educational contexts, technostress research, Self-Determination Theory, and cross-cultural considerations in music education. Second, the paper analyzes specific demands in music learning, including technical, physical, temporal, performance, social-emotional, technostress, and cultural identity demands. Third, the paper examines specific resources including teacher support, peer relationships, material resources, intrinsic motivation, feedback systems, and AI-powered tools. Fourth, the paper synthesizes these elements into an integrated JD-R model specific to music education in the AI era.

Methodological Approach

This paper adopts a narrative literature review methodology combined with conceptual framework development. Unlike systematic reviews that follow prescriptive search protocols and inclusion criteria (e.g., PRISMA guidelines), narrative reviews provide a comprehensive, critical, and interpretive synthesis of existing literature organized around theoretical themes (Grant & Booth, 2009). This approach is particularly appropriate for the present study for several reasons. First, the research question—how JD-R theory can be extended to encompass AI-related and cultural identity demands in music education—is inherently exploratory and integrative, requiring the synthesis of literature from multiple disciplinary domains (occupational health psychology, music education, technology studies, and cross-cultural research) that employ diverse methodologies. Second, the rapidly evolving nature of AI in music education means that the evidence base is nascent and heterogeneous, making strict systematic review criteria prematurely restrictive. Third, the primary aim is theory development rather than effect-size estimation, which aligns with the conceptual orientation of narrative review methodology (Paré et al., 2015).

The literature search was conducted across multiple databases (PsycINFO, Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar) using combinations of terms including “music education AND burnout,” “technostress AND creative professions,” “AI AND music composition,” “AI AND music performance,” “cultural identity AND music learning,” and “Job Demands-Resources AND students.” Sources were prioritized according to quality hierarchies: peer-reviewed journal articles and authoritative institutional reports were given precedence over industry reports and media commentary. The review encompasses literature published primarily from 2000 to 2026, with seminal earlier works included where foundational. Importantly, this paper does not claim to provide an exhaustive enumeration of all relevant studies; rather, it aims to identify the key constructs, relationships, and mechanisms that constitute a theoretically coherent JD-R framework for music education in the AI era.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Job Demands-Resources Theory: Core Principles

Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory represents one of the most influential and empirically validated frameworks in contemporary occupational health psychology (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Bakker et al., 2014). The theory provides a comprehensive model for understanding how working conditions affect employee well-being, offering explanatory mechanisms for both negative outcomes (burnout) and positive outcomes (engagement). At its core, JD-R theory classifies all working conditions into two broad categories: job demands and job resources.

The theoretical mechanism underlying JD-R theory involves two distinct but complementary processes. The health impairment process proposes that high job demands deplete

employees' psychological and physical resources, leading to exhaustion and burnout over time. When demands exceed an employee's capacity to cope, the strain accumulation results in energy depletion, characterized by emotional exhaustion, physical fatigue, and cognitive overload.

One of the key strengths of JD-R theory is its flexibility in accommodating diverse types of demands and resources across different occupational contexts. The theory does not prescribe a fixed list of demands and resources; rather, it provides a conceptual framework that researchers can operationalize for specific work environments. This adaptability has enabled JD-R theory to be successfully applied across a wide range of occupational settings, from healthcare to education to manufacturing.

2.2. Extensions to Educational Contexts

The application of JD-R theory to educational contexts represents a significant extension of the original framework, recognizing that students face demands analogous to employees and require resources to support their learning and well-being (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Students encounter academic demands including coursework load, examination pressure, time constraints, and performance expectations that require sustained cognitive effort and can deplete psychological resources. Simultaneously, students require educational resources including teacher support, learning materials, feedback, peer collaboration, and institutional resources to facilitate their academic engagement and success.

Research applying the JD-R theory to educational settings has demonstrated consistent patterns matching those found in occupational research. Studies have shown that academic demands predict burnout symptoms, including exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced academic efficacy, while academic resources predict engagement characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption in studies (Salanova et al., 2010). The buffering hypothesis has received support in educational contexts, with resources such as social support and self-efficacy buffering the relationship between demands and burnout outcomes.

However, existing applications of JD-R theory to education have primarily focused on general academic contexts, with limited attention to specialized training environments such as music education. This limitation is significant because music education exhibits distinctive features that may require theoretical adaptation. The present paper argues that music learning contexts represent a particularly compelling case for JD-R theory application due to several unique characteristics: the intensive one-on-one master-apprentice relationships, the public performance evaluation systems, the physical demands of instrument manipulation, the integration of technical and artistic development, the career-oriented nature of professional music training, and—in the contemporary era—the technological transformation of musical practice through artificial intelligence.

2.3. Technostress: An Emerging Demand in the AI Era

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into professional and educational contexts has given rise to a new category of occupational stress: technostress. Technostress is defined as the stress experienced by individuals who are compelled to adapt to new technologies in their work or learning environments, characterized by technological strain that manifests as psychological tension and negative physiological responses (Tarafdar et al., 2007). Originally studied in organizational contexts where technology adoption was voluntary or planned, technostress research has become increasingly relevant as AI systems demonstrate capabilities that rival or exceed human performance across numerous domains, including creative pursuits such as music.

Research has identified five distinct dimensions of technostress that are particularly relevant to understanding technology-related demands in music education. Techno-overload

refers to the experience of being compelled to work faster and longer due to technology, as AI systems can generate music, provide feedback, or recommend practice activities at speeds that exceed human processing capacity. Music students may feel pressured to practice more intensively to keep pace with AI-assisted peers or to utilize AI tools that promise accelerated learning outcomes.

Techno-insecurity represents a particularly potent source of technostress for music students, encompassing the fear of being replaced by technology or becoming obsolete in one's professional domain. As generative AI systems such as ChatGPT, Midjourney, and specialized music AI tools (e.g., AIVA, Amper Music, Suno) demonstrate increasingly sophisticated capabilities for composing, producing, and performing music, music students may question the value of their training and the viability of careers in human musicianship (Epstein et al., 2023). This dimension of technostress connects to broader discussions about the future of creative work in an age of automation, with profound implications for the psychological well-being of those investing years in developing musical expertise that machines can now replicate.

The integration of technostress into the JD-R framework for music education requires recognizing that AI-related demands operate through both direct and indirect pathways. Directly, technostress dimensions function as job demands that require sustained psychological effort to manage, depleting resources over time. Indirectly, technostress may amplify traditional musical demands; for example, techno-insecurity may intensify performance anxiety by adding concerns about human relevance to the existing pressures of musical evaluation.

2.4. Self-Determination Theory and Intrinsic Motivation

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) provides complementary theoretical grounding for understanding motivation in music learning contexts (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017; Klein, 2019). SDT proposes that human beings possess fundamental psychological needs for autonomy (experiencing volition and self-direction), competence (feeling effective in one's actions), and relatedness (connecting meaningfully with others). When these needs are satisfied, individuals experience intrinsic motivation, engaging in activities for their inherent satisfaction rather than external rewards or pressures.

The integration of SDT with JD-R theory is theoretically coherent because resources in JD-R theory can be understood as satisfying basic psychological needs. Autonomy-supportive teaching, competence-building feedback, and relatedness-supportive relationships function as resources that foster intrinsic motivation. In music education contexts, this integration is particularly relevant because music learning is inherently an activity that can provide intrinsic satisfaction through artistic expression, technical mastery, and creative fulfillment.

The emergence of AI in music education introduces new complexities for the SDT-JD-R integration. On one hand, AI-powered tools have the potential to enhance autonomy by providing personalized learning pathways that adapt to individual student preferences and needs. AI feedback systems may support competence by offering precise, immediate information about performance quality.

2.5. Burnout, Technostress, and Engagement: Conceptualization and Measurement

Burnout, technostress, and engagement represent distinct but related outcome constructs in the extended JD-R framework proposed in this paper. Burnout is a psychological syndrome resulting from chronic exposure to occupational stress that has not been successfully managed, characterized by three dimensions: exhaustion (fatigue and energy depletion), cynicism (negative or indifferent attitude toward work), and reduced profes-

sional efficacy (feelings of incompetence and reduced accomplishment) (Maslach et al., 2001). The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) remains the most widely used instrument for assessing burnout, with established reliability and validity across occupational contexts (Schaufeli et al., 1996).

Technostress, as discussed above, represents a distinct outcome construct with its own dimensions (Tarafdar et al., 2007). While technostress shares some conceptual overlap with burnout—particularly in the exhaustion dimension—it captures a specific form of strain arising from technology adaptation that may not be fully captured by generic burnout measures. The development of validated technostress instruments for educational contexts, including measures specific to creative domains such as music, represents an important direction for future research.

Work engagement represents the positive antithesis of burnout, defined as a positive, fulfilling work-related state characterized by vigor (high energy and mental resilience), dedication (sense of significance and enthusiasm), and absorption (full concentration and engrossment in work) (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) provides a validated measurement of engagement dimensions, with strong psychometric properties across diverse occupational groups (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Importantly, burnout and engagement are not merely opposite ends of a single continuum; rather, they represent related but distinct constructs that can coexist or independently vary.

The application of burnout, technostress, and engagement constructs to music education contexts requires careful consideration of measurement adaptation. While the MBI, technostress scales, and UWES were developed for occupational contexts, research has successfully adapted these instruments to educational settings by modifying item wording to reference academic activities rather than paid employment (Salanova et al., 2010). Similar adaptations would be necessary for music education research, replacing references to “work” or “studies” with references to “music practice” or “musical training.” Specifically, for burnout measurement in music education, the Maslach Burnout Inventory—Student Survey (MBI-SS) provides a validated starting point, with items adapted to reference music practice (e.g., “I feel burned out from my music practice”). For technostress, the instrument developed by Tarafdar et al. (2007) captures five dimensions (techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity, techno-insecurity, techno-uncertainty) but requires adaptation for music-specific technology contexts (e.g., referencing AI composition tools rather than general workplace technology). Ragu-Nathan et al. (2008) developed a technostress creators’ scale that could be adapted to measure the specific technostress experiences of music students creating with AI tools. For engagement, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale—Student version (UWES-S) provides a validated measure of vigor, dedication, and absorption that can be adapted for music practice contexts.

Additionally, music-specific stressors—including performance anxiety, physical injury concerns, subgroup-specific AI threats, and other domain-specific factors—may require supplementary measures. The Kenny Music Performance Anxiety Inventory (K-MPAI; Kenny, 2009) provides a validated measure of performance anxiety specific to musicians. For the newly theorized subgroup-specific impacts identified in this paper (e.g., the voice cloning paradox for singers, market displacement anxiety for composers), new scale development may be necessary, as existing instruments do not capture these distinctive constructs. Future research should prioritize the development and validation of music-specific technostress scales that differentiate among composer, performer, and singer experiences.

3. Demands in Music Learning

3.1. Technical Demands

Music learning imposes substantial technical demands that differentiate it from most other forms of education. The acquisition of musical proficiency requires the development of complex sensorimotor skills involving precise timing, fine motor control, auditory discrimination, and multidimensional coordination (Janata et al., 2012). Unlike cognitive academic skills that can often be mastered through verbal instruction and conceptual understanding, musical technical skills require thousands of hours of deliberate practice to achieve expert performance levels (Ericsson et al., 1993; McPherson & Davidson, 2006).

The technical demands of music learning encompass multiple sub-dimensions. Instrument-specific technical requirements vary substantially across musical disciplines; string players must develop bowing techniques and fingerings, wind players must master breath control and embouchure, pianists must coordinate independent hand movements, and vocalists must train their respiratory and vocal fold mechanisms. Beyond instrument-specific skills, musicians require general musicianship skills, including sight-reading, ear training, knowledge of music theory, and interpretive understanding.

The psychological costs of technical demands are considerable. Technical challenges that exceed current ability levels create frustration and anxiety, particularly when progress stalls despite sustained effort. The highly specific nature of musical technical skills means that plateau periods—periods where improvement appears to halt—are common and psychologically challenging (Sloboda et al., 1996).

3.2. Physical Demands and Injury Risk

Beyond cognitive and technical demands, music learning imposes significant physical demands that can threaten student health and sustainability. Many musical instruments require sustained awkward postures, repetitive movements, and sustained muscle contractions that can lead to musculoskeletal disorders, repetitive strain injuries, and other physical problems (Wristen, 2013; Schlaug, 2001; Ackermann et al., 2011). The prevalence of playing-related musculoskeletal disorders among musicians is remarkably high, with some studies suggesting that up to 80% of professional musicians experience significant physical problems during their careers (Fishbein et al., 1988).

The physical demands of specific instruments vary considerably. String players commonly experience neck, shoulder, and back problems from holding their instruments in asymmetric positions. Keyboard players face risks of carpal tunnel syndrome, tendinitis, and other upper extremity disorders from repetitive finger movements and sustained wrist positions.

The psychological implications of injury risk extend beyond immediate physical concerns. Playing-related injuries can threaten students' musical identities, create fear about practicing and performing, and generate anxiety about future career prospects. Students who experience injuries may develop hyper-vigilance about physical sensations, potentially leading to psychosomatic symptoms that compound or mimic organic problems.

3.3. Temporal Demands and Practice Requirements

The temporal demands of music learning represent another distinctive feature that separates it from most educational contexts. Serious music training typically requires substantial daily practice time, often four to six hours or more for students in conservatory programs, in addition to lesson time, ensemble rehearsals, and academic coursework (Miksza, 2007). This practice requirement competes with other life demands, including academic studies, employment, relationships, and self-care, creating chronic time pressure that can generate substantial stress (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011).

The organization of practice time itself creates additional demands. Effective music practice requires sustained concentration, attention to detail, and continuous self-monitoring—cognitively demanding activities that cannot be easily interrupted and resumed (Duke et al., 2009). The requirement to maintain focused attention for extended periods can lead to mental fatigue, particularly when practice sessions extend beyond optimal durations.

The temporal demands of music learning also include the long time horizons characteristic of musical development. Unlike some skills that can be acquired relatively quickly, expert musical performance typically requires ten or more years of sustained training (Ericsson et al., 1993). This extended developmental trajectory means that music students must maintain motivation and manage well-being across many years, often during psychologically vulnerable periods, including adolescence and young adulthood.

3.4. Performance Demands and Evaluation Pressure

Perhaps the most distinctive demands in music learning involve public performance and evaluation. Unlike most academic learning where knowledge is assessed through written examinations or assignments, music learning culminates in public performances where students demonstrate their abilities to audiences, judges, teachers, and peers (Ballantyne et al., 2012). These performances expose students to evaluation anxiety, social comparison, and the potential for public failure in ways that differ qualitatively from other educational contexts.

Performance anxiety represents a critical demand in music learning, affecting musicians across all skill levels from beginning students to elite professionals (Kenny & Ackermann, 2011; Kenny & Drinkwater, 2010). Music performance anxiety (MPA) is characterized by marked and persistent apprehension about evaluation in music performance contexts, with symptoms including physiological arousal (trembling, sweating, rapid heartbeat), cognitive interference (negative thoughts, memory lapses), and behavioral manifestations (avoidance, incomplete performances) (Kenny & Ackermann, 2011). The prevalence of significant MPA among music students is concerning; research suggests that music students report higher levels of anxiety than both the general population and students in other creative arts disciplines (Osborne & Kenny, 2008; Kenny & Osborne, 2006).

The evaluation pressures in music education extend beyond public performances to include the hierarchical assessment systems characteristic of conservatory training. Traditional music pedagogy often emphasizes one-on-one instruction from a master teacher, where ongoing evaluation by a single authority figure creates intense scrutiny (Nettl, 1995). Students may perceive that their worth and future prospects depend entirely on their teacher's judgment, creating power dynamics that can generate anxiety, perfectionism, and dependency.

3.5. Social–Emotional Demands

Music learning involves distinctive social–emotional demands arising from the interpersonal relationships, artistic expression, and identity issues characteristic of musical training. The master–apprentice relationship in music education creates intense emotional dynamics, as students invest not only their technical development but also their artistic identity in relationships with teachers who hold significant power over their futures (Nettl, 1995). These relationships can become sources of both support and stress, depending on the teaching style, the fit of the personality, and the communication patterns.

The expressive nature of music creates additional emotional demands. Music is fundamentally an art form that communicates emotion, requiring musicians to access, experience, and express emotional states through their performances (Juslin & Västfjäll,

2008). This requirement can be psychologically demanding, particularly when performing music with emotional content that resonates with personal experiences.

Musical identity formation creates ongoing social–emotional demands as students navigate the integration of their musical selves with broader personal identities. Serious music students often report that music becomes central to their self-concept, creating high stakes for musical outcomes (Hargreaves et al., 2002). When musical outcomes fall short of expectations, students may experience threats to self-worth that extend beyond the musical domain.

3.6. Technostress and AI-Related Demands

The integration of artificial intelligence into music education represents a paradigm shift that introduces novel categories of demands beyond those traditionally associated with musical training. As AI-powered tools become increasingly prevalent in practice environments, recording studios, composition studios, and music theory classrooms, music students must navigate not only the established demands of technical mastery, performance pressure, and physical demands but also the emerging challenges of technological adaptation, algorithmic evaluation, and existential questions about the value of human musicianship. This section analyzes these technology-related demands through the lens of technostress theory, identifying specific stressors that contemporary music students face in the AI era.

Techno-overload manifests in music education through several pathways that increase time pressure and cognitive burden. AI-powered practice platforms such as Tonara, Simply Piano, and Yousician can generate unlimited practice exercises, provide instant feedback, and recommend personalized content at a pace that exceeds what students can meaningfully process. Students may feel compelled to extend practice sessions to utilize all available AI features, or may experience guilt when not using available technological resources—a form of technology-induced obligation that compounds traditional temporal demands.

Techno-invasion represents another significant demand as AI tools increasingly penetrate personal and private spaces. Mobile applications enable practice and study at any time and location, removing natural boundaries between practice time and rest periods. AI-powered composition tools may generate musical ideas at any hour, creating expectations of continuous creative availability.

Techno-complexity creates cognitive demands as students must develop technological literacy alongside musical skills. Understanding how AI tools generate recommendations, provide feedback, or compose music requires mental models that may conflict with traditional musical understanding. Students must learn to interpret AI-generated analysis, which may identify patterns invisible to human ears but miss contextual nuances that experienced musicians understand intuitively.

Techno-insecurity represents perhaps the most psychologically potent AI-related demand for music students, as it addresses fundamental questions about the value and future of human musical expertise. The emergence of generative AI systems capable of producing professional-quality music—instrumental compositions, vocal performances, and full productions—has challenged assumptions about the unique value of human musicianship (Epstein et al., 2023). Students who have invested years developing technical skills may observe AI systems achieving comparable or superior technical results in seconds, raising concerning questions about the worth of their training investment.

Research on automation anxiety suggests that techno-insecurity operates through multiple psychological pathways, including threat to self-efficacy, fear of obsolescence, and identity threat (McClure, 2018). Music students experiencing techno-insecurity may exhibit heightened self-comparison with AI capabilities, reduced motivation to develop

skills that machines can replicate, anxiety about career prospects, and questioning of their fundamental commitment to musical pursuits. These psychological responses may be particularly pronounced during periods of rapid AI advancement, when new capabilities seem to emerge continuously and previously “safe” domains become automated.

Techno-uncertainty adds a layer of demand as the technological landscape of music education continues to evolve rapidly. Students must adapt to changing AI tools, updated interfaces, new platform features, and shifting institutional policies regarding technology integration. The lack of stable technological standards in music education creates uncertainty about which skills and tools will be relevant in the future.

The integration of AI into music education also introduces demands related to algorithmic evaluation and data privacy. Many AI music tools collect extensive data about student practice patterns, performance characteristics, and learning trajectories. Students may experience discomfort about the extent of monitoring involved in AI-enhanced practice, or may feel pressure to present their learning in ways that algorithms can interpret and evaluate.

Furthermore, AI-generated content in music education introduces demands related to authenticity, creativity, and originality. Students must learn to navigate the distinction between human-created and AI-generated music, understanding both the capabilities and limitations of generative systems. The availability of AI-generated compositions, arrangements, and even performances may create confusion about what constitutes legitimate musical learning and achievement.

The cumulative effect of these AI-related demands may be particularly significant because they compound rather than replace traditional musical demands. Students facing technical challenges, performance pressure, physical demands, and temporal constraints must now also manage technological complexity, algorithmic evaluation, and existential uncertainty about the value of their expertise. This accumulation of demands may create compounding effects that risk overwhelming coping resources and contributing to burnout, disengagement, or abandonment of musical pursuits, particularly for students who lack adequate resources or institutional support.

Techno-Cultural Homogenization

Beyond individual-level technostress, AI integration in music education raises collective-level concerns about cultural diversity that operate as a distinct category of demand at the cultural-collective level. Music generation AI systems are predominantly trained on Western classical and popular music datasets, embedding specific harmonic languages, rhythmic patterns, and timbre preferences into their outputs (Epstein et al., 2023). When students increasingly rely on AI-generated music as models, references, or practice material, they may be inadvertently immersed in culturally narrow musical aesthetics that differ from the diverse global musical heritage.

The mechanisms of techno-cultural homogenization operate through several interconnected pathways. First, algorithmic bias reflects the demographic composition of training datasets, which are overwhelmingly composed of Western musical traditions. Research has documented that generative AI systems inherit and amplify biases present in their training data (Epstein et al., 2023). Second, the evaluation functions of many AI music tools reinforce Western musical norms—AI-powered sight-reading apps judge pitch accuracy according to equal-tempered Western tuning systems, rhythm evaluation tools apply Western metric conventions, and music theory AI assistants explain harmony using Western functional harmony frameworks. Third, recommendation algorithms create reinforcement loops that narrow rather than broaden musical exposure, suggesting music similar to what a student

has previously studied. Fourth, economic incentives favor culturally dominant markets, leading developers to prioritize features relevant to the largest user populations.

For students from East Asian backgrounds, the dynamics of techno-cultural homogenization interact with regional educational traditions in specific ways. The prominence of Western classical music training in East Asian countries, often promoted for its perceived prestige and educational benefits, creates particular vulnerability to cultural homogenization (Ho & Law, 2006). When AI tools compound this dynamic by providing endless Western repertoire recommendations while ignoring Chinese classical, Cantonese opera, or regional folk traditions, the result is cultural musical heritage that is progressively marginalized in institutional music education. Students whose cultural backgrounds involve non-Western musical traditions may find that the very tools intended to support their development instead marginalize their cultural heritage—a form of double marginalization whereby both the human-designed curriculum and the AI-augmented learning environment privilege Western traditions.

The demand of techno-cultural homogenization is distinct from other technostress dimensions because it operates at the collective-cultural level rather than the individual-psychological level. The JD-R framework must therefore be extended to include cultural-collective demands alongside individual-psychological demands. Addressing this demand requires interventions at multiple levels: AI music systems should be trained on diverse datasets; music programs should intentionally incorporate diverse repertoire; teachers should help students connect their cultural backgrounds with their musical studies; and institutions should evaluate AI tools for cultural diversity before adoption.

3.7. Differentiated AI Impacts Across Music Student Subgroups

The preceding analysis of technostress has largely treated music students as a homogeneous population. However, the AI-related demands and resources identified above do not affect all music students equivalently. A critical limitation of existing scholarship—and of the present framework if left unaddressed—is the conflation of music student subgroups who face qualitatively different demand-resource configurations in the AI era. This section differentiates the impacts of AI across two principal subgroups—composers and performers—with particular attention to career-stage variations and the special case of singers.

3.7.1. Composers: Direct Demand Shocks and Resource Opportunities

Composers represent the music student subgroup most directly exposed to AI's competitive pressures. Generative AI systems such as Suno, Udio, AIVA, and Google Magenta are now capable of producing complete musical compositions—from melody and harmony to arrangement and full production—in seconds, directly encroaching on the professional domain of human composers (Solomon, 2025). The CISAC-commissioned global economic study projects that music creators may face up to 24% revenue loss by 2028 due to generative AI, with composers particularly vulnerable as AI-generated content increasingly competes in commercial music markets for background music, advertising jingles, film scores, and library music (PMP Strategy & CISAC, 2024). A UNESCO report further confirms that creators worldwide are experiencing steep income declines as generative AI transforms the cultural and creative industries, with music creators among the most exposed (UNESCO, 2026).

Importantly, the demand shock from AI appears to be stratified by career stage. Mature and established composers face greater demand pressure, as AI systems can directly substitute for the services these composers provide—particularly in commercial composition markets where speed, cost, and stylistic versatility are prioritized over artistic original-

ity (Solomon, 2025). Composers who have built careers supplying production music, advertising scores, or media soundtracks may find their market position eroded by AI systems that deliver comparable outputs at near-zero marginal cost. The techno-insecurity experienced by these composers is therefore not abstract but grounded in observable market displacement.

Conversely, entry-level and novice composers may experience AI primarily as a resource rather than a demand. AI composition tools can lower barriers to creative output, enabling beginners to produce complex, multi-instrumental arrangements that would previously have required years of training in orchestration, counterpoint, and music production (Herremans et al., 2017). Research on AI-assisted music creation suggests that novice creators who co-create with AI tools over extended periods develop creative agency and artistic satisfaction, treating AI as a collaborative partner rather than a competitor (Fu et al., 2025). For these students, AI functions as a competence-supportive resource within the JD-R framework, satisfying the basic psychological need for effectiveness and accelerating skill development.

However, both established and novice composers share a common vulnerability: the risk of eventual AI replacement. Even as AI tools provide entry-level composers with creative resources, the trajectory of AI development suggests that the gap between human and AI compositional capability is narrowing across all complexity levels (Epstein et al., 2023). Composers at all career stages therefore face the paradox of AI as both a resource that enables creative production and a demand that threatens the long-term viability of their professional identity. This dual nature of AI—as simultaneously a JD-R resource and a JD-R demand—creates a particularly complex psychological configuration for composers that may contribute to ambivalent engagement patterns, whereby students experience both enthusiasm for AI-assisted creativity and anxiety about professional obsolescence.

3.7.2. Performers: Indirect Disruption and Emerging Opportunities

Performers experience AI's impact through more indirect but nonetheless consequential pathways. Unlike composers, whose creative output can be directly replicated by generative AI, performers' core competency—live musical performance involving embodied physical skill—remains comparatively resistant to full AI substitution. Live concert performance, with its irreplaceable social and ritual dimensions, continues to require human presence (Solomon, 2025). However, this relative insulation from direct AI competition should not be mistaken for immunity.

For professional performers who have not achieved celebrity status, recording work represents a substantial proportion of income. Session musicians, orchestral recording players, and freelance performers rely on studio recording engagements—including film scores, album recordings, advertising sessions, and library music production—as a primary revenue stream. AI-generated music production is increasingly displacing this work: when a film score or commercial jingle can be produced entirely by AI at minimal cost, the demand for human session musicians declines correspondingly (PMP Strategy & CISAC, 2024). The CISAC study projects that background music and synchronization markets—traditionally key income sources for recording musicians—will be among the most disrupted segments, with AI cannibalization rates estimated at 20% for background music and 15% for synchronization by 2028 (PMP Strategy & CISAC, 2024). This represents a significant demand increase for non-elite performers, who must navigate shrinking recording opportunities while maintaining their investment in instrumental training.

Simultaneously, AI creates new resource opportunities for performers. The emergence of AI-powered accompaniment tools enables solo performers to create full-band or orchestral arrangements independently, supporting the development of self-media careers

through platforms such as YouTube, TikTok, Bilibili, and other social media channels. A performer can now record a single instrumental track and use AI to generate complementary accompaniment parts, producing polished content without requiring a full ensemble. This “performer-plus-AI” model represents a novel JD-R resource: it satisfies performers’ needs for autonomy (independent content production), competence (high-quality output), and potentially relatedness (audience engagement through social media). Research on AI-assisted creative collaboration suggests that performers who embrace these tools may experience enhanced creative agency and expanded professional identities (Fu et al., 2025).

For entry-level performers, however, the combined effect of recording market contraction and the perceived obsolescence of traditional performance skills may be particularly discouraging. Beginning performers who observe AI systems producing high-quality recorded music may question the return on investment of years of instrumental training, potentially leading to techno-insecurity-driven disengagement. The JD-R framework predicts that these students, who lack the established professional networks and reputational capital that buffer mature performers, may experience the AI transformation as a net increase in demands without corresponding resource gains—precisely the configuration that predicts burnout and disengagement.

3.7.3. Singers: The Voice Cloning Paradox

Singers occupy a unique position within the performer subgroup that warrants specific analysis. Recent advances in AI voice cloning and vocal synthesis technologies—including platforms such as ACE Studio, Synthesizer V, and various voice conversion models (e.g., RVC, So-VITS-SVC)—have created a distinctive paradox for singers that operates on a different temporal logic than the impacts on instrumentalists or composers.

In the near term, AI voice cloning technology creates new resource opportunities for singers. As developers of virtual singer products and AI vocal systems seek to build diverse voice libraries, professional and semi-professional singers are increasingly hired to record their vocal timbres and techniques for training data. These recording sessions represent a novel income stream: singers are compensated for “donating” their vocal identity to AI systems that will subsequently generate singing output in their voice (Lee & Sun, 2026). For music students who are singers, this opportunity may appear as a valuable JD-R resource—paid work that leverages their trained vocal ability and satisfies competence needs.

However, this short-term resource carries a profound long-term demand implication. Each voice recording session contributes to the training data that enables AI systems to replicate that singer’s vocal characteristics without further human involvement. Lee and Sun (2026) analyze this dynamic as a threat to “vocal identity”—the legal and ethical concept that a person’s voice constitutes a core aspect of personal identity deserving protection. Once an AI system can faithfully reproduce a singer’s timbre, phrasing, and expressive characteristics, the singer becomes functionally replaceable in recording contexts. The very resource that provides near-term income thus contributes to the long-term demand of techno-insecurity, creating a temporal paradox whereby current gain enables future displacement.

This paradox is particularly acute for singers because the voice, unlike instrumental performance, cannot be easily distinguished from the performer’s embodied identity. While a pianist’s performance can be separated from the pianist’s body (a recording captures the performance, not the person), a singer’s voice is inseparable from their physical being. AI voice cloning therefore represents a more fundamental form of identity threat than instrumental AI substitution. Research in legal scholarship has begun to address this concern, with Lee and Sun (2026) arguing that existing intellectual property frame-

works—including right of publicity, copyright, and trademark law—are inadequate to protect vocal identity from AI-enabled appropriation. The implications for music students who are singers are significant: they face a demand-resource configuration in which the same AI technology simultaneously provides income opportunities and erodes the unique value of their trained instrument.

The temporal structure of this paradox—short-term resource gain enabling long-term demand escalation—suggests that singers may initially exhibit elevated engagement with AI tools, followed by heightened burnout and techno-insecurity as the displacement effects become apparent. This predicted trajectory has implications for intervention: educators and institutions should help singing students develop critical awareness of the long-term risks associated with voice recording for AI training, while also supporting them in cultivating irreplaceable performance dimensions (live performance, audience connection, artistic interpretation) that AI cannot replicate.

3.8. Cultural Identity and Music Learning

Music learning occurs within cultural contexts that profoundly shape students' musical identities, instrument selections, genre preferences, repertoire choices, and career aspirations. The intersection of cultural identity and music education represents a significant yet often overlooked demand dimension in traditional JD-R applications to educational settings. For students from minority cultural backgrounds or non-Western musical traditions, music education may involve navigating tensions between heritage musical traditions and dominant Western classical music frameworks that characterize most conservatory curricula worldwide (Kallio, 2020). This cultural negotiation creates additional identity-related demands that are distinct from the technical, physical, or performance demands discussed earlier.

The demand dimension of cultural identity in music learning operates through multiple pathways. First, students from cultural minorities may experience marginalization when their musical traditions are excluded from or marginalized within mainstream music curricula. When conservatory programs emphasize Western classical repertoire as the standard of musical excellence, students whose backgrounds involve jazz, folk, traditional, or non-Western musical systems may experience their cultural musical identities as devalued or invalidated. This can create internal conflicts between maintaining cultural heritage and pursuing musical credentials that require adherence to Western norms.

Second, globalization has intensified cultural demands in music education by creating pressure toward musical homogenization while simultaneously raising awareness of cultural differences. International students studying in foreign countries face particular challenges in negotiating between their cultural musical identities and the expectations of their host institutions. Research on cross-cultural music education has documented the psychological costs of cultural alienation, including reduced motivation, identity confusion, and diminished sense of belonging in music programs (Ho & Law, 2006).

Third, the demographic composition of music programs creates social demands related to representation and inclusion. Students from underrepresented cultural backgrounds may experience isolation in programs where they are statistically rare, facing implicit or explicit expectations to represent their cultural groups or to assimilate into dominant cultural norms. These social demands can compound other stressors and contribute to disengagement or withdrawal from music education.

Fourth, cultural expectations regarding gender, family obligations, and career paths intersect with musical training to create demand configurations that vary across cultural contexts. Research has demonstrated that cultural norms significantly influence both the opportunities available to music students and the psychological meaning they attach

to musical achievement (Sloboda et al., 1996). Students whose cultural backgrounds emphasize collective achievement over individual expression may experience different motivational dynamics than those from individualistic cultural contexts.

The intersection of AI technologies with cultural identity demands creates additional complexity. As discussed in relation to techno-cultural homogenization, AI systems trained predominantly on Western musical data may reinforce dominant cultural frameworks while marginalizing diverse musical traditions. Students from non-Western backgrounds may find that AI tools further disadvantage them by privileging Western musical norms in feedback, evaluation, and repertoire recommendations. This intersection of technological and cultural demands requires explicit attention in theoretical frameworks and practical interventions.

For students from East Asian backgrounds, including those in Hong Kong, Mainland China, Taiwan, and diaspora communities, cultural identity demands in music education have specific characteristics shaped by regional educational contexts. The prevalence of Western classical music training in East Asian countries, often emphasized for its perceived prestige and educational value, creates particular dynamics where cultural heritage music (such as Chinese classical traditions, Cantonese opera, or Taiwanese folk music) may receive less institutional support despite strong family and community ties (Ho & Law, 2006). Students may face pressure to pursue Western instruments and repertoire while their cultural musical identities remain underdeveloped or conflicted.

The Hong Kong context provides a particularly illustrative case of cultural identity demands in music education. As a former British colony with deep ties to Mainland China and international connections, Hong Kong's music education system reflects multiple cultural influences. Western classical music has long held a prominent position in Hong Kong's formal music education, with the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music (ABRSM) examinations and Royal Conservatory credentials serving as markers of musical achievement (Ho & Law, 2006). Simultaneously, rich traditions of Cantonese music—including Cantonese opera, folk songs, and instrumental traditions—form an important part of community musical life that is often marginalized in formal conservatory curricula.

Students in Hong Kong navigating between these cultural traditions may experience several distinctive demands. The prestige associated with Western classical credentials may create pressure to pursue Western instruments (piano, violin) and repertoire while downplaying or abandoning Cantonese musical traditions. Students who wish to maintain their cultural heritage may face the perception that their musical choices are less serious or less valuable. Conversely, students who pursue exclusively Western training may experience cultural disconnection from family and community expectations.

The mainland Chinese context reflects similar dynamics with additional complexity due to the mainland's scale and regional diversity. Mandarin-dominated formal music education has increasingly emphasized Western classical training, with conservatories in Beijing, Shanghai, and other major cities following international Western standards. Meanwhile, China's fifty-six recognized ethnic groups each have distinctive musical traditions, and regional variations within Han Chinese music—the guqin tradition, various regional opera traditions, folk song traditions—are substantial. Students whose backgrounds involve these traditions may face demands similar to those faced by Hong Kong students.

Taiwan's music education context reflects its own distinctive cultural dynamics. Taiwanese music education incorporates both Western classical traditions inherited from the Japanese colonial period and the Republican period, as well as Taiwanese Hakka and Minnan musical traditions. The political complexity of Taiwan's identity adds another layer to cultural identity negotiations in music education, as musical choices may carry political as well as cultural meanings.

Diaspora communities—Chinese communities in Singapore, Malaysia, North America, Europe, and elsewhere—face yet other configurations of cultural identity demands. Students in diaspora contexts may experience pressure to maintain heritage musical traditions as markers of cultural identity while simultaneously integrating into the musical cultures of their host countries. The demands they face involve navigation between heritage, host, and sometimes global musical cultures.

Beyond East Asian contexts, similar dynamics operate for students from other non-Western backgrounds. South Asian students may navigate between Hindustani and Carnatic classical traditions, folk traditions, and Western classical or popular music. African students may navigate between diverse African musical traditions and Western genres. Indigenous students may navigate between tribal musical traditions and Western music education. In each case, the demands involve cultural identity negotiation that extends beyond the musical domain to broader questions of belonging, heritage, and personal identity.

The theoretical implications of cultural identity demands for JD-R theory are significant. Traditional JD-R applications have primarily focused on individual-level psychological demands, treating cultural context as a background factor rather than a direct source of demands. The present framework extends JD-R theory by including cultural identity as a direct demand category, operating at multiple levels: the individual-psychological level (identity confusion, self-doubt), the interpersonal level (social comparison, representation pressure), and the collective-cultural level (cultural marginalization, heritage erosion).

4. Resources in Music Learning

4.1. Teacher Support and Pedagogical Resources

Teacher support represents one of the most critical resources in music education, functioning as a buffer against demands and a direct predictor of positive outcomes. The intensive master-apprentice relationships characteristic of music education mean that teachers have profound influence over students' technical development, artistic growth, and psychological well-being (Nettl, 1995). When teachers provide supportive relationships—characterized by warmth, respect, autonomy support, and constructive feedback—students experience enhanced motivation, reduced anxiety, and greater engagement in their musical studies.

Autonomy support from teachers is particularly important in music education contexts. Self-Determination Theory research has demonstrated that autonomy-supportive teaching—characterized by providing choice, acknowledging feelings, minimizing control, and encouraging initiative—satisfies students' fundamental need for autonomy and promotes intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Aelterman et al., 2019). In music education, autonomy support might include allowing students some choice in repertoire, encouraging musical interpretation, and providing a rationale for technical requirements rather than imposing demands arbitrarily.

Competence feedback represents another crucial pedagogical resource. Students require accurate, specific, and actionable feedback about their musical performance to guide their development (Duke et al., 2009). Effective feedback helps students understand their current level of functioning, identify specific areas for improvement, and perceive progress over time—all of which satisfy the basic psychological need for competence.

4.2. Peer Relationships and Social Support

Peer relationships constitute an important resource for music students, providing emotional support, practical assistance, and collaborative learning opportunities. Music education environments that facilitate positive peer relationships—through ensemble participation, collaborative practice, peer feedback groups, and informal social connec-

tions—offer students resources that can buffer demands and enhance well-being (Creech, 2012). Peer support can take multiple forms, including emotional support (understanding and validation during stressful periods), instrumental support (practical help with practice or performance preparation), informational support (sharing knowledge and strategies), and social belonging (providing a sense of community and shared identity).

Ensemble participation provides particularly rich opportunities for peer resource provision. Orchestras, bands, choirs, and chamber groups require coordination and collaboration among musicians, creating interdependence that fosters mutual support and shared purpose (Creech, 2012). Ensemble membership provides regular social contact with peers who share similar challenges and experiences, reducing the isolation that can characterize individual study on an instrument.

Beyond formal ensemble participation, informal peer relationships within music programs provide important resources. Students who form friendships with fellow music students can access emotional support during stressful periods such as juries, examinations, and performances. Peer practice partners can provide motivation, accountability, and feedback that enhance practice effectiveness.

4.3. Material and Institutional Resources

Material and institutional resources provide essential infrastructure that supports music learning and reduces the friction associated with managing demanding training schedules. Access to quality instruments, adequate practice facilities, appropriate learning materials, and institutional support services all function as resources that facilitate musical development and protect against demand-induced strain. The availability and quality of these resources varies substantially across music education contexts, with significant implications for student outcomes.

Instrument quality represents a fundamental material resource. Students with access to well-maintained, quality instruments can produce better sounds, develop more accurate technical habits, and experience greater satisfaction from their practice. Conversely, inadequate instruments—those that are poorly maintained, incorrectly sized, or of low quality—can impede technical development, contribute to physical problems, and generate frustration that compounds other demands.

Institutional support services provide additional resources that can protect student well-being. Music programs that offer counseling services, health resources, academic support, and career guidance provide comprehensive resources that address the diverse challenges music students face (Wristen, 2013). Institutional policies that protect student welfare—such as mandatory break periods, limits on practice requirements, and support for injury recovery—demonstrate organizational commitment to student well-being and provide structural resources for managing demands.

4.4. Intrinsic Motivation and Flow Experiences

Intrinsic motivation represents a powerful psychological resource that can sustain music students through demanding training periods. When students engage in music practice for the inherent satisfaction of musical activity itself—enjoying the sounds they create, feeling absorbed in the process of musical expression, or experiencing the flow of technical mastery—they draw on intrinsic motivational resources that buffer demands and promote engagement (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Intrinsically motivated students experience music practice as rewarding regardless of external outcomes such as grades, awards, or audience approval, providing resilience against the evaluation pressures and setbacks that characterize music training.

Flow experiences represent particularly valuable intrinsic motivation states in music learning. Flow is characterized by complete absorption in an activity, a sense of timelessness, effortless concentration, and intrinsic reward from the activity itself (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Musicians commonly report flow experiences during optimal performance states, when technical demands are met with sufficient skill to allow complete attention to musical expression (Wrigley & Emmerson, 2013).

Self-regulation skills constitute another important motivational resource. Students who can effectively manage their practice time, set appropriate goals, monitor their progress, and adjust their strategies possess self-regulatory resources that enhance their ability to manage demands (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994; Bandura, 1997). Self-regulated learners can structure their practice sessions effectively, maintain focus during challenging technical passages, and persist through plateaus without external pressure.

4.5. Feedback and Progress Monitoring

Feedback constitutes a critical resource in music learning, providing students with information about their current performance level, progress over time, and areas requiring further development. Effective feedback systems satisfy the basic psychological need for competence, help students calibrate their self-assessment, and guide the allocation of practice effort toward highest-priority areas (Duke et al., 2009). Without adequate feedback, students may practice inefficiently, develop incorrect habits, or lose motivation due to unclear progress indicators.

Multiple feedback sources operate in music education contexts. Teacher feedback during lessons provides the most direct and authoritative information about musical performance. Formal assessments, including examinations, juries, and competitions provide periodic comprehensive evaluations.

Progress monitoring resources help students perceive improvement over time, which is crucial for maintaining motivation during extended training periods. Music learning progresses through definable stages of development, from novice through intermediate to advanced levels, and eventually to expert performance (Ericsson et al., 1993). Students who can perceive their movement through these stages experience satisfaction and motivation from visible progress.

4.6. AI-Powered Learning Tools and Resources

The emergence of artificial intelligence in music education creates not only new demands but also new resources that can support student learning, enhance well-being, and buffer the negative effects of traditional demands (Ruthmann & Hebert, 2012). This section analyzes AI-powered resources through the JD-R framework, with attention to how their resource and demand properties vary across student subgroups.

Intelligent practice assistants represent one of the most developed categories of AI resources. Applications such as Tonara, Simply Piano, Flowkey, and Yousician use machine learning algorithms to listen to student performances, identify errors, provide immediate feedback, and recommend practice activities tailored to individual skill levels (Herremans et al., 2017). These tools address a critical resource gap: the availability of feedback outside of scheduled lesson time. AI-powered accompaniment systems enable practice in contexts that previously required human collaborators, generating real-time accompaniment that responds to student tempo, dynamics, and interpretation. For performers, these accompaniment tools also support the emerging “performer-plus-AI” self-media career model discussed in Section 3.7.

Automated composition and arrangement tools represent resources that can support creative development. AI systems such as AIVA, Amper Music, Google Magenta’s Music-

VAE, and various composition assistants can generate musical material that students can use as starting points for their own creative work (Herremans et al., 2017). For entry-level composers, these tools function as competence-supporting resources that lower barriers to complex creative output; for established composers, they may represent competitive threats rather than resources—a distinction that underscores the subgroup-dependent nature of AI's JD-R properties.

AI-based music analysis tools provide resources for developing musical understanding and interpretive sophistication. Applications that analyze harmonic content, structural relationships, performance characteristics, and historical context can deepen students' comprehension of repertoire. AI-powered performance analysis tools help students develop self-assessment capabilities by analyzing pitch accuracy, timing precision, dynamic control, and interpretive expression. Personalized learning algorithms represent a meta-resource that adapts to individual learning patterns, identifying optimal practice sequences and adjusting difficulty in real-time.

Virtual reality and AI-integrated performance training tools represent emerging resources for managing performance demands. VR environments that simulate performance contexts can provide graduated exposure to performance situations in low-stakes settings. AI-powered world music knowledge platforms represent resources for cultural diversity, providing access to musical traditions from around the world that can counterbalance the cultural homogenization demand described in Section 3.6.

However, the resource potential of AI tools is contingent on several conditions. First, the effectiveness of AI resources depends on their quality and appropriateness; poorly designed tools may provide misleading feedback or create frustration. Second, AI resources require technological access and literacy; students without appropriate devices, internet connectivity, or technological skills may be excluded from these benefits. Third, as the subgroup analysis in Section 3.7 demonstrates, the same AI tool may function as a resource for one student subgroup while operating as a demand for another, making universal prescriptions about AI tool adoption inappropriate.

The integration of AI resources with traditional JD-R constructs requires attention to how these resources satisfy basic psychological needs. AI tools may support autonomy by providing choices and personalizing learning pathways; they may support competence through immediate, specific feedback; and they may support relatedness by facilitating connection with peers and mentors. However, AI tools may also threaten basic needs if they are experienced as controlling rather than supportive, if feedback undermines rather than builds self-efficacy, or if technology replaces rather than enhances human connection.

5. Integrated JD-R Model for Music Education in the AI Era

5.1. Model Overview

The preceding analysis of demands and resources in music learning provides the foundation for an integrated JD-R model specific to music education contexts, now extended to address the transformative influence of artificial intelligence and globalization. This section synthesizes the identified demands and resources into a coherent theoretical framework, proposing relationships between model components and outcome variables. The resulting model addresses the unique characteristics of music learning—including the emerging role of AI technologies and the cultural contexts in which music learning occurs—while maintaining alignment with established JD-R theory principles.

The proposed model classifies music learning demands into seven categories: technical demands, physical demands, temporal demands, performance demands, social-emotional demands, technostress demands arising from AI integration, and cultural identity demands arising from negotiations between heritage musical traditions and dominant global

frameworks. Each category encompasses multiple specific stressors identified in the music education literature, with technostress and cultural identity demands representing newly theorized categories specific to the contemporary context of AI-transformed globalized music education. The model classifies music learning resources into six corresponding categories: teacher support, peer relationships, material/institutional resources, intrinsic motivation, feedback systems, and AI-powered learning tools. Critically, the model incorporates subgroup differentiation, recognizing that the configuration and intensity of AI-related demands and resources varies substantially across music student subgroups—composers, performers, and singers—with further variation by career stage (entry-level vs. established).

5.2. Health Impairment Process in Music Learning

The health impairment process in the proposed model follows the established JD-R mechanism whereby high demands deplete psychological and physical resources, leading to burnout outcomes over time. In music learning contexts, this process operates through several specific pathways. Technical demands deplete cognitive resources as students engage in sustained problem-solving, error correction, and skill acquisition activities.

Physical demands contribute to the health impairment process through the mechanisms described earlier, including musculoskeletal strain, repetitive motion injuries, and fatigue from sustained playing postures. These physical demands can interact with cognitive demands, as physical discomfort interferes with concentration and cognitive processing, creating compound depletion effects. Students who experience playing-related injuries may face particularly severe health impairment processes, as injuries can limit practice ability while simultaneously generating anxiety about career prospects and creating pain that directly affects well-being.

Performance demands represent particularly potent sources of health impairment through their effects on anxiety and stress responses. Music performance anxiety generates physiological arousal (elevated heart rate, sweating, muscle tension), cognitive interference (worry thoughts, concentration difficulties), and behavioral symptoms (trembling, incomplete performances) that tax psychological resources (Kenny & Ackermann, 2011). The chronic nature of performance evaluation in music education—extending across lessons, juries, recitals, competitions, and examinations—means that students face repeated exposure to performance stressors throughout their training.

The technostress demands introduced by AI integration represent a distinct pathway in the health impairment process, with subgroup-specific manifestations. For composers, techno-insecurity operates through direct market displacement—AI systems that can produce commercial-quality compositions at near-zero cost erode the economic foundations of composition careers (PMP Strategy & CISAC, 2024). For performers, the impairment pathway is more indirect: the contraction of recording markets reduces income opportunities, while the perceived obsolescence of physical instrumental skills generates identity threat. For singers, the health impairment process may follow a delayed trajectory, as initial engagement with voice recording opportunities gives way to heightened anxiety as the long-term replacement implications become apparent. Techno-overload compounds temporal demands by creating pressure to practice more intensively and utilize AI tools continuously. Techno-invasion erodes boundaries between practice and recovery time, as AI applications accessible through smartphones and cloud platforms create expectations of continuous availability.

Cultural identity demands represent another pathway in the health impairment process, particularly for students from non-Western backgrounds navigating between heritage musical traditions and dominant global frameworks. Students experiencing conflicts between their cultural musical identities and institutional expectations may experience

identity confusion, reduced belonging, and cultural alienation that compound other demands. The pressure to abandon heritage traditions in favor of globally prestigious Western training may create internal conflicts that deplete psychological resources over time.

The health impairment process is moderated by the availability of resources. When music students have access to adequate resources—supportive teachers, helpful peers, quality instruments, strong intrinsic motivation, effective feedback, and appropriately integrated AI tools—they can better manage the depletion effects of demands. Resources may buffer demands through direct mechanisms (e.g., social support provides emotional relief that reduces strain accumulation) or through indirect mechanisms (e.g., effective feedback helps students practice more efficiently, reducing the time needed to achieve progress and thus reducing temporal demands).

5.3. Motivational Process in Music Learning

The motivational process in the proposed model follows the JD-R mechanism, whereby resources promote engagement through need satisfaction and motivational enhancement. In music learning contexts, this process operates through several specific pathways that leverage the unique characteristics of musical activity. Teacher support satisfies students' needs for relatedness and autonomy, providing the interpersonal warmth and respect that make students feel valued as individuals rather than mere performers.

Peer relationships provide resources for the motivational process through similar mechanisms. Belonging to a community of fellow musicians satisfies needs for relatedness, providing a sense of shared identity and mutual understanding that can be particularly meaningful given the intensity and uniqueness of musical training experiences (Creech, 2012). Peer collaboration provides opportunities for social learning and mutual encouragement that enhance perceived competence.

Intrinsic motivation serves as both a resource and an outcome in the motivational process. When music learning activities satisfy basic psychological needs, students experience enhanced intrinsic motivation that leads to engagement characterized by vigor (enthusiasm for practice), dedication (commitment to musical excellence), and absorption (complete immersion in musical activity) (Lamont, 2012). These engagement states, in turn, contribute to positive outcomes including improved performance, greater persistence, and enhanced well-being.

Material and institutional resources contribute to the motivational process by removing barriers to engagement and providing structural support for musical development. Quality instruments enable students to realize their musical intentions, supporting feelings of competence. Adequate practice facilities enable sustained engagement without environmental interference.

AI-powered learning tools offer additional pathways for the motivational process when properly integrated, though their motivational effects differ across student subgroups. For entry-level composers, AI tools function primarily as resources that enhance competence and autonomy, enabling the creation of complex musical works that would otherwise require years of training. Intelligent practice assistants can provide immediate, specific feedback that satisfies competence needs and supports skill development. Personalized learning algorithms can maintain optimal challenge levels that sustain flow experiences. For performers, AI accompaniment tools that enable independent content creation may satisfy autonomy and relatedness needs through self-media engagement. However, for established composers and professional performers, these same tools may undermine motivation by generating techno-insecurity that threatens professional identity—a reminder that the same AI capability can function as either a resource or a demand depending on the student's career stage and subgroup affiliation.

5.4. Demand-Resource Interactions

The proposed model incorporates multiple types of demand-resource interactions that are consistent with JD-R theory. The most fundamental interaction involves the buffering hypothesis, whereby resources moderate the relationship between demands and strain outcomes. In music learning contexts, this suggests that the negative effects of high demands on burnout and technostress outcomes will be weaker for students with abundant resources compared to those with limited resources.

A second type of interaction involves the JD-R two-process model, whereby demands and resources independently predict outcomes through separate pathways. In this formulation, high demands predict burnout and technostress through the health impairment pathway, while high resources predict engagement through the motivational pathway. These effects can be additive or interactive; students can simultaneously experience high burnout and high engagement, or low burnout and low engagement, depending on their specific demand-resource configurations.

A third type of interaction involves the matching hypothesis, whereby specific resources address specific demands. For example, teacher feedback may be particularly effective for addressing technical demands, while peer support may be particularly effective for addressing social-emotional demands. AI tools may be particularly effective for addressing temporal demands by improving practice efficiency, while human teacher support may be particularly effective for addressing techno-insecurity by providing reassurance about the enduring value of human musicianship. Importantly, the matching of demands and resources is subgroup-dependent: for entry-level composers, AI tools serve as a primary resource matching competence-related demands, whereas for established composers facing market displacement, AI tools may exacerbate rather than buffer techno-insecurity demands, making human mentorship and institutional support more critical matching resources.

The interaction between traditional demands and AI-related demands requires particular attention. The proposed model suggests that technostress may amplify traditional demands through cross-loading effects. Techno-overload adds to temporal demands, techno-invasion complicates recovery from social-emotional demands, techno-complexity competes with cognitive resources needed for technical demands, techno-insecurity intensifies performance anxiety, and techno-uncertainty adds to general uncertainty about career trajectories.

5.5. Hypotheses and Empirical Propositions

Based on the integrated JD-R model for music education in the AI era, several testable hypotheses can be derived. First, the model predicts that music learning demands (technical, physical, temporal, performance, social-emotional, and technostress) will positively predict burnout and technostress outcomes among music students. This prediction follows directly from the health impairment process and has received preliminary support from research demonstrating relationships between specific demands (e.g., performance anxiety, time pressure) and negative well-being outcomes among musicians, as well as emerging research on technostress in educational contexts.

Second, the model predicts that music learning resources (teacher support, peer relationships, material/institutional resources, intrinsic motivation, feedback, and AI tools) will positively predict engagement outcomes among music students. This prediction follows from the motivational process and aligns with research demonstrating relationships between support, motivation, and positive outcomes in music education contexts. The strength of this prediction may vary across resource types, with intrinsic motivation expected to have particularly strong effects given its direct connection to engagement.

Third, the model predicts that resources will buffer the relationship between demands (including technostress) and strain outcomes, such that the positive relationship between demands and burnout/technostress will be weaker for students with high resources compared to those with low resources. This buffering effect is expected to be particularly pronounced for performance demands and techno-insecurity, given the strong role of social support and intrinsic motivation in managing evaluation anxiety and existential concerns about AI. Fourth, the model predicts that the combined effects of demands and resources will explain substantial variance in burnout, technostress, and engagement outcomes beyond what either construct alone can explain, supporting the dual-process JD-R formulation.

Fifth, the model predicts that the relationship between AI tool usage and outcomes will follow a curvilinear pattern, with moderate usage associated with positive outcomes due to resource provision, while excessive usage may become a demand through techno-overload and techno-invasion mechanisms.

Sixth, and critically, the model predicts that AI-related demands and resources will exhibit subgroup-specific patterns. Composers are expected to report higher levels of techno-insecurity and perceived market displacement than performers, while entry-level composers are expected to perceive AI tools as more resourceful compared to established composers. Performers are expected to experience AI-related demands primarily through recording market contraction rather than direct competition. Singers are expected to show a distinctive temporal pattern: initially higher engagement with AI opportunities (voice recording) followed by increasing techno-insecurity as replacement implications become salient. These subgroup differences are hypothesized to moderate the relationships between AI-related demands/resources and burnout/engagement outcomes.

These hypotheses provide a foundation for empirical research that can test and refine the proposed model. Methodologically rigorous studies would employ longitudinal designs capable of establishing temporal precedence, use validated measures adapted for music education contexts—including music-specific technostress scales—and analyze data using analytical techniques appropriate for testing interaction effects. Future research should also employ subgroup-comparative designs that distinguish composers, performers, and singers, enabling direct tests of the differentiated impact hypotheses proposed here. Qualitative research could complement quantitative approaches by exploring the lived experiences of music students in terms of the model's constructs, potentially identifying additional demands or resources not captured in the current formulation.

6. Discussion and Implications

6.1. Theoretical Contributions

The proposed JD-R model for music education contributes to theory development in several significant ways. First, the model extends occupational health psychology theory into a novel domain by systematically analyzing music learning contexts through the JD-R lens, now updated to address the technological transformation of contemporary music education. While JD-R theory has been successfully applied to general educational settings, the distinctive features of music education—including intensive master-apprentice relationships, public performance evaluation, physical demands of instrumental playing, and extended developmental timelines—required theoretical adaptation that goes beyond simple application of existing frameworks.

Second, the model advances understanding of the mechanisms through which music learning affects psychological outcomes. By identifying specific categories of demands and resources—including the newly theorized technostress dimensions—the model provides conceptual precision that can guide empirical research and practical intervention. Rather than treating “music learning stress” as a monolithic construct, the model distinguishes

among technical, physical, temporal, performance, social–emotional, and technostress demands, each with different etiological pathways and potentially different intervention strategies. Furthermore, by introducing subgroup differentiation—recognizing that composers, performers, and singers face qualitatively distinct demand–resource configurations in the AI era—the model moves beyond the assumption that music students constitute a homogeneous population. This differentiation is not merely a nuance but a theoretical necessity: the same AI technology (e.g., generative music composition) that functions as a resource for entry-level composers simultaneously operates as a demand for established composers, and the same voice cloning technology that provides short-term income for singers may enable their long-term replacement.

Third, the integration of Self-Determination Theory with JD-R theory provides additional theoretical precision regarding the motivational mechanisms underlying the JD-R processes, with important implications for understanding AI's role. By explicitly linking resources to basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, relatedness), the model explains why resources have motivational effects and provides a foundation for understanding individual differences in resource utilization. This integration clarifies how AI tools can either support or undermine motivation depending on their implementation: AI that provides choice, supports competence development, and facilitates human connection enhances motivation, while AI that imposes control, provides overwhelming feedback, or replaces human relationships may undermine it.

Fourth, the explicit treatment of technostress as a distinct outcome construct—alongside burnout and engagement—represents a theoretical contribution with implications beyond music education. As AI becomes increasingly integrated into creative professions, the technostress experienced by music students may foreshadow challenges faced by professionals in other creative domains. The framework developed here may inform research on AI and creativity in fields including visual arts, writing, design, and other creative disciplines where similar dynamics are emerging.

Fifth, the explicit inclusion of cultural identity demands extends JD-R theory beyond its traditionally individual-level focus to include collective-cultural level demands. The technological homogenization construct represents a novel demand category that operates at the cultural-collective level, addressing how AI systems trained on Western-dominated datasets may erode cultural musical diversity. This extension is particularly relevant for music education in non-Western contexts, including East Asian regions such as Hong Kong, Mainland China, and Taiwan, where students must negotiate between Western classical music curricula and their heritage musical traditions.

6.2. Globalization, Cultural Homogenization, and Music Education

The intersection of globalization with music education creates both opportunities and demands that warrant specific attention. The globalization of music education—driven by international conservatories, standardized examinations (ABRSM, RCM), international competitions, and digital access to global repertoire—has led to unprecedented cross-cultural exchange. However, this process has not been neutral; scholars have identified it as a form of musical colonialism, whereby Western classical music norms spread as universal standards while marginalizing diverse musical traditions (Kallio, 2020).

The theoretical framework developed in this paper provides a JD-R lens for understanding globalization's effects. The homogenization of global music education operates as a demand at multiple levels: the individual level (identity confusion when heritage traditions are marginalized), the interpersonal level (social comparison with students from dominant traditions), and the cultural-collective level (erosion of musical heritage as global standards override local traditions). For students in non-Western contexts, the

prestige of Western classical credentials creates pressure to pursue Western training, while the globalization of career opportunities rewards those who meet global standards—yet globalization may simultaneously undermine the cultural specificity that makes music meaningful within local contexts.

AI compounds these globalization dynamics through techno-cultural homogenization, as discussed in Section 3.6. The AI systems that increasingly support music learning are predominantly designed for Western musical traditions; their training datasets reflect Western musical dominance, and their evaluation algorithms apply Western standards. When students worldwide use the same AI tools, the result is amplified homogenization rather than genuine cross-cultural exchange. This dynamic is particularly challenging for students in Hong Kong, Mainland China, Taiwan, and other East Asian contexts who navigate between heritage musical traditions and global standards that privilege Western classical music.

Addressing these dynamics requires interventions at multiple levels: institutions should consciously incorporate diverse musical traditions; teachers should help students connect cultural backgrounds with musical studies; AI developers should design systems attentive to diverse musical traditions; and students should be supported in developing bi-cultural musical identities that honor heritage while pursuing global opportunities.

6.3. Implications for Music Educators

The proposed model offers several practical implications for music educators seeking to support student well-being alongside musical development in the AI era. First, the model highlights the importance of teacher support as a critical resource that can buffer multiple demand types—including technology-related demands. Music teachers can enhance their support provision by practicing autonomy-supportive teaching, providing regular and specific feedback, maintaining warm and respectful relationships, and avoiding controlling behaviors that undermine student motivation.

Second, the model suggests that managing demands is as important as providing resources, and that this principle extends to technology-related demands. Teachers can help students manage technostress by discussing the role of AI in contemporary music practice, normalizing concerns about AI and human musicianship, and providing a perspective on the enduring value of human artistic expression. Rather than ignoring AI or promoting uncritical adoption, teachers can help students develop healthy frameworks for thinking about technology's role in their musical lives. Critically, educators should be attentive to the differentiated impacts of AI across student subgroups: composition students may need particular support in navigating techno-insecurity related to market displacement, while performance students may benefit from guidance on leveraging AI accompaniment tools for self-media career development. Singers require especially nuanced mentoring regarding the voice cloning paradox—understanding both the near-term opportunities and the long-term risks of recording their vocal timbres for AI training data.

Third, the model emphasizes the value of appropriate AI integration as a resource while cautioning against excessive reliance. Teachers can incorporate AI tools strategically to enhance feedback availability, provide practice support, and expand creative possibilities, while maintaining human mentorship as the primary pedagogical relationship. The goal should be to use AI to enhance human connection rather than replace it.

Fourth, the model suggests that teachers attend to the complex interactions between traditional and technological demands. Students experiencing high performance pressure may be particularly vulnerable to techno-insecurity, as evaluation anxiety may generalize to concerns about being replaced by machines. Teachers should be alert to these compounding effects and provide targeted support when students face multiple simultaneous demands.

6.4. Implications for Institutions

Music education institutions also have important roles to play in implementing the model's implications. Institutional policies should ensure adequate resource provision, including quality instruments, appropriate practice facilities, and support services, including counseling and health resources (Wristen, 2013). With respect to AI, institutions should provide guidance on appropriate tool selection, offer training in effective AI utilization, and establish norms that prevent excessive technology use while encouraging beneficial adoption.

Policies should protect student welfare by establishing reasonable practice expectations, providing injury prevention resources, and supporting students who experience physical problems. With respect to technostress, institutions should consider policies that protect student well-being in relation to technology use. This might include establishing guidelines for AI tool adoption that prioritize student welfare, providing resources for managing technology-related stress, and creating cultures that value human musicianship alongside technological fluency.

Institutional climates that prioritize student well-being alongside musical excellence create structural conditions that support positive outcomes. This climate should extend to technology use, with institutions modeling healthy relationships with AI tools and avoiding pressure to adopt technologies before their effects are understood. The rapid pace of AI development creates uncertainty about which tools will prove valuable; institutions should resist hype-driven adoption while remaining open to beneficial innovations.

Curriculum design can incorporate the model's insights by balancing demanding components with resource provision. For example, intensive performance requirements can be paired with robust support systems, including performance-preparation workshops, anxiety-management resources, and post-performance debriefings. Technical skill development can be accompanied by music theory, musicianship, and musicians' health components that provide knowledge and resources beyond mere technical training.

6.5. Implications for Technology Developers

The proposed model has significant implications for developers of AI tools for music education. The framework suggests that effective AI resources should satisfy basic psychological needs rather than undermining them. Developers should design tools that support autonomy by providing meaningful choices rather than creating compulsive usage patterns.

The model also suggests that developers should attend to the demand dimensions of their products. Tools that create techno-overload through excessive features or gamification should be reconsidered. Tools that invade personal time through notifications and accessibility should include features that support healthy boundaries.

The most successful AI tools for music education will likely be those that are designed with explicit attention to both their resource and demand properties. Developers who understand the psychological dynamics of music learning will be better positioned to create tools that genuinely support student well-being and musical development.

6.6. Implications for Students

Music students can also utilize the model's framework for self-understanding and self-management. Recognizing that the challenges they experience—including technology-related challenges—are systemic rather than purely personal can reduce self-blame and facilitate help-seeking. Students can assess their own demand-resource profiles, identifying which demand types are most problematic (including which technostress dimensions are most salient) and which resource types are most lacking in their current circumstances.

Students can develop self-regulation skills that function as personal resources for managing demands (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994; Bandura, 1997). Effective practice strategies, time management approaches, goal-setting techniques, and stress management skills can all enhance students' capacity to manage demands without depleting resources. With respect to AI, students can develop healthy practices around technology use, including setting boundaries, choosing tools deliberately, and maintaining perspective on AI's role in their musical development.

The model also suggests that students should attend to their basic psychological needs as a foundation for motivation and engagement. Seeking learning environments that support autonomy, building relationships that provide relatedness satisfaction, and pursuing activities that develop competence can all enhance intrinsic motivation. With respect to AI, students should be intentional about which tools they adopt and how they use them, choosing tools that support need satisfaction rather than undermine it.

The ultimate goal is not merely to prevent burnout and technostress but to foster engagement—the energized, meaningful, absorbed state that makes musical learning worthwhile. When demands are appropriately calibrated and resources are abundantly provided—including appropriately integrated AI tools that serve genuine educational purposes—learners can experience the rewards of musical engagement: technical mastery, artistic expression, creative fulfillment, and the profound human connection that music makes possible.

7. Limitations and Future Directions

The proposed JD-R framework provides a foundational lens for understanding music education in the AI era. To fully realize its potential, the boundaries of the current study highlight several promising and constructive avenues for future research.

First, opportunities for Empirical Validation: This study establishes a robust theoretical model; its specific propositions—particularly those regarding AI-induced technostress offer a clear roadmap for future empirical testing. Future research should prioritize developing adapted technostress scales specific to music education and conducting longitudinal studies. Translating this theoretical framework into measurable insights will further establish the validity of the hypothesized demand-resource interactions.

Second, deepening Subgroup and Individual Analyses: The model successfully identifies distinct demand-resource configurations for key subgroups, including composers, performers, and singers. Future studies can build upon this by examining the substantial heterogeneity within these groups, such as variations across musical genres (e.g., classical, popular, jazz), cultural contexts, and institutional settings. Additionally, exploring how individual traits—such as perfectionism, career anxiety, or self-efficacy—mediate vulnerability to techno-insecurity will provide a more granular understanding of student experiences.

Third, expanding Outcome Dimensions: By focusing on psychological well-being (burnout, technostress, and engagement), this model establishes a vital psychological baseline. Future research can constructively expand this scope by integrating objective measures of musical performance, physical health, and long-term career persistence. Investigating whether AI tools genuinely improve objective performance or primarily serve to increase performance pressure through human-AI comparison will provide a more holistic view of their impact.

Fourth, application to Broader Contexts: This study is intentionally situated within formal music education to address its unique institutional and pedagogical demands. This focused approach provides a strong springboard for future scholarship to adapt the framework for informal learning environments, self-directed study, and professional perfor-

mance settings. Examining how established professional musicians navigate technostress differently from students represents a particularly valuable next step

Fifth, evolving with Technological Advancements: Given the rapid trajectory of generative AI, this framework is designed as a dynamic, foundational model. As new AI capabilities, creative tools, and paradigms of human-AI interaction emerge, future scholarship can iteratively refine and recalibrate this model. This will ensure the framework remains a highly relevant and adaptable tool for navigating the ongoing technological transformation in music education.

8. Conclusions

This paper has developed a comprehensive theoretical framework applying Job Demands-Resources theory to music education contexts, now extended to address the transformative influence of artificial intelligence on contemporary musical training. The analysis identified seven categories of demands—technical, physical, temporal, performance, social-emotional, technostress, and cultural identity—each encompassing specific stressors documented in the music education literature, including the emerging research on technology-related stress. Similarly, six categories of resources were identified—teacher support, peer relationships, material and institutional resources, intrinsic motivation, feedback systems, and AI-powered learning tools—each providing functions that can buffer demands and promote engagement. A critical contribution of the present framework is the differentiation of AI-related demands and resources across music student subgroups: composers face direct market displacement as demand but also creative augmentation as a resource, with effects stratified by career stage; performers experience indirect disruption through recording market contraction alongside emerging self-media opportunities; and singers confront a distinctive temporal paradox whereby short-term voice recording income enables long-term vocal replacement.

The integrated JD-R model for music education in the AI era proposes that these demands and resources interact through health impairment and motivational processes to shape student outcomes. The health impairment process follows the established JD-R mechanism whereby high demands deplete psychological and physical resources, leading to burnout and technostress outcomes over time. The newly integrated technostress construct captures the specific strain arising from AI integration, including techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity, techno-insecurity, and techno-uncertainty.

The practical implications of this framework extend to music educators, institutions, technology developers, and students themselves. Music educators can enhance their effectiveness by providing autonomy-supportive teaching, managing demands appropriately—including technology-related demands—and facilitating peer support while thoughtfully integrating AI tools. Music institutions can create healthier learning environments through policy design, resource provision, and climate cultivation that addresses both traditional and technological stressors.

The emergence of artificial intelligence in music education represents both an opportunity and a challenge for the field. AI tools offer unprecedented capabilities for personalized practice guidance, immediate feedback, and expanded creative possibilities—resources that can enhance musical development and well-being when appropriately integrated. At the same time, AI introduces novel stressors that must be recognized and addressed: the pressure to work faster and longer, the invasion of technology into personal time, the complexity of understanding and using AI systems, the insecurity of training in fields where machines increasingly demonstrate comparable capabilities, and the uncertainty of rapid technological change.

When demands are appropriately calibrated, and resources are abundantly provided—including thoughtfully integrated AI tools that serve genuine educational purposes—learners can experience the rewards of musical engagement: technical mastery, artistic expression, creative fulfillment, and the profound human connection that music makes possible. This vision of music education provides the aspiration toward which theory and practice should strive. The proposed JD-R framework offers a theoretical foundation for achieving this vision by systematically addressing the psychological dynamics—including the technological transformation—that shape music student outcomes.

The future of music education will inevitably involve artificial intelligence in increasingly sophisticated ways. The question is not whether AI will be integrated into music learning, but how that integration will be managed to support human flourishing rather than undermining it. By attending to both the demand and resource dimensions of AI integration, the framework developed in this paper guides creating music education environments where human creativity and machine capability complement rather than compete with each other.

Funding: This research was funded by Beijing Normal University Research Fund grant number 31220050252509.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

- Ackermann, B. J., Kenny, D. T., & Fortune, J. (2011). Incidence of injury and attitudes to injury management in skilled flute players. *Work*, 40(3), 255–259. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-2011-1227>.
- Aelterman, N., Vansteenkiste, M., Haerens, L., & Soenens, B. (2019). Toward an integrative and fine-grained insight in motivating and demotivating teaching style: The role of teachers' need-supportive vs. need-thwarting behavior. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 111(3), 497–521. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000293>.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD–R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 389–411. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235>.
- Ballantyne, J., Kerchner, J. L., & Aróstegui, J. L. (2012). Developing music teacher identities: An international multi-site study. *International Journal of Music Education*, 30(3), 211–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02557614111433720>.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Creech, A. (2012). Interpersonal behaviour in one-to-one instrumental lessons: An observational analysis. *British Journal of Music Education*, 29(3), 387–407. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026505171200006X>.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>.
- Duke, R. A., Simmons, A. L., & Cash, C. D. (2009). It's not how much; it's how: Characteristics of practice behavior and retention of performance skills. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56(4), 310–321. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429408328851>.
- Epstein, Z., Hertzmann, A., Akten, M., Farid, H., Fjeld, J., Frank, M. R., Groh, M., Herman, L., Leach, N., & Mahari, R. (2023). Art and the science of generative AI. *Science*, 380(6650), 1110–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh4451>.
- Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100(3), 363–406. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.3.363>.
- Fishbein, M., Middlestadt, S. E., Ottati, V., Straus, S., & Ellis, A. (1988). Medical problems among ICSOM musicians: Overview of a national survey. *Medical Problems of Performing Artists*, 3(1), 1–8.
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>.

- Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. C. Quick, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 165–184). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1chs29w.14>.
- Hargreaves, D. J., Miell, D., & MacDonald, R. A. R. (2002). What are musical identities, and why are they important? In R. A. R. MacDonald, D. J. Hargreaves, & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical identities* (pp. 1–20). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198509325.003.0001>.
- Herremans, D., Chuan, C.-H., & Chew, E. (2017). A functional taxonomy of music generation systems. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 50(5), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3108242>.
- Ho, W. C., & Law, W. W. (2006). Challenges to globalisation, localisation and Sinophilia in music education: A comparative study of Hong Kong, Shanghai and Taipei. *British Journal of Music Education*, 23(2), 217–237. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051706006942>.
- Janata, P., Tomic, S. T., & Haberman, J. M. (2012). Sensorimotor coupling in music and the psychology of the groove. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 141(1), 54–75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024208>.
- Juslin, P. N., & Västfjäll, D. (2008). Emotional responses to music: The need to consider underlying mechanisms. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 31(5), 559–575. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X08005293>.
- Kallio, A. A. (2020). Decolonizing music education research and the (im)possibility of methodological responsibility. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 42(2), 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X19845690>.
- Kenny, D. T. (2009). The factor structure of the revised Kenny Music Performance Anxiety Inventory. *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Performance Science*, 1, 249–254.
- Kenny, D. T., & Ackermann, B. J. (2011). Performance anxiety. In E. R. Aldridge (Ed.), *Routledge companion to music and emotion* (pp. 415–434). Routledge.
- Kenny, D. T., & Drinkwater, M. (2010). The role of negative emotions in performance anxiety. In P. N. Juslin, & J. A. Sloboda (Eds.), *Handbook of music and emotion: Theory, research, applications* (pp. 425–451). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199230143.003.0016>.
- Kenny, D. T., & Osborne, M. S. (2006). Music performance anxiety: Theoretical frameworks and intervention strategies. In E. K. R. Aldridge (Ed.), *Music therapy and neurological rehabilitation* (pp. 231–251). Barcelona Publishers.
- Klein, M. (2019). Richard M. Ryan and Edward L. Deci: Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness [Review of the book *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*, by R. M. Ryan & E. L. Deci]. *Sociologický Časopis*, 55(3), 412–413.
- Lamont, A. (2012). Emotion, engagement and meaning in strong experiences of music performance. *Psychology of Music*, 40(5), 574–594. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735612448510>.
- Lee, J.-A., & Sun, X. (2026). Vocal identity under siege by AI voice cloning technologies. *Singapore Journal of Legal Studies*, 2026, 46–76. Available online: https://law.nus.edu.sg/sjls/wp-content/uploads/sites/14/2025/10/sjls_mar_2026_46.pdf (accessed on 1 May 2026).
- Fu, Y., Newman, M., Going, L., Feng, Q., & Lee, J. H. (2025). Exploring the collaborative co-creation process with AI: A case study in novice music production. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2501.15276>.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>.
- McClure, P. K. (2018). “You’re fired,” says the robot: The rise of automation in the workplace, technophobes, fears of unemployment. *Social Science Computer Review*, 36(2), 139–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439317698637>.
- McPherson, G. E., & Davidson, J. W. (2006). Playing an instrument. In G. E. McPherson (Ed.), *The child as musician: A handbook of musical development* (pp. 331–352). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198530329.003.0017>.
- Miksza, P. (2007). Effective practice: An investigation of observed practice behaviors, self-reported practice habits, and the performance achievement of high school wind players. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 55(4), 359–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429408317513>.
- Nettl, B. (1995). *Heartland excursions: Ethnomusicological reflections on music of the home*. University of Illinois Press.
- Osborne, M. S., & Kenny, D. T. (2008). The role of sensitizing experiences in music performance anxiety in adolescent musicians. *Psychology of Music*, 36(4), 447–462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735607086051>.
- Paré, G., Trudel, M.-C., Jaana, M., & Kitsiou, S. (2015). Synthesizing information systems knowledge: A typology of literature reviews. *Information & Management*, 52(2), 183–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2014.08.008>.
- PMP Strategy & CISAC. (2024). *Study on the economic impact of generative AI in the music and audiovisual industries*. International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers. Available online: <https://www.cisac.org/Newsroom/news-releases/global-economic-study-shows-human-creators-future-risk-generative-ai> (accessed on 1 May 2026).
- Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and empirical validation. *Information Systems Research*, 19(4), 417–433. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1070.0165>.

- Ruthmann, S. A., & Hebert, D. G. (2012). Music learning and new media in virtual and online environments. In G. E. McPherson, & G. F. Welch (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music education* (Vol. 2). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199928019.013.0037>.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.
- Salanova, M., Schaufeli, W. B., Martínez, I. M., & Bresó, E. (2010). How obstacles and facilitators predict academic performance: The mediating role of study burnout and engagement. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 23(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800802609965>.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A. B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 10–24). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203853047-6>.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1996). Maslach Burnout Inventory–General Survey. In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *The Maslach Burnout Inventory* (3rd ed., pp. 19–26). Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>.
- Schlaug, G. (2001). The brain of musicians: A model for functional and structural adaptation. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 930(1), 281–299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2001.tb05739.x>.
- Sloboda, J. A., Davidson, J. W., Howe, M. J. A., & Moore, D. G. (1996). The role of practice in the development of performing musicians. *British Journal of Psychology*, 87(2), 287–309. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1996.tb02591.x>.
- Solomon, F. (2025). The influence of artificial intelligence on music composition and performance: Opportunities, challenges, and ethical considerations. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15295637>.
- Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The impact of technostress on role stress and productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(1), 301–328. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240109>.
- UNESCO. (2026). *Re|Shaping policies for creativity: We share, we act, we build* (4th ed.). United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://doi.org/10.58337/DQDA4649>.
- Wrigley, W. J., & Emmerson, S. B. (2013). The experience of the flow state in live music performance. *Psychology of Music*, 41(3), 292–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735611425903>.
- Wristen, B. G. (2013). Depression and anxiety in university music students. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 31(2), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8755123312473613>.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Bandura, A. (1994). Impact of self-regulatory influences on writing course attainment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(4), 845–862. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312031004845>.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.