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The aim of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was to improve the performance of America’s primary and secondary schools by assuring that highly qualified teachers were in place to educate our nation’s children. However, music teachers are sometimes placed in job positions that run contrary to their pre-service training. Research indicates a trend of states moving to non-stratified K-12 music certifications that may be exacerbating this problem.

This study investigated the relationship of teacher role and music teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the 15 benchmarks associated with the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Participants were a convenience sample of two groups of high school music teachers from Ohio and defined as multidiscipline (instrumental/choral) and specialist (instrumental or choral) music. The final overall response rate was 25.7% (N=147) of specialist (n₁=122) and multi-discipline (n₂=25) teachers. Data were derived from an online questionnaire using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Using a repeated measures analysis of variance, between- and within-group variances were analyzed to identify
differences with respect to teacher role (specialist teachers versus multi-discipline teachers) and benchmark.

Findings indicated no significant difference exists between specialist and multi-discipline music teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. In addition, there was no significant interaction effect between teacher role and benchmarks. Slight differences between select benchmark means and teacher role suggested future studies could investigate benchmarks by content standard rather than collectively. Future research on the topic of specialist and multi-discipline music teachers will require better precision in sampling and improved control to better investigate distinctions between these teacher groups.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The publication of the National Standards for Arts Education (1994) established the instrument for state agencies to create voluntary standards in arts education in the United States. These standards were the result of a long process of compromise, including a nationwide review of state-level arts education frameworks. In that same year, the passage of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, n.d.) cast a broad stroke toward helping students attain competency in many areas including the arts. By extension, the National Standards for Arts Education became a means by which students could demonstrate competency in the arts as a core subject area. In 1997, a joint council was made by the Ohio State Board of Education and Board of Regents to oversee the recommendations of the Secondary and Higher Education Remediation Advisory Commission (Music: Alignment by standard, 2003). Its initial work was to establish a set of common expectations in six content areas: the arts, English language arts, foreign languages, mathematics, science, and social studies (Music: Alignment by standard, 2003). A final draft of the Ohio Academic Content Standards (OACS) (ODE, 2003) was presented to the State Board of Education on December 9, 2003.

Within the Fine Arts section of the OACS, there are five overarching standards: Historical, Cultural, and Social Contexts; Creative Expression and Communication; Analyzing and Responding; Valuing the Arts/Aesthetic Reflection; and Connections, Relationships, and Applications. These state standards, although developed specifically
for Ohio, are rooted in the National Standards for Arts Education, indicating what a student should know and be able to do at each grade level. Thus, the OACS document provides Ohio educators with common expectations on which to base arts education. However, Ohio does not require music to be a requisite subject on the Ohio Graduation Test (OGT) (ODE, 2008). It follows that the implementation of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music may vary from school district to school district. Teachers are not bound to the precepts of the standards and are free to create balanced programs in the best way they see fit.

Some of the variability in the execution of the Ohio standards may be due to multi-discipline teacher placements. Academic disciplines have long established the practice of multi-discipline area teaching. This has helped to ease class scheduling while meeting the constraints of shrinking school budgets or teacher shortages (Ingersoll & Curran, 2004). In mathematics, it is common for an educator to teach geometry along with courses in algebra and pre-calculus. Historically, the sciences have maintained a staff member who taught not only physics, but biology and chemistry as well. Related positions also include those teachers who coach athletic teams (Figone, 1994). It can be argued that permutations of various kinds of teaching assignments have become established norms.

In this case, the practice of placing teachers in job positions inconsistent with their training has seemingly remained unchanged despite the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2001). The aim of this law was to eliminate “out-of-field” placements (Ingersoll & Curran, 2004) and improve the performance of America's primary and secondary schools. It increased the standards of
accountability for states, school districts, and schools as well as providing parents more flexibility in their choice of school for their children. A primary concern of teachers was, and still is, the national requirement of becoming “highly qualified” (NCLB, p. 29) in a particular discipline. In Ohio, for example, a teacher is considered highly qualified if they have a bachelor’s degree in their content area and are fully certified as defined by the state department of education. Additionally, a teacher must have one of the following: (a) passed the NTE or Praxis II in their content area, (b) have an academic major or equivalent in their content area, or, (c) a master’s degree in the content area of their teaching assignment (Zelman & Troyer, 2005). Until a change was made allowing for flexibility for rural and urban schools in 2004, certain discipline areas were in jeopardy of losing teachers due to their lack of area specific qualifications (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). For example, a teacher in a rural school district who taught various disciplines of science might not be able to do so unless there was documentation indicating state certification in all subject areas taught.

Given the unique specialty involved with the teaching of the voice, wind, or stringed instruments, even fewer similarities may exist in these music discipline areas than in their aforementioned math and science counterparts. Typically, a pre-service teacher in the field of music is concentrated in a specific area of discipline within the music profession. An instrumental major, while having an expertise with a particular family of instruments, i.e., brass, percussion, woodwinds, or strings, is unlikely to have the same level of proficiency in all of these areas. A vocalist spends years learning to train an area of the body that is visibly hidden and must develop procedures to elicit freely produced vocal sounds from the laryngeal area. Unless a music teacher has
specifically determined a course of study that will gain insight and expertise into all of these areas, the educator is, in essence, a specialist in a particular discipline of study within the music profession. Discipline specific training in music may not qualify an educator to teach every aspect of music (both vocal and instrumental) from kindergarten through 12th grade.

Despite the passage of the NCLB, National Standards for Arts Education, and state-level standards, music still struggles to be recognized as a core subject area. The practice of placing music teachers in multi-discipline teaching positions seemingly remains prevalent even though other core subject areas seem to be more restrictive regarding the requirement of having highly qualified teachers. Moreover, music standards in general are not assessed in the same manner as the other disciplines. For example, music is not tested on the OGT and is not required for graduation (ODE, 2008). Given the current climate of education in the United States surrounding accountability for teaching and education, academic standards and benchmarks provide validity to curricula and teaching. The ability of teachers to effectively deliver standards and benchmarks in a systematic and ordered process provides the best possible situation for students to thrive as participants, performers, or as future professionals within the music profession.

Byo (1997) compared elementary generalist (regular classroom) and specialist music educators. Using seven professional and resource items, i.e., training, musical ability, availability of resources, availability of assistance, available time, interest, and sense of responsibility, she examined teachers’ perceived ability to implement the national music standards. According to this research, generalist teachers felt they were most comfortable with the standards that related to other subject areas and music's
relationship to culture and history. They readily admitted they were unable to teach the
content required of the standards and relied upon the elementary music specialist to
provide adequate teaching of them. A particularly salient part of the research was the
generalist teacher's near-complete rejection of the implementation of the standards based
on (a) time, (b) resources, (c) training, (c) materials, and (d) interest. Generalist and
specialist teachers agreed there was a lack of adequate instructional time built into
schedules as well as a lack of equipment and materials.

Need for the Study

This study defined generalist and specialist in a slightly different manner than
Byo. The music teacher hired to teach both areas was not considered a generalist for this
study, but “multi-disciplined.” The “specialist” music teacher was defined as one who
conducts ensembles within a specified major area of college preparation (instrumental or
choral). The primary need for this change in semantics is due to instrumental and choral
areas being inherently different. Each constitutes a major field with specialty areas
defined by college music education curricula. In an effort to cover all essential areas of
each discipline, the multi-discipline teacher may place more emphasis on general musical
content rather than a strict depth of understanding of music. This creates a concern
regarding how a teacher approaches a balanced ensemble program. As a simple matter of
music teacher training, one or more of the performing groups in a multi-discipline
position would fall outside of the major applied performance area of the teacher’s pre-
service training. In research done by Conway (2002), an administrator offered feedback
to a questionnaire stating, “We really need a band director who can also build the choral
program” (p. 31). If standards are to be implemented in a meaningful way in a multi-

discipline teaching position, then it should be determined whether or not proper undergraduate and pre-service training, resources, or improper teacher placement has a negative impact. The added pressure of having to learn a new discipline “on-the-job” could produce circumstances that might render a teacher vulnerable to being considered unqualified under the terms specified by NCLB.

Purpose for the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship of teacher role and music teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the 15 benchmarks associated with the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Specifically, it was designed to test whether multi-discipline and specialist teachers had differing opinions of their ability to implement these benchmarks for high school performance ensembles. The results of the findings could have implications on how public schools determine music program design and staffing, suggest new elements of focus for music education training for pre-service and in-service teachers, and address the nature of teacher licensure in music.

Statement of the Problem

What is the relationship of teacher role and music teachers' opinions of their ability to successfully implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music?
Research Questions

1. What difference exists between multi-discipline and specialist teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully implement the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music?

2. What differences exist across the 15 benchmarks in music teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully implement the benchmarks of the 15 Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music?

3. Are the differences between multi-discipline and specialist teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music the same for multi-discipline and specialist teachers?

Research Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between multi-discipline and specialist teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

2. There is no significant difference between music teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across each of the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

3. There is no significant interaction between multi-discipline and specialist teacher’s opinions of their ability to successfully implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.
Methodology

The design of the current study was based on research completed by Byo (1997) comparing elementary generalist (regular classroom) and specialist (music) educators, and their ability to implement the national music standards. Since there is a direct relationship between the national standards and the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music, this study made use of the 15 benchmarks within these state-level standards.

The pilot survey instrument was distributed to music teaching professionals for an initial evaluation of content validity and usability. The feedback received from the pilot participants shaped the web version of a new pilot and final version of the survey instrument for the main study. In the main study, participants were a convenience sampling of two groups of high school teachers: multi-discipline conductors (instrumental and choral) and specialist conductors (instrumental or choral). These groups were defined by teacher databases used for research through the music education department at Kent State University and contacted via electronic mail. Those teachers willing to participate in the main study were provided a link to the web-based survey via the initial electronic mail contact.

Demographic information (gender, age, degree, area of expertise, current position, years of experience, and school population size) was elicited in the first section of the survey. These data were descriptively analyzed to provide a background understanding of the sample populations. Additionally, all possible permutations of music discipline were stratified into subgroups of teaching, i.e., band, orchestra, and choral.
The first independent variable was defined as teacher role (area of instruction: multi-discipline and specialist music teachers). Since this study was a comparison of these two populations of teachers, these groups represented two levels of this variable. The second independent variable was the 15 benchmarks within the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Survey participants were asked to provide responses regarding the effect of their own training, musical ability, availability of resources, availability of assistance, available time, interest, and sense of responsibility on their opinions of their ability to implement each of the 15 benchmarks. These questions were formatted using a Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

To address the first hypothesis, multi-discipline and specialist teachers' ratings for the seven resource and professional items were summed for each of the benchmarks. This sum score of the seven professional resource items served as a scale (dependent variable) subjected to statistical calculations. Between-group comparisons identified differences with respect to teacher role (specialist teachers versus multi-discipline teachers). The second hypothesis compared the mean score between teachers’ ratings for each of the seven resource items across each of the 15 benchmarks. This allowed for inferences regarding comparison of teachers’ opinions of what benchmarks were preferred. The third hypothesis addressed a possible interaction effect with regard to teacher role and the 15 benchmarks. A .05 alpha level was determined a priori to be an appropriate measure of significance.
Delimitations

1. The scope of this study was for high school music education. It does not address
the larger body of the arts or similar situations in other disciplines.

2. The survey was limited to the database provided through the music department at
Kent State University.

3. The time frame for this study was one year. Therefore, changes in the database
were possible and expected.

4. Responses of the teachers were limited to the items contained in the survey
instrument.

Definitions and Terms

1. Availability of assistance: adjunct assistance to help support the music program
(private instrumental and vocal lessons, guest speakers, and clinicians, special
education aids).

2. Availability of resources: resources include materials with which to teach (books,
recordings, music for performance or study) and musical equipment (including
instruments, media, technology), and proper facilities.

3. Available time: proper instructional time allocated within the school class
schedule for music.

4. Benchmark: “the specific component of the knowledge or skill identified by an
academic content, performance, or operational standard. It can be characterized as
being declarative, procedural, or contextual in the type of knowledge it describes”
(Music: Alignment by standard, 2003, p. 18). This study will be concerned with
the benchmarks only associated with grades 9-12.
5. Curriculum: the structure, organization, balance, and presentation of expected or recommended study topics that address content standards and meet local expectations.

6. Highly qualified: a teacher is determined to be highly qualified under NCLB having met certain standards of education: having a bachelor’s degree in the content area and being fully certified as defined by the state department of education. Additionally, the teacher must have one of the following: (a) passed the NTE or Praxis II in their content area, (b) have an academic major or equivalent in their content area, or, (c) a master’s degree in the content area of their teaching assignment (Zelman & Troyer, 2005).

7. Interest: the teacher’s value placed upon the choices of topics to be highlighted or de-emphasized.

8. Licensure/certification: official state documentation required of teachers in order to teach in a specified area.

9. Multi-discipline teacher: a teacher who is in a position that is inclusive of different music ensemble areas. The term will often be used in this study to qualify music teachers who are assigned to band/choral, band/orchestra, choral/orchestra, or band/choral/orchestra positions.

10. Musical ability: competence in the field of music.

11. Opinions: in the data analysis, this is defined as the sum score of the professional and resource items relative to the two levels of teacher role, or as a total mean score.
12. Out-of-field placements: teaching a subject area outside the area of qualification or expertise.

13. Secondary education: any position at the grade 9 through 12 levels.


15. Specialist teacher: a teacher who is in a position that is a specific area of ensemble performance. The term will often be used in this study to qualify music teachers who are assigned to band, orchestra, and choral positions.

16. Standard: an overarching goal or theme. In broad terms, a standard “describes what students should know and be able to do as a result of a comprehensive program of study” (Music: Alignment by standard, 2003, p. 18).

17. Teacher role: the defined instructional position of the music teacher (specialist or multi-discipline).

18. Training: the body of knowledge, skills, and attitudes developed in preparation for a teacher’s current position.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Multi-discipline teachers are not a new phenomenon in education. Roots of the practice began early in the history of education with the one-room schoolhouse. At the turn of the 20th century, there were over 200,000 functioning one-room schoolhouses in the United States (Lohnes, 2001). However, at the close of the 20th century there were approximately 800 spread throughout the states with the largest numbers located in Alaska, California, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Wyoming, North and South Dakota (Rose & Campbell, 1997). School life met the demands of the early agrarian society. Though some schools were open for seven or eight months, many were open for only three or four. The one-room school typically included first through 8th grades with ages and attendance varying widely. The curricula at these schools were particular about memorization, drill and recitation, understanding manners, reading, writing (grammar, spelling, penmanship), arithmetic, U.S. history, and geography. Teachers often lived with local families, rotating from household to household.

Early Teacher Preparation and Certification

The public has historically expected teachers to be knowledgeable in many areas, especially when delivering a broad-based curriculum. With the demand for quality education in America came the demand for quality educator training. The teaching or “normal” school concept became the chief source for trained teachers from 1840-1900. Normal schools garnered their name from the École Normale Superieur or Normal Superior School established in Paris, France in 1794 (Normal School, 2007). This school
was established with the intention of training teachers and served as a model for other schools with similar intent. Graduates of these schools were expected to uphold and teach norms or rules. Normal schools in the United States were established primarily to train elementary school teachers. They were state supported and offered a two-year course beyond the secondary school level.

In the early part of the 19th century, reformers such as James Carter and Horace Mann in Massachusetts were determined to support an improvement in education and teacher training. Harper (1939) indicated, “For the upper classes, there existed colleges providing a classical education in ministry, law, or medicine” (p. 12). Teacher education was not considered a profession worthy of college curricula. Common (public) schools during this time were rather poor. Typically in session only four months of the year due to the needs of a farming calendar, they were poorly attended and taught by whoever was available. Public schools were seen as “pauper schools” (Mark & Gray, 2007, p. 117), and education was for “… the classes, not the masses” (Harper, 1939, p. 12). Dr. Heman Humphery, president of Amherst College, felt people should teach the public with no pretense to quality teaching. Humphery indicated that he “…might quote their [citizens] complaints until sunset, that it is impossible to have good schools without good teachers. Many who offer themselves are deficient in everything” (p.13). James Carter, known as the "Father of the American Normal School” (p.16) denounced public education for what he thought it was a “… total disregard for the education of the children and the state” (Keene, 1982, p. 100). He believed in the appropriation of expenditures to support schools so that suitable texts, facilities, and most importantly, qualified teachers were available. His argument was that the lack of an institution where teachers were trained
constituted an inconsistency in the free-school system. By April of 1838, political systems were in place to support the establishment of three experimental normal schools in Lexington, Bridgewater, and Barre, Massachusetts. Horace Mann said at the dedication of the Lexington school:

I believe Normal Schools to be a new instrumentality in the advancement of the race. I believe that, without them, Free Schools themselves would be shorn of their strength and their healing power and would at length become mere charity schools and thus die out in fact and in form. (Harper, 1939, p. 21)

The Bridgewater Normal School had a storied achievement. Graduates of the Bridgewater school went to other states to form their own normal schools. By 1865, schools with established teacher preparation programs were recognized in Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota, Kansas, and California. (Harper, 1939; Keene, 1982)

Following the Civil War, normal schools came into their own and played a major role in the development of teaching as a profession in common or public schools. Most normal schools were established by states, although a small number of them were established by cities. In Cincinnati, Ohio, a normal school was an established part of their school system from 1868 to 1900. Saint Louis, Missouri had their own normal school in the first decade of the 20th century that prepared classroom teachers for their educational roles (Mark & Gray, 2007).

The consistent charge of the normal school was to properly prepare graduates to go into communities with the knowledge and background to teach. The normal school course curricula, however, was designed for general classroom teachers. Music courses
were seen as electives embodying general cultural purposes (Keene, 1982). According to Keene, teachers who possessed a natural ability most likely found themselves as teachers of music. After completing a course of study, these teachers would have likely attended a summer institute to supplement their training. It was not until the last three decades of the 19th century that stability existed in normal school music programs, allowing teachers to graduate with a music emphasis. One example was the 1884 opening of the Potsdam Musical Institute in New York by Julia Ettie Crane, which was specifically designed to train music supervisors in a normal school (Mark & Gray, 2007). Other literature refers to this school as the Crane Normal Institute (Keene, 1982). Crane established her music preparation courses with the philosophy that there was “commonality between the preparation of the music teacher and the preparation of the musician” (Keene, 1982, p. 215). In connection with the normal school located in Potsdam, she offered actual teaching experiences in model classrooms. Her courses in theory and singing contained practical applications for a model classroom setting. Potential teachers were instructed in the art of arranging subject matter in a logical course of study. It was only after the completion of observations by Crane Institute faculty that pre-service teachers were allowed to pursue actual lab instruction at the normal school located in Potsdam. These students were required to teach twenty minutes per day for ten weeks. During this period, they would meet with normal school teachers to reflect on their teaching and discuss common problems. Crane’s book, *Teachers’ Manual* (Keene, 1982) in 1887 influenced the training of music teachers at other institutions. She embraced the Pestalozzian principle of “the thing before the sign” (Keene, p. 216). In particular, she understood the following tenets, which exemplified that standard:
1. The pupil must hear the scale before he can sing it.

2. After hearing the scale, pupils can learn to sing it accurately.

3. When children can sing the scale, the symbols can be learned. (p. 216)

The child-study movement with the work of G. Stanley Hall and the progressive philosophy of John Dewey caused a new edition in Crane’s *Teachers’ Manual* in 1915 making it more reflective of current trends at the time. Julia Crane was particularly tied to the public school movement in the United States.

As previously stated, music teachers would often attend summer institutes to further their understanding of music teaching. Summer institutes were sponsored by publishers and supported the public school movement. For instance, Hosea Holt held his first of many summer institutes to introduce his *Normal Music Course* (Mark & Gray, 2007). It is here where a polarity occurred in the timeline of music teacher preparation. Colleges and conservatories were tied to the European tradition of teaching. To college professors, music was for the elite and talented and was not to be wasted. This became the leading, yet dichotomous, method of music teacher preparation as normal schools and universities were in constant competition with each other. Often, academia tried to limit normal schools to educating only elementary teachers while leaving high school subjects for higher education. Music supervisors caught between this high school and post-secondary struggle most likely hastened the solution of establishing teacher colleges (Mark & Gray, 2007). By virtue of the growing specialized nature of music, training within general education programs was seemingly not enough. By the 1880s, music supervisors were primarily trained at schools of music and examined in that content area.
The closing decades of the 19th century brought tentative steps in the evolution of music education, as standards for certification were not formalized. The decentralization of the common schools was a characteristic of all American schools from their early inception (Birge, 1996; Mark & Gray, 2007). This caused curricular offerings and institutional standards to differ from one demographic set to another. It was common during this time for people to attend normal schools even though they did not finish high school (Keene, 1982). According to Elwood Cubberly of the National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook of 1906, it was reported that an “… eleven-year old boy received a mark of 98% on a county teacher test” (Mark & Gray, p. 218). The earning of a high school diploma became a more standard expectation in the closing years of the 19th century, and it was mandatory for students to achieve this distinction before attending a normal school. Additionally, leaders in the western expansion of normal schools were concerned about “cheap imitations” (Harper, 1939, p. 99), as it was likely rural areas would establish normal schools without qualified people to staff them. One president of a normal school insisted a standard (or standards) be created so “a teacher trained in one state shall be regarded as competent to teach in every state, and that a diploma given by a normal school of one state shall be valid over the whole United States” (p. 99).

Those standards fell under the purview of state departments of education, which by their nature began to raise standards in both teacher education and certification (Mark & Gray, 2007). Music had successfully established itself as a necessary and valid aspect of regular public school curricula. Birge (1996) maintained that reading music moved the music profession from a “… doubtful status to a secure place in the curriculum” (p. 143).
This cumulative success became the primary reason for the expanding specializations that would eventually occur in the 20th century.

The Growing Specialization of Instrumental and Vocal Music

Instrumental Music

Instrumental music was late in arriving into the curriculum of American public schools. One possible reason for the disassociation of instrumental music and public education, discussed by Birge (1996), may have been due to early fundamental prejudices toward secular music carried throughout of the 18th and 19th centuries. In the 17th century, instrumental music was rarely part of any aspect of society due to Puritan beliefs. In the 18th century, pipe organs began to appear in churches; even so, instrumental music was still seen as a diversion and “frivolous if not wicked” (p. 177). This remained a common belief through most of the 19th century. An exception to this was piano playing, which was seen as an accomplishment for young women; in fact, Keene (1982) makes the point that instrumental instruction was already a factor in a person’s schooling. According to the author, a school band existed in Boston in 1857. Keene, however, has no documentation as to whether it was a wind band or an orchestra. The teaching of instrumental music, with the exception of piano, took place in academies, conservatories, music schools, and homes (Keene, 1982). Especially in public schools, a private instructor provided contracted services for instrumental lessons with parents paying a fee for the service (Mark & Gray, 2007). By comparison, vocal music had been part of the singing schools of Europe and America for years. Instrumental music had been cultivated primarily within families through private instruction or in community orchestras. The lack of precedence made many school officials reluctant to embrace any type of
instrumental music and its inclusion in school curriculum (Birge, 1996). The understanding that the majority of music teachers and supervisors were trained as singers, which was the prevailing need in school music curriculum at the time, strengthened this reasoning.

Will Earhart of Richmond, Indiana was one of the first recognized music supervisors to organize a school orchestra program in addition to vocal and music appreciation offerings. His orchestra had grown from humble beginnings in 1898 to an ensemble with a full symphonic complement of players by 1912 (Birge, 1996; Mark & Gray, 2007). One of the prominent features of these first orchestras was their ability to show immediate results due to the experience of the children selected for the ensemble. Membership largely consisted of students trained by private teachers. This allowed ensembles to begin their performance of music at a higher level. Concerns soon arose for creating a balanced ensemble. “Basses, violas, horns, oboes, bassoons, and kettledrums needed to be purchased for the schools so that they were available for students” (Birge, 1996, p. 180) as parents would not purchase instruments of a non-solo nature. To expedite training of students on these new instruments, supervisors encouraged orchestra members to move to instruments within the same family, e.g., violinists moved to string bass, cornet players to french horn, and clarinet players to oboe or bassoon.

As mentioned previously, members of the ensembles generally consisted of students of private teachers. This proved to be the best way to select ensemble membership, as these students were pre-trained on their respective instruments. The orchestras themselves were “… limited to that of the ordinary theatre orchestra, namely, first and second violins, and occasional bass and cello, cornets, trombones, clarinets,
flutes, drums and piano” (Birge, 1996, p. 178). Increasingly, these orchestras became involved in community events, which encouraged more interest in the ensembles. What solidified orchestral instrumental music in schools was the formation of younger, grade school orchestras. A coordinated effort took place between the grade areas (younger grades to high school) that turned what was once a two- to three-year experience into six years or more. Orchestral music enjoyed a very steady growth through the end of the 19th century and was eventually included as part of public school curriculum.

Another significant movement involving the inclusion of instrumental music in American public schools was the Maidstone Movement (Birge, 1996; Keene, 1982; Mark & Gray, 2007). The name comes from the town in England where the program was first observed. The primary influence of the movement was the development of instrumental music lessons as a group activity rather than an individual one. In 1898, the head of a parish in Maidstone began violin classes at the “All Saints School” (Keene, 1982, p. 281) although the identity of this person is unknown (Mark & Gray, 2007). The Murdock Company, a dealer in musical instruments, supplied the equipment and teachers for violin classes. The popularity of these classes soon spread to other towns. Classes were held under the supervision of schools, and payments were arranged in small weekly amounts so students of all social classes were able to afford them.

In 1908, Charles Farnsworth, a noted American music educator, heard of the program and was present at a concert that involved 1,450 instrumentalists from school orchestras in and around London (Keene, 1982). Many of his observations in Europe influenced teachers in the areas of choral music and Dalcroze educational methodology (Mark & Gray, 2007). Farnsworth’s reporting of a new classroom approach to
instrumental music in Maidstone, England was to have a profound effect on American instrumental music education. His experience observing those programs inspired him to bring the process back to the United States. “The idea of teaching violin in classes strikes one at first as being impossible, but here is a movement where just this thing is done, not in school time, but outside, yet under the direction of school authorities” (Birge, 1996, p. 193). Group instruction was a normal function of choral music; however, it was an unfamiliar methodology when it came to instrumental instruction.

Other prominent educators also observed the Maidstone program. In 1910, Albert Mitchell received a year’s leave of absence from Boston schools in order to observe the English phenomenon. The result was the introduction of this group method in the Boston schools and the creation of the Mitchell Class Method (Birge, 1996). By his second year, the school district employed Mitchell to specifically focus on his work in instrumental music. He claimed Boston to be the first city in the United States to introduce systematic violin teaching classes in public schools (Keene, 1982). Paul Stoeving, a concert violinist and teacher trained at the Leipzig Conservatory, was teaching in London at the time of the movement and brought what he observed at Maidstone to America. Stoeving presented his observations to the 1914 Music Teachers National Association convention in Pittsburgh (Keene, 1982).

Both homogeneous and heterogeneous class teaching followed, although, pockets of resistance endured. Will Earhart of Indiana came to the defense of classroom teaching, supporting it with anecdotal evidence of student behavior noting “… the improvement of personal appearance, regular attendance, and attitude toward other studies” (Mark &
Gray, 2007, p. 268). Furthermore, Earhart stated it was the school’s job not to “…fit the pupil into musical life, but to fit music into the pupil’s life” (p. 268).

Around 1910, the growing interest in instrumental music spawned school bands. Band ensembles were normally considered to be a military custom. The allure of performing in such an ensemble was already a part of the public aesthetic, most notably through the enjoyment of annual holiday parades in which community bands marched (Birge, 1996).

In the early days of community bands, the ensembles were associated with local military posts. After 1850, minstrel bands became very popular, traveling widely with minstrel troupes. According to Mark and Gray (2007), Theodore Thomas, was one of the earliest influences in instrumental music being one of the first to lead a touring orchestra (see also Birge, 1996; Keene, 1982). His orchestra was credited with being the primary vehicle by which people first heard quality orchestral music. Patrick Gilmore’s influence on the growth of brass bands was the primary catalyst for their popularity. As a bandsman, Gilmore’s main influences were the bands of Europe. When he accepted the post of the director of the Twenty-Second Regiment Band of New York, he modeled the ensemble after the European bands he brought to Boston (Keene, 1982). Between 1876-1891, Gilmore toured throughout the United States. These concerts inspired towns to form their own bands and to encourage a reintegration of woodwinds into the ensemble. His ensemble performed band transcriptions of orchestra music by Wagner, Liszt, and Berlioz (Keene, 1982). For most people hearing Gilmore’s band, it was their first time to hear music by these composers.
John Phillip Sousa continued the tradition Gilmore began by touring the United States, Canada, and Europe between the years 1892 and 1932. Sousa’s band established new standards of excellence in band playing, was the first model upon which school bands relied, and enjoyed even more popularity than that of Gilmore’s, as his band toured during the initial rise of instrumental music in the public schools (Mark & Gray, 2007). As the popularity of band music began to grow, the quality of it began to diminish. Lesser-known professional bands with limited abilities and musicianship began to filter into the performance market and undercut the better and more expensive professional bands (Mark & Gray, 2007). Beginning around the year 1910, the band movement slowly began to lose strength. By 1920, most professional bands had vanished (Keene, 1982).

In contrast, the town band continued to flourish even after the years of Gilmore and Sousa. By 1889, there were 10,000 adult and youth bands in the United States (Keene, 1982), many of them playing the music of Gilmore and Sousa. In 1900, a new type of ensemble, the industrial band, was promoted as a solution to alleviating work stress in industry (Keene, 1982). These bands formed to be components of factories or department stores, even playing at company picnics. College bands also began to appear at the end of the 19th century. Both Purdue University and the University of Wisconsin began giving academic credit for participation in band (Keene, 1982). St. Olaf College in Minnesota and Baylor University in Texas established permanent bands by 1906.

What made the building of school bands feasible was that more people were playing wind instruments than could be absorbed by orchestras (Birge, 1996). When schools decided to sponsor a band, there were many ready to join. Unlike orchestras, band members usually did not know how to play an instrument. Music supervisors found
that in order to build these ensembles, they had to begin students on instruments themselves rather than relying on skills students had learned previously through private teachers.

The marching band had its origins in the military, but began to appear in schools at the beginning of the 20th century. Austin Harding became an important figure in this effort. As the director of bands at the University of Illinois in 1905, he founded a separate department of bands, for he did not want the music department to impose restrictions on him. His bands would form letters on the field, a performance feature unfamiliar among other marching bands (Mark & Gray, 2007). Quickly, his innovations were copied by other directors and became a dominant force in the development of the high school marching band. In Harding’s mind, the marching band’s purpose was to grab the attention of the general public. At the 1932 Music Supervisors National Conference (MSNC) convention he noted, “The value of the marching band to music education in general lies in its advertising power” (p. 317). Furthermore, Mark and Gray stated that Harding believed parents were quick to realize the value of marching bands as an excellent outlet for a student’s energy, and that these ensembles provided “… an entrance to further musical culture, in which they [parents] are at the time probably more interested than the child himself” (p. 318).

Music teachers at the turn of the 20th century utilized many of the same strategies that educators use today in building their ensembles. In 1909, W. Otto Meissner, a school supervisor in Connersville, Indiana described his process (Birge, 1996; Keene, 1982). Birge indicated that Meissner’s band was not part of the school curriculum. His primary reason for organizing the band was to keep boys with “unchanged voices interested in
music” (Keene, 1982, p. 286). He secured permission from the principal and parents to give lessons during the “noon intermission” and “after school hours” (Birge, 1996, p. 187). In a later phase of the movement, John Thompson described a similar situation in Joliet, Illinois in 1915. In his case, he went to the school board to request the purchase of instruments. Before teaching the lessons, Thompson sent “… word to ten of our eight-room buildings for the sixth grade teacher to send me two boys of her class that stood the highest in average of all subjects and at the same time a good singer” (p. 189). By the end of the first year, they had a complement of 50 members with uniforms consisting of “… white duck military coats and white duck caps with blue bands lettered in gold” (p. 190). John Wainwright of Oberlin, Ohio formed a boy’s band in 1913 promising them if they worked hard “he would take them to Washington to play for the President” (Keene, 1982, p. 286). Sponsored in part by the State of Ohio Agricultural Commission, his band eventually played for Woodrow Wilson at the White House. Touring Ohio with his band encouraged the formation of other school bands. The idea of teaching children how to play instruments from their initial experiences to joining the band was a new concept for teachers; in fact, it was that philosophy that allowed the band movement to germinate and grow.

During the first 15 years of the 20th century, the public school system had to increasingly adjust itself to expanding educational demands. According to Birge (1928), two main influences helped accelerate the instrumental movement in America: the junior high movement and World War I. The reorganization of school systems in favor of a junior high school between grade school and high school offered a much better way for students to matriculate through school music curriculum. This process helped music
instructors keep attrition in programs at a minimum with cooperation between teachers in several levels of music programs. The effect upon instrumental music was students could enjoy a “chain of ensembles” (Birge, 1996, p. 205) in most of their public school experience, and teachers could create logical matriculation between grade school and high schools.

The MSNC had demonstrated little interest in the formation of school bands during this early period of instrumental music despite accepting several presentations on the subject. In 1916, F. M. Hunter, Superintendent of Schools in Lincoln, Nebraska spoke to the conference. His speech focused on the development of a community consciousness that placed the welfare of people first (Keene, 1982). Nonetheless, music educators were still not interested. When W. Otto Meissner spoke to the MSNC in St. Louis in 1919, notice was finally taken of how the child-study movement could possibly overlook the individual child who could not sing but might play an instrument. He believed in “democratizing” (Keene, 1982, p. 289) music by teaching all of its branches and embracing the growing instrumental music movement already taking place. Joseph Maddy’s orchestra performance at the 1922 conference prompted the formation of an “Instrumental Affairs Committee” (Birge, 1928, p. 197) serving from 1922-1925. The committee’s charge was to help standardize instrumental efforts nationally. It was through their efforts that a national focus began to form.

In association with the 1923 MSNC convention in Chicago, the first of many national competitions began. An immediate concern, however, was the possible exploitation of students with contests sponsored by instrument manufacturers. This led to more state control with the formation of state contests and required lists of concert
repertoire from which bands could choose performance material. From state contests, winners would then attend the national contests. The contests directly influenced the standardization of band instrumentation, the practice of publishing full band scores, and increased emphasis on instrumental music in teacher training programs (Mark & Gray, 2007).

Eventually, performance opportunities at ceremonies once delegated to orchestras were offered to bands as these types of ensembles were more mobile and could perform either inside or outdoors (Keene, 1982). Following the war, band music was part of the public consciousness and was more attainable compared to masterworks by composers of a more classical nature. At the time of his book’s publication, Birge (1996) indicated, “Practically every school system large and small has an instrumental department, or provides for that instruction in some form” (p. 206). The growth of the band movement naturally created an impetus for teacher training schools to include it as part of their curriculum as a specific area of study for potential instrumental teachers.

**Choral Music**

Choral music did not disappear in public schools, but to some extent was taken for granted as a subject area as instrumental music made its way into school curricula. While vocal music had long established itself as an activity in school programs, it was often unorganized and without curricular purpose. According to Keene (1982), group types varied widely and included those organized for casual auditorium singing, extracurricular glee clubs, and large groups formed for the purpose of singing oratorios (Birge, 1996; Keene, 1982). Some educators sought to promote quality singing experiences within their choirs by having them perform major oratorio works. This was
remarkable because the majority of students were obliged to be part of this choral activity, but the directors of some ensembles had only one rehearsal per week (Birge, E., as cited in Keene, 1982). In a survey completed in 1911 with 299 schools responding, “… 47 schools reported performing oratorios and 151 schools required choral practice” (Keene, 1982, p. 317). Many high school programs were using oratorios as the basis of repertoire for choral singing, along with “simple, light part-song music” (p. 305).

The practice of assembly singing was carried from the late 19th century into the 20th century. Bolstered by this practice, educational leaders like Will Earhart and Frances Elliot Clark began to search for educational uses of choral music as a vehicle for music appreciation. Clark, one of the founding members of MSNC, began using a Victrola at the beginning of her choir rehearsals (Birge, 1996; Keene, 1982; Mark & Gray, 2007). She felt that utilizing a recording of a person singing the melody of the song under study would bring a deeper understanding to, and ultimately a better performance by, her singers. Within a year of presenting this methodology to the 1910 Wisconsin Teachers Association, she moved to New Jersey to work for the Victor Talking Machine Company, the production company responsible for producing Victrolas. Through her involvement, she became an advocate for using the radio and recordings as avenues for music appreciation. Various publications by leading educators such as Clark and Earhart were utilized as part of the initial stages of development for children. These texts became the standard for students, teachers, and the public to become better listeners of music programs performed over the radio.

One of the first major influencers to change the face of choral ensemble music was Frank Damrosch (Keene, 1982). Eager to show audiences there was more to choral
singing than oratorios and part-song music, he decided to involve *a cappella* and unaccompanied singing in his concerts. This style was sufficiently rare as a performance area. College choirs began to imitate Damrosch exploring ways to include *a cappella* and unaccompanied works by Italian, English, and German composers.

The St. Olaf College Choir, under the direction of F. Melius Christiansen, was one of the most influential at the turn of the century. One of the greatest controversies surrounding Christiansen’s philosophy of choral tone was his use of a “so-designated straightness of tone without vibrato” (Keene, 1982, p. 313). Opponents of the tone called it “flat and colorless” (p. 313). Christensen himself indicated “…we must have straight voices, not the dull untrained kind – although that is preferable than the trained wobble – but the straight voice with developed color” (p. 313). Even so, it was the words “straight tone” that people heard that was the source of the opposing rhetoric. This controversy did not diminish St. Olaf’s growing reputation as the “…ideal toward which vocal ensembles strive” (p. 314). He extended his reputation in choral music by hosting several camps and schools in which he would teach students and choral conductors his techniques.

The Westminster Choir, under the direction of John Finley Williamson, was an equally influential choir, although their school of choral tone was different. It was during this tenure that Williamson’s ideas regarding choral tone changed. He developed four choirs, one of which maintained an unaccompanied music repertoire for many years. His theory was tied to pronunciation and mood of the text. If students were going to sing correctly, they were to do:

“…the exact same thing they did as a child. If a child is angry, the size of the cavity within the chest automatically changes; if he is joyous there is another
change in the cavity...Creating a mood automatically makes the individual adjust the cavity to express the mood” (Keene, 1982, p. 315).

Another college choir of note during this time was the Northwestern University Choir under the direction of Peter Lutkin. While the choir did not break new ground regarding choral music tone, it established itself as a learning center for choral directors (Keene, 1982).

Yet, choral music remained a confused activity nationally partly due to the growing instrumental movement. In 1928, the MSNC decreed the mark of a choral program was no longer going to be determined by “… assembly sings, hackneyed operetta productions [and] major oratorio performances” (Keene, 1982, p. 320). Instead, high school directors were to pursue unaccompanied singing as the basis of their choral programs. It was at the conference that a high school choral program won the hearts of educators. The Flint High School choir, of Flint, Michigan, epitomized the potential of what high school choirs could become. After the conference, then president Charles Bowen remarked, “It was about the finest piece of singing ever done by a high school group” (p. 320). The group became a national sensation and inspired many teachers to return to their schools refreshed with a new sense of purpose.

By the mid-1930’s, the a cappella [sic] movement was reaching its zenith. Several factors contributed to this movement including national radio broadcasts of a cappella [sic] music, competition regarding rising instrumental music, and the creation of the National High School Chorus (Keene, 1982). Initially, this group was formed as an element of the 1928 MSNC convention occurring at every convention through 1932. In 1940, a downward trend ensued after what was defined as the “golden age” (p. 328) of a
cappella [sic] music. One reason for this decline was the manner in which educators implemented the style of singing. Some teachers justified its use as parallels to spiritual activity (Keene, 1982). Others created programs that brought unaccompanied singing to excess by performing works such as the Handel’s Hallelujah Chorus completely unaccompanied (Wilson, H., 1941, as cited in Keene, 1982). As complaints grew, a return to accompanied singing was incorporated alongside performances with unaccompanied music. Educators believed this improved balance of singing opportunity would ultimately be best for students involved in choral programs.

By the end of the 1920s, instrumental music assumed a status equal to that of choral music in the public school. Had it not been for the a cappella [sic] movement and the performance of the Flint High School Choir of Flint, MI, at the 1928 MSNC, it is possible that instrumental music may have eclipsed choral music in the music curricula across the country (Keene, 1982; Mark & Gray, 2007). Since 1928, both areas have generally been included as initial music ensemble offerings in public music education.

A Growing Need: Standardizing Teacher Preparation

The first three decades of the 20th century saw an urgency to bring music programs on par with other disciplines. Public schools were recognizing four-part choral singing as the prominent musical activity for students. Music curricula began to expand elective choices including music appreciation, instrumental ensembles, music history, and theory in different parts of the country (Mark & Gray, 2007). As preparation of teachers was slowly shifting from the summer sessions sponsored by publishers to normal schools, colleges, and universities, better oversight was needed to assure qualified music educators were teaching in public school music programs.
Concerns regarding teacher preparation were developing at the state level that fueled a competition between normal schools (transitioning to teacher colleges), and traditional colleges and universities. In 1902, the National Education Association formulated a committee to investigate a plan of study for music teachers in public school. By 1905, their report set in place the following elements that have been present in programs ever since:

1. literary qualification at least equal to those of high school graduates;
2. musical qualification to include proficiency on an instrument or as a singer, knowledge of theory, music history, and conducting;
3. and familiarity with school music textbooks and courses of study. (Mark & Gray, 2007, p. 321)

By expanding music education into four-year programs, teacher colleges were able to develop and enrich their curriculum.

The formation of the MSNC (1907) acted as an authority to help standardize the curriculum of normal schools and teacher colleges (Birge, 1996; Mark & Gray, 2007). One of the acts of the organization was to establish the Educational Council to serve as a forum for discussion regarding the standardization of music education curricula. MSNC, however, was in its infancy and was not yet the advocacy establishment it has become today (National Association for Music Education - MENC). Several reports were made to national conferences of MSNC regarding the growing need for regulations in the teaching of music, but these reports did not have an immediate impact on music education.

At the 1910 Cincinnati Music Supervisors Conference, Superintendent of Schools F. B. Dyer asked educators how it might be possible to introduce music appreciation
courses in high school (Mark & Gray, 2007). Dyer indicated that high school credit was being offered for a four-year high school music course in Chelsea, Massachusetts. Furthermore, the music program in Chelsea was awarding credit for study “with an outside teacher” (p. 289). Dyer’s query provided an opportunity for the establishment of the first committee to explore offering school music for credit. In particular, the committee had sought to develop a high school music course or a major in music (Mark & Gray, 2007). The committee consisted of Will Earhart, Hollis Dann, Walter Aiken, Edward Birge, and Karl Gehrkens. At the 1912 convention, the committee recommended credit be given for music in high school. They suggested, “… one credit be awarded for courses requiring homework while participation in ensembles earned a half credit” (Mark & Gray, 2007, p. 291). The 1912 convention also heard a presentation by Carl Seashore regarding his concept of testing for musical aptitude. Seashore’s offering helped to legitimize the importance of music courses in the public school curriculum.

A review of historical research has revealed that choral music has been part of the basis of curricula since the formation of music teacher training in the 19th century (Birge, 1996; Keene, 1982; Mark & Gray, 2007). Thousands of Americans were taught to sing in their formative years as reading music was a predominant part of people’s collective school experiences. For instance, high school choral singing was considered “compulsory” (p. 327). Choral music was a regular part of pre-service curricula for people interested in teaching music and that pursuit of qualified training remained into the 20th century. In 1907-08, Karl Gehrkens influenced the formation of choir programs in Oberlin, Ohio with his establishment of a public school music program at Oberlin.
Conservatory. He became intimately involved in the process of music teacher training and began speaking to that issue on a national level.

At this point in this historical analysis, primary resources concentrate on the growing instrumental movement from 1900-1935. The rapid interest in instrumental music created an urgency to train specialized instrumental teachers. During the beginning decades of the 1900s, most band directors were former musicians in bands from which they had lost jobs playing for circuses, vaudeville, and theaters. Administrators recognized that given the growing popularity of student involvement, “… an authority or agent of the school must teach lessons or ensembles under the auspices of school” (Birge, 1996, p. 193). Additionally, the Music Supervisors Conference expressed concerns regarding the proper credentialing of instrumental music supervisors, yet, the predominant concerns of music teachers pertained to the expansion of vocal music and music appreciation. Many orchestra directors gave up time from their orchestras and choirs to form school bands. Unfortunately, many of these teachers were not qualified as there were no mechanisms in place to certify the thousands of directors that were needed to satisfy demand. By 1912, the Music Supervisors Conference devoted more attention to instrumental music, but mostly for the growth of the school orchestra rather than the school band (Keene, 1982).

In part, the school band was brought into the focus of the public’s attention of the armed services requirements during World War I. Birge (1996) freely admitted that at the time of the publication of his book, he was “too near it in time to estimate this [the war’s] influence with true perspective” (p. 205). Keene (1982), however, indicated that World War I intensified the country’s interest in bands. Patriotism was stimulated by band music
often used for soldier deployment or homecomings. Moreover, the government placed such important emphasis on winning the war that music was determined to be a “… vital force in national life” (Birge, 1996, p. 205). Music became part of a national consciousness that unified people in patriotism. No matter the discipline, this solidified the importance of music as a major subject in our educational system. For administrators, its effectiveness as both a subject and activity grew in acceptance in response to growing public recognition of bands (Birge, 1996). Many returning soldiers found employment as performers in orchestras, theaters, vaudeville houses, and silent movies. Those trained by the Damrosch brothers became instrumental band directors (Mark & Gray, 2007).

In 1918, Walter Damrosch was made aware by army generals of the need for competent band directors while visiting France under the auspices of the Young Men’s Christian Association (Keene, 1982). General Pershing told Damrosch he had heard the bands from England and France, and in comparison, recognized the inferiority of Army bands. His suggestion to Damrosch was to create an elite band under the direction of the best director in order to serve as a model for other American Army bands to follow. Damrosch agreed this was possible as most of the men were musically talented, but “… had little opportunity for acquiring what we may call technique of the baton” (p. 292). He designed a program where 50 bandmasters would receive intense training in conducting, harmony, and orchestration. After a five-week intensive training session, Damrosch was satisfied that significant progress had been made for the band effort within the Army. At the end of the war, many of these bandmasters found employment in public schools. The rigorous and disciplined training helped to strengthen existing programs looking for qualified conductors. Following the war, most school systems had an instrumental
department, or provided for that instruction in some form (Birge, 1996). The growth of instrumental music naturally created an impetus for teacher training schools to include it as part of their curricula as a specific area of study for instrumental teachers.

Another influence on the increase in teacher supply was due to a change in the American entertainment industry (Mark & Gray, 2007). With the invention of talking moving pictures, many musicians who were employed to accompany silent films became unemployed. Coupled with the Great Depression, many of these performers returned to school to further their education. After attending teacher colleges, many of these musicians began to fill instrumental positions in schools.

At the 1919 St. Louis Music Supervisors Conference meeting, Karl Gehrkins had solicited information from over 300 colleges and discovered that “… approximately half offered two-year courses, 12 granted the Bachelor of Science, and five the Bachelor of Music degree at the completion of a four-year program” (Mark & Gray, 2007, p. 323). Having prepared a four-year program for Oberlin, Gehrkins made college music education programs the basis of his committee report at the 1921 convention. The Education Council’s formula, which included three years of music and professional courses and one year of general studies, became the model program for music education (Keene, 1982). Once The Music Supervisors Conference sanctioned the model, Gehrkins returned to Oberlin to implement his design where, in 1922, three students graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Music Education (Mark & Gray, 2007). Another renowned instrumental director, William Revelli, addressed the problem of the lack of fundamentals offered to school instrumental educators. Until his appointment to the faculty at the University of Michigan in 1935, the school offered no degree in wind instruments. He
created a degree program that enabled a student to develop expertise on all woodwind and brass instruments. The program led to a Bachelor of Music and eventually masters and doctoral degrees (Mark & Gray, 2007).

Current Trends in Teacher Preparation and Certification

The basis of curricula for training teachers has not changed much since the 1920s. According to Mark and Gray (2007), the average college music curriculum still incorporates appropriate amounts of general education, professional education, and music coursework. It was not until the Performance-Based Teaching initiatives of the 1960s, which grew into the Competency-Based Teacher Education of the 1970s, that subsequent changes in music teacher education took place. In 1984, the Task Force on Music Teacher Education in the Nineties (Mark & Gray, 2007) proposed fundamental changes in the way teachers were recruited and trained for the profession. Currently, the federal No Child Left Behind Act (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2001) has required all teachers to be highly qualified in the core academic content area(s) they teach. This act placed major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving achievement for all students. Federal regulations required that new teachers be highly qualified at the time of hire (Zelman & Troyer, 2005). This emphasis on accountability within content areas grew out of research studies showing that teachers' mastery of the academic content they teach is critical to engaging students and is a significant factor in raising levels of achievement. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future concurred with this finding, having focused on the various issues that affect student learning, teacher learning, and teacher retention. In What Matters Most (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996), discussions were presented surrounding the
implications of what teachers should know and do and how these implications influence student learning. “Competent and caring teaching should be a student right” (p. 6). This infers the government understands that competent, qualified teachers are necessary; yet, a seemingly dichotomous situation seems to exist between K-12 certifications and music education programs today.

Certification

In most states, certification of teachers in music covers a broad area of music teaching from kindergarten to grade twelve. In 1992, Erbs (1992) identified the certification data for all 50 states. In his data, he indicated that 34 states certify music teachers with a non-stratified designation of “K-12, PreK-12, Nursery-12, NurseryK-12, PrePrimary-12, 1-12, or K-12/Adult” (p. 5). More recently, Greher & Tobin (2006) indicated that state licensure in the United States is starting to move away from a more specialized, stratified structure to a more general approach. The resulting implication is that music teachers are expected to be proficient in all areas and grade levels of music. The article further explains that training is expected in the areas of music theory, music appreciation, music history, various instrumental and choral techniques for ensemble performance, knowledge of state and national standards, as well as various types of learning theories as they apply to special learners, at risk students, and diversity issues. This lack of licensure specification infers a situation where specialized music teaching areas could be combined into one position to meet the needs of many music students while meeting more specific state benchmarks in other core areas.
Seven Professional and Resource Items

The primary thrust of this study is the replication of Susan Byo’s study (1997) comparing elementary generalist (classroom) and specialist (music) educators. She examined these teachers’ perceived ability to implement the national music standards. Using seven professional and resources items (availability of assistance, availability of resources, time, interest, musical ability, training, and sense of responsibility) as her measure, Byo was able to infer these teachers’ opinions of each standard. Specialist and generalist teachers agreed there was a lack of adequate instructional time for music built into schedules as well as a lack of equipment and materials to implement the standards.

Availability of Assistance

Through her review of literature, Byo defined “assistance” as the ability of teachers to work in conjunction with one another. Specifically, she thematically represented a need for the elementary specialist and generalist teachers to work cooperatively in order to best implement the national standards in music. Unfortunately, her discussion was limited to elementary grade teaching. Teaching music at any level, depending on the role served by the teacher (multi-discipline or specialist), can be a cooperative or an individual undertaking. In order to best serve the responsibility of delivering instruction in music, Byo determined that an atmosphere of collaboration and the ability to make connections to areas outside of music allowed for the best possible instruction in music.

There is a therapeutic nature of being able to share ideas or commiserate about aspects of teaching between colleagues. Jones (1978) found elements related to job stress that work counter intuitively with regard to collaboration and collegiality:
Questions regarding isolation, loneliness, culture shock, in-service help, administrative help, community relations, feelings of failure, of being in a ‘sink-or-swim’ situation, of feeling over worked, overburdened, overwhelmed, overtired, of being confused by or in disagreement with administrative policies and evaluations, dealing with parents, and feeling threatened, insecure, or vulnerable are usually overlooked by studies which are limited to describing preparational deficiencies of first-year music teachers. (pp. 6–7)

Krueger (2000) concurred suggesting that various support issues, combined with feelings of isolation, influence both job satisfaction and teacher attrition, especially for new teachers. In the fall publication of *Horace*, Cushman (1996) discussed the virtues of professional learning communities within schools. She prefaced her discussion with an anecdote from *The New York Times* science pages. In 1993, heart surgeons in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont (of which there were only 23 at the time) agreed to observe each other regularly in the operating room and share their knowledge and insights. In the two years that followed the nine-month project, the death rate among their patients fell by a significant 25%. By working within a paradigm of teamwork and communication rather than as solitary entities, Cushman indicated that doctors brought about major changes in their individual and institutional practices. Most professional music organizations and teacher educators advocate participation in professional development activities by in-service and pre-service teachers. The ability to interact with colleagues on a regular basis may be a resource that is often overlooked in schools.
Available Resources and Time

Byo stated the availability of resources (categorized by equipment and materials for study) and time within a schedule for effective delivery influences the ability of teachers to successfully teach the national standards in music. She determined that if these elements are in scant supply, one cannot be actively engaged in learning. For example, music standards that require active listening, music composition, and improvisation demand the use of technology in today’s society. In this regard, secondary schools fare better with resources than elementary schools (Pioli, 1991 as cited in Byo, 1997). The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development stated that schools must be prepared to identify, fund, and purchase the items and equipment necessary to accomplish standards (Bennett, et. al., 1994 as cited in Byo, 1997).

The National Education Commission on Time and Learning (1994) recognized the arts as part of the core curriculum for every student. They distinguished two elements that summarize a full calendar day: the academic day and the school day. The commission defined the academic day as being 5.5 hours. Due to this classification, activities that do not fit within that time frame are placed outside of the schedule or sacrificed altogether (National Education Commission on Time and Learning, 1994). While it is accepted that some ensembles are sometimes relegated to rehearsal time after the academic day, an emergent concern is the reallocation of time to core subject areas. Due to more regular testing of core subject areas required by No Child Left Behind, more time is sometimes allotted to those class periods of instruction. While the intent of this apportionment of time could be determined as a positive strategy to raise test scores, there is research to the contrary. A study by Wilkins (et. al., 2003) determined that the
practice of allocating more time to core areas in order to increase scores on standardized tests was not effective. Virginia elementary principals (n=547) completed a survey delineating the time specialists taught within the arts and physical education. Correlations between time allocation and school achievement indicated no meaningful relationship between those variables. The findings by Wilkins would seem to indicate that reduced time allocation to art, music, and physical education is not related to higher test scores in other subjects.

**Interest**

Interest in teaching national or state standards has a bearing on the effectiveness of instruction in education (Byo, 1999). Teacher interest in effective teaching is related to the value the individual educator places on the knowledge to be taught. Reimer (1994 as cited in Byo, 1997) believed this to be a crucial element of teaching. Saunders and Baker (1992 as cited in Byo, 1997) compared the value pre-service to in-service elementary classroom educators placed on musical concepts. They found that interdisciplinary applications of the arts were more valued than the development of musical skills in playing instruments or reading musical notation. Furthermore, Saunders and Baker found that classroom teachers viewed music as a diversion for recreational or transitional periods during the school day.

Bias is not relegated to classroom teachers outside of music. It can affect the choices of music teachers based on their individual training and expertise. Most students self-select the field of music based on a love of performing (Byo, 1999). The development of skills in music history, theory, composition, and other skills relevant to teaching are acquired secondarily to this initial interest. Given the conservatory nature of
instruction in most college music programs, there is a natural pre-disposition for performance to be carried into educational settings. This reinforces music teachers to teach-as-they-were-taught in order to stimulate student curiosity and excitement (Pioli, 1991 as cited in Byo, 1997). Therefore, the choice to highlight or de-emphasize certain attributes of a subject area can be influenced by a prospective teacher’s early influences and teacher training.

Musical Ability and Training

Teachers cannot design effective methodologies for instruction unless they have both the musical ability and training to develop a cohesive delivery system for teaching; however, these two concepts are not synonymous. Their relationship is based on several issues including, but not limited to, the background skills and value teachers bring to their training, the quality of the training received, and the length of time between training and instruction (Blair, 1984; Mullins, 1993, as cited in Byo, 1997).

Students are required to take various content specific courses outlined in the standards for music programs established by the National Association of Schools of Music and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Reimer (Reimer, 1993 as cited in Byo, 1997) believed subject matter expertise needed to be the major component of teacher preparation. Given the growing trend of non-stratified certifications in music, there is also a need for teachers to be able to instruct in all areas of music. It is questionable as to whether or not music teachers can truly be trained in such a general manner within the largely accepted conservatory format of music schools. According to Bennett, “it is impossible to prepare pre-service generalist elementary teachers to teach
music with only one course of instruction in a four-year degree. According to Bennett, (1992 as cited in Byo, 1997) to accomplish this is “delusive” (p. 32).

Recognizing the changing nature of certification, music education programs have explored altering curricula in response to the growing trend of generally stating licensure qualifications instead of stratified designations. In a series of reports from the Holmes Group (1986, 1990 & 1995, as cited in Conkling & Henry, 1997), it was advocated that better partnerships between secondary and post-secondary institutions occur with the four-year design of a pre-service education degree. Conkling and Henry (1997) outlined and embraced the Holmes Group reports with an added post-baccalaureate effort to groom graduates as future mentors in professional development school relationships. As part of their design, students would apply for entrance into the music education program upon completion of their second year of study. In the third year of study, students would be broken into groups that focus upon issues regarding how to teach the subject matter they are simultaneously learning. In their fourth and final year, groups would then be immersed in professional partnerships that conclude with student teaching. According to the researchers, over 300 universities and colleges across the country have embraced a five-year format with teacher preparation as the exclusive point of study before entering into student teaching and ultimately, the profession. In a later study by Conkling (2004), anecdotal evidence supplied through exit interviews with pre-service music education students indicated improved learning through professional development partnerships as described in her earlier study with Henry. Collected longitudinally, student experiences provided evidence of an improved ability to embrace their future roles as music teachers.
Greher and Tobin (2006) investigated post-secondary curricula design changes by highlighting various college programs seeking to address the issue of music teacher certification. Using the NASM website, the researchers examined college music curricula from around the United States. They found that most schools offer a standard fare of music courses in an elementary or secondary area of teaching. At designated points in music degree programs, these major subject areas track to an instrumental or vocal concentration. Many students and faculty often lament forcing what sometimes amounts to a five-year nature of college music curricula into a four-year program. Some music programs, however, have made attempts at reform. Some examples highlighted by the researchers are:

Central Michigan University has expanded their program to four-and-a-half to five years.

Boise State University requires a balance of choral and instrumental experiences for all students enrolled in elementary and secondary methods.

Chapman University maintains separate vocal and instrumental tracks. However, at the completion of the four-year program students enroll in professional courses and do their student teaching.

University of Louisville offers a pre-certification Bachelor of Music degree with an emphasis in music education in either instrumental or vocal music. (Greher & Tobin, 2006, p. 53)

These efforts are laudable as it is expected teachers will at times be expected to teach at least one subject area in which they have minimal formal training. In educational climates where curricula are more integrated, this may be a necessity. For example,
singing is likely the most used teaching skill in music instruction. Barry (1992 as cited in Byo, 1997) concluded that teachers who are uncomfortable singing would not likely use this skill in their classroom. In this instance, the inability to sing could complicate a music teacher’s ability to competently impart certain national or state standards. Completing an integrated program in music education with experience in both choral and instrumental methods might be of particular benefit to future music educators.

Teacher training in education is not limited to students graduating with a bachelor’s degree in education. Those seeking licensure but lacking the coursework in education can return to college for a master’s degree in teaching. The University of Southern Maine in Gorham, Maine offers a Master of Teaching and Learning degree (http://usm.maine.edu/grad) in order to transition people into education from other areas of the workforce. Kent State University, in Kent, Ohio offers a similar experience in their Master of Arts in Teaching Program (http://www.kent.edu/ehhs/mat/index.cfm). While existing at the graduate level, these programs are consistent with the progressive music education curricula highlighted in the research done by Greher & Tobin (2006). The additional time to complete coursework could alleviate constraints placed upon students in meeting curricular objectives and better prepare them for the education profession.

The culmination of any teacher education program should be viewed as the completion of a successful and positive pre-service experience. This perspective is in line with research on the quality of student teaching and mentoring in acclimating to professional teaching. As part of a review of music education curricula, Conway (2002) researched the perceptions of beginning teachers and their mentors. The responses revealed the best pre-service experiences in teaching to be the ones over which college
professors have the least control. These variables were chronicled in field observations made by students and occurred in student teaching. Several comments by students and mentors implied a more comprehensive approach to music education was needed. One of the highest rated requests by these beginning teachers was the inclusion of out-of-track experiences. Frequently, they indicated more experience in another type of ensemble would have been beneficial. Four of the 14 teachers studied were in teaching positions that included teaching at least one course outside their track, i.e. band, orchestra, vocal, or general music. All of these teachers indicated more coursework outside of their chosen area of study should be required. Teacher comments such as "I wish BTU had made me sing in an ensemble" and "Everyone should be required to take some course in teaching general music" (Conway, 2002, p. 30) were indicated. Administrators of small schools also commented on the need for broader preparation in music. One administrator indicated, “We really need a band director who can also build the choral program” (Conway, p. 31). Conway commented that she made note of the number of students who struggled outside of their chosen track of university study. She concluded students did need more experiences outside of their chosen majors, much more time with general music issues, and possibly extended student teaching assignments. If K-12 certification is what defines a quality teacher in music education, then it stands to reason students are going to need more time to develop more subject expertise in areas outside their discipline of college study.

Students are often motivated to become teachers because they aspire to be like their high school band, orchestra, or choral teacher (Conway, 2002). Many students will pre-select what is important by determining something is for “…beginners and I won’t be
doing that” (p. 34). It is possible students will not be employed in an ideal setting once they leave college, and pre-service training must address that contingency. A study by Todd and Agnello (2006) looked at this issue by immersing future educators in the experience of teaching in relatively small communities. According to the researchers, more than 80% of teacher education candidates at the university came from urban/suburban school districts and expected to return to schools similar to those they attended. Moreover, they indicated nearly one-third (31%) of America’s public schools are located in areas with fewer than 2500 people. In their study, prospective educators were taken to a small town to document experiences and create lesson plans to teach the local students. It was found the university students did not expect to witness the amount of quality teaching taking place. Many of the issues that pertained to suburban or urban teaching situations were present at this rural school. A very high quotient of learning was taking place with the school well connected to the global community via the Internet, and no faculty member was found to have less than nine years of experience. A student from an urban setting was intrigued at how the smaller class sizes were conducive to better learning: “Ashleigh commented that she was interested in seeing what it would be like to have only seven students in a class. She saw how much the ‘teacher’ can monitor the class and assess comprehension of subjects closely” (p. 180). The lack of understanding of rural educational experience is noteworthy. Having interacted with community members and students, a paradigm shift occurred in the belief systems of these pre-service educators.

Once educators are in the field, proper mentoring and induction planning for new teachers have been determined to help new teachers acclimate to the profession. Conway
(et. al., 2004) developed a case study of four beginning teachers. In particular, it was her assertion that new teachers become consumed with non-musical aspects of a teaching position. One of the teachers, “Jeff,” felt he was well prepared for his grades 5-12 band and high school choral position. His overriding difficulty was with the lack of parity in fundraising for the band and chorus. Although half the band members were also in the choir, the current band booster program was insistent upon directing funds for instrumental purposes only. He recommended a general “music booster” program but was met with resistance. This polarized the director and the booster association. After three years in that school, he eventually settled into a new position with a middle school band that was more in line with his major field of study. The researchers concluded while teacher preparation programs must focus on extending content area knowledge, mentoring programs could be a beneficial part of a new teacher’s acclimation to a school position. Additionally, it could be posited that non-musical issues constitute a distraction factoring into a teacher’s ability to implement national or state standards.

The types of reforms being implemented to alleviate preparation and certification concerns seem to be in partial response to the general designation of licensure. However, research in out-of-track teaching suggests general licensure can be problematic for teachers who instruct students in subjects outside of their specialty (Ingersoll, 2001, 2005). Ingersoll identified out-of-track teaching placements as “out-of-field” defining them as “teachers assigned to teach subjects that do not match their training or education” (2005, p. 175). One of the premises under which the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) operated was that school reform cannot succeed unless it “focuses on creating conditions in which teachers can teach, and teach well” (p. 6).
Viadero’s (2006) article detailed her interview with University of Pennsylvania professor Richard Ingersoll and referenced his research on the problems associated with out-of-field placements in Asian education. Ingersoll suggested this practice appeared to be more prevalent in the United States than in Asia. At the secondary level, 38% of U.S. math teachers, 35% of English teachers, 30% of social studies teachers, and 29% of science teachers teach a subject in which they neither majored nor minored in college. In Japan, no more than 1% of teachers teach outside their field. Ingersoll indicated, "The idea of mis-assigning teachers is very frowned upon in Japan" (p. 2). The impact of placing a teacher in an out-of-field position can create the impression of negligent preservice training, which is not always the case.

Aforementioned research on teacher preparation has indicated that college and university music programs are exploring ways to meet the needs of certification. Ingersoll believes that out-of-track displacements are likely caused by administrative choices: "That's not a requirement problem, he [Ingersoll] said. That’s not a training problem. That's a management problem” (Viadero, p. 3). School principals face the task of providing a vast range of programs with limited resources. In this context and from a managerial perspective, Ingersoll (2005) stated that principals might find assigning teachers out of their field as “more convenient, less expensive, and less time consuming than the alternative” (p. 176). With inadequate staffing and inappropriate teaching assignments, school administrators may be in danger of sending the message that the number of students served is more important than quality of instruction.
In 1994 as part of their *Opportunity To Learn Standards in Music Education*, the National Association of Music Education (known as MENC) published the overriding statement that the best way to deliver elementary music instruction was a successful collaboration between the specialist and generalist teachers (as cited in Byo, 1997). The specialist teacher could provide guidance based on specific skills, knowledge, and musical training. Generalist teachers would augment the efforts of the music specialists by making music a part of daily classroom activities or integrating music into other aspects of the curriculum. Several educational leaders (Boyer, 1989; Goodlad, 1983; Sizer, 1992, as cited in Byo, 1997) have advocated integrated curricula. This was further supported by Gardner (1983) who developed the theory of seven multiple intelligences. He asserted that humans regularly utilize several intelligences in order to perform tasks. Gardner indicated these intelligences do not occur independently and are impossible to assess in their “pure form” (p. xxii) or in the abstract. Generally, he acknowledged that only two of the seven intelligences, linguistic and logical/mathematical, are given priority in typical public school curriculum. He advocated a better balance of instruction utilizing all seven intelligences. With respect to Gardner’s research, this integration parallels the natural processes of the brain making relevant the need for integrated curricula development.

This review of the literature was conducted to describe the basic evolution of instrumental and choral positions in public schools. It was intended to highlight the importance of distinct teaching areas, i.e., choral and instrumental, relative to their respective historical development and present them as domains of specialized knowledge.
From the one-room schoolhouse of early American education to present day, the increasing complexity of music education over time resulted in a shift from generalized to more specialized music instruction in the classroom. Current trends, however, indicate a rising use of non-stratified (general) licensure to certify music teachers. This creates a need for teachers to be trained in all areas of music, which is not practical in many pre-service music programs. It is plausible that music teachers can be placed in a position where they are forced to teach outside of their expertise, which may impede the quality implementation of state or national music standards. It is within the context of this disparity that the current study investigates music teachers’ ability to implement the Ohio Academic Standards in Music.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship of teacher role and music teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the 15 benchmarks associated with the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. It was designed to investigate the problem outlined in Chapter 1, specifically, to explore the relationship of teacher role (multi-discipline and specialist teachers) and teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement these benchmarks for high school performance ensembles.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

A comprehensive review of the literature was conducted to describe the basic evolution of instrumental and choral positions in public schools. The review was intended to highlight the importance of distinct teaching areas, i.e., choral and instrumental, relative to their respective historical development and present them as domains of specialized knowledge. Additionally, it addressed the trend of broad K-12 certification and the implications of “out-of-field” placements (Ingersoll 2001, 2005). Further, the review was designed to build a basis for understanding a possible incongruity between teacher expertise and teacher role/assignment. Much was discussed regarding teacher training initiatives as being non-aligned to trends of non-stratified certification. This lack of congruency could impede educators' ability to implement educational standards effectively. Byo (1997) found that elementary general educators and music educators differed in their perceived abilities to implement the national standards in music. While
Byo's work established a methodological approach to examine the relationship of teacher role and teachers’ ability to implement national standards in music, it remained unclear as to whether such a relationship existed between two groups of educators within a specialized field. In particular, the current study defined those as multi-discipline and specialist music teachers.

Therefore, the following research questions and corresponding hypotheses were generated:

Research question #1: What difference exists between multi-discipline and specialist teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully implement the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music?

Research question #2: What differences exist across the 15 benchmarks in music teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully implement the benchmarks of the 15 Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music?

Research question #3: Are the differences between multi-discipline and specialist teachers opinions of their ability to successfully implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music the same for multi-discipline and specialist teachers?

Hypothesis #1: There is no significant difference between multi-discipline and specialist teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

Hypothesis #2: There is no significant difference between music teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.
Standards in Music across each of the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

Hypothesis #3: There is no significant interaction between multi-discipline and specialist teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

Development of the survey instrument

Preliminary Study

In order to investigate the issues of the research questions and hypotheses, a web-based survey instrument was developed to query music teachers in Ohio. For the purposes of the current study, the seven professional resource items used in Byo (1997) were utilized, and the National Standards for Arts Education (1994) in music were replaced with the benchmarks for the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music (Music: Alignment by Standard, 2003). Additionally, participants were sampled from two groups of high school music teachers: (a) multi-disciplinary (combined instrumental/choral positions), and (b) specialist (instrumental or choral positions). This sample selection deviated from Byo’s approach in order to better understand the impact of teacher role on populations of educators with more similar background training in the field of music education. Participants in the current study were determined from teacher databases used for music education research at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio.

The preliminary work for this study took place in the summer of 2006 by soliciting free responses to research questions based on initial reviewed literature and questions posed by the researcher. With permission granted by MENC, the researcher
obtained a database of Ohio music teachers, which was categorized by job description. Using this list and a random number generator (Scott & Mark, 2004), 15 music educators were randomly selected and solicited by mail for their participation in a telephone survey (Appendix A). Included in this initial contact was a consent form outlining the permission granted by the Internal Review Board (IRB) from Kent State University and National Association of Music Education (known as MENC) (Appendix B). Using the contact information provided in an initial letter, music educators responded by either telephone or e-mail to notify the researcher of their willingness to participate. Each participating educator was contacted by telephone and administered the preliminary questionnaire (Appendix C). As a follow-up to the phone interview, the teachers were supplied a hardcopy version of the conversation as basis for assessing accuracy of the information provided to the researcher. This process is defined as member checking (Conway, 2002) whereby the researcher verifies information directly with research participants. For this preliminary survey, teacher participants reviewed the phone interviews with the researcher to correct any information or to note any problems they experienced while completing the questionnaire.

Results from this process were two fold. With respect to the database supplied by MENC national office, it was revealed that the list of people teaching within subject areas was largely self-reported. These findings created an inability to determine whether the people who reported teaching in more than one area were simply indicating an “interest” in another discipline or were currently teaching in that area. To illustrate, some participants contacted for the survey were people not actively teaching in multi-discipline positions who were subsequently eliminated as potential participants in this initial survey:
1. Participant #3 was a substitute teacher who had taught both band and chorus, but never at the same time. In the database, both were indicated as teaching areas, thus creating a false positive in terms of the definition of generalist for this study.

2. Participant #6 had been a general educator for 25 years and had a three-year span where he assisted with parts of a choral program at a high school in West Virginia.

3. Participant #7 was secretary for an arts center that maintained a membership with MENC as a matter of maintaining a relationship to a national music organization. All teaching areas were indicated, yet she was not a teacher.

The vetting of the database in this way was ultimately helpful in determining a better procedure for locating potential participants. A second confounding factor of MENC database was the source listing of educators that included a mixture of home and school addresses of teachers. Contact letters (Appendix C) were mailed to 40 people randomly selected by a number generator program. The provided list proved somewhat unreliable. In an interview with one of the participants, he indicated that had he not “… gone to his school to check the mail, he would have missed the letter until school began in August” (Welenc, 2006). With respect to the instrument, the participants offered insightful anecdotes on their experiences in Ohio as well as the initiative of the research. The few who had acted in a combined discipline capacity early in their careers offered what they could remember of their experiences. Those who were not currently acting in the capacity of a multi-discipline position offered their perspectives on their current positions. These results validated or defined strands of research, which helped formulate future questions for the pilot survey.
Pilot Study

The feedback received from the preliminary grounded research, review of literature, along with Byo’s (1997) methodology, helped shape the pilot version of the survey instrument for the main study. The pilot questionnaire (Appendix E) was divided into three parts:

1. Section 1 contained questions relating to gender, age, degree, number of years in teaching, current position, and music program student population.
2. Section 2 contained questions that were based on the seven professional items as they related to the implementation of 15 Ohio benchmarks (Music: Alignment by standard, 2003).
3. Section 3 contained questions designed to examine future implications of this study.

The question design in Section 2 included a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Section 3 was formatted in the same manner, but limited to five extended research questions. Subjects were instructed to choose the response that, in their opinion, best answered each question.

Conflicting methods concerning the process of implementing a survey instrument (paper or web-based) can create inconsistency of information retrieval. Peterson (2001) determined that an optimal return rate of 10% to 30% could be expected. Regarding the research questions associated with the current study, the intention was to survey high school music educators from an e-mail list provided by the Ohio Music Educators Association. Schonlau, Fricker, and Elliot (2002) refer to this type of web surveying as “closed population sampling” (p. 37). Organizations that fall into this category are those
that maintain lists or a directory of members or employees. While the e-mail list eventually used was not from Ohio Music Educators Association, this structure of web survey was retained as it still related to teachers in Ohio. According to these researchers, the expected acceptable rate of return (between 30% and 40%) was much better than with Peterson’s earlier research. This was used as a guideline for the final data return rate. Contact with music educators was done electronically through the website using a detailed electronic mail list provided by the music education department at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio. The list was generated during the 2006-2007 academic year and contained the e-mail address of every music teacher in the state of Ohio. The researcher amended the list to include only those teachers who were high school music teachers and teachers who had a professional e-mail address listed. Using this filtering process, a final list of 792 teachers was determined as being valid for the overall project. Requests soliciting teacher participation were e-mailed in the fall of 2008 to randomly selected groups from each teacher group until 15 specialists and 15 multi-discipline teachers had completed the pilot survey. The participants evaluated the survey instrument on its design, usability, and content validity (Appendix F). All e-mails used for the pilot survey were summarily deleted from the master database.

At the time of Peterson’s research (2001), a standard programming script called Common Gateway Interface (CGI) allowed information to download directly to a central spreadsheet file. Since then, significant advancements in technologies associated with web design have become available to assist researchers in the design of Internet surveys, developing a spreadsheet of the data, and linking to a central website. After reviewing several Internet web-based options available for independent research, the services of
SurveyMonkey.com (2007) were employed. The use of this service assures ease in contacting participants, ease of usability, and assures that participant responses are protected and anonymous.

In a study of Internet-based research, Peterson (2001) accounted for research that discussed the reliability and return of web-based surveys. A number of questions and challenges were encountered specific to the web-based nature of his survey instrument and apply to the current study. The questions that arose in the Peterson study that were most applicable for the current study are as follows:

1. How will subjects gain access to the survey?
2. What kinds of skills will subjects need to complete the web survey?
3. What rate of return can be expected from a web survey and what types of biases might be encountered in a web-based environment?
4. What are the control and variable problems specific to electronic surveys?
5. Can the researcher procure the proper method of distributing the web survey to the target population?
6. What server will be used to house the final survey website?
7. What types of safeguards will be needed to ensure the results are reliable? (p. 69)

These questions served as a proper outline to develop overall access. The issues of participant access to the survey and usability were addressed by making the questionnaire available to anyone with a computer and an Internet browser. The user needed to know how to point-and-click a mouse to navigate simple links to move from one web page to another.
Given the small sample size, the data from the pilot survey was calculated in a spreadsheet utilizing Microsoft Excel (2004). This was the spreadsheet format utilized and supplied by SurveyMonkey.com (2007). A hardcopy version of the survey was available to increase availability of the questionnaire to those participants not willing to respond via an electronic medium. However, while this accommodation was available none of the teachers participating in the survey requested the hardcopy option. This accommodation was also presented as an option in the final version of the questionnaire.

**Administration of the Final Survey Instrument**

The results of the preliminary and pilot studies helped define and refine the content and format of the final survey instrument (Appendix G). With regard to the overall design and usability, participants provided consistent feedback regarding pilot survey usability and design (Appendix F). In order to measure reliability between the professional resource questions of the pilot, a Cronbach’s alpha test was run as well as an inter-correlational measure. Performed using Microsoft Excel (2004), these were exploratory in nature given the low sample size. These preliminary findings indicated $\alpha=.81$ with an average inter-correlational mean of .53 (Table 1). However, when the question on “assistance” was removed from the analysis the result was $\alpha=.95$ with an average inter-correlational mean of .79. A review of the questions revealed that all were written in present tense with the exception of Question 6, which was in future tense (based on the model presented by Byo): “I could effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.” The question was reworded to match the tense of the rest of the questions and inserted into the final survey instrument: “I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.” In a
Table 1

*Inter-correlation Matrix of the Seven Professional Items from the Pilot Survey Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Int.</th>
<th>Resp.</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Assist.</th>
<th>Resources*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Ability</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: without Question 6: $m=.79$, $\alpha=.95$; with Question 6: $m=.53$, $\alpha=.81$

follow-up procedure after the administration of the final questionnaire, another Cronbach’s alpha test was calculated and compared to the initial pilot test result. While the query of specialist help did well in both analyses, the question on the professional item regarding “assistance” had better correlation with the amended present tense wording. The seven questions were found to have $\alpha=.88$ with a mean inter-correlation of .52 after the final survey data collection. When removing Question 6, the result was $\alpha=.91$ with a mean inter-correlation of .64. The discrepancy between the analysis of questions with and without Question 6 was smaller when compared to the pilot survey analysis. This provided far more confidence in the reliability of the survey.

In January 2009, the questionnaire was sent via e-mail to 571 teachers of high school music programs in the state of Ohio based on an electronic mail database used in
music education research by Kent State University, Kent, Ohio. Reminders were sent to prospective participants on a bi-weekly basis over the course of six weeks.

Issues with Item Non-Response

An issue encountered with collecting the data from the survey was the amount of participant non-response. Of the 571 questionnaires distributed via e-mail to Ohio music teachers, 171 teachers attempted the survey with 24 completing between 1-73%; 11 teachers completed 88-99%; and the remaining 136 completed the full questionnaire. Given that the data from most of the incomplete sets from this research would need to be discarded, the decision was made to impute data from completed questionnaires in order to maintain data from surveys that were from the highest percentile of completion. According to literature on this subject, imputation is a common problem with survey research in general. The hot deck method of data imputation was selected as the best choice to resolve this issue.

Research consistently defines the hot deck method as a procedure where information from a donor (completed information) is given to a recipient (missing data) (Andridge & Little, 2010; Durrant, 2005; Ford, 1983; Kalton & Kasprzyk, 1982; Sande, 1983; Schoier, 1999). Ford (1983) distinguished the adjective of “hot” as using the data sample at hand and “cold” as using the imputed data from previous or outside research (p.186). Matching the donor to the recipient is implemented by using filter variables utilizing those records that complement if the donor and recipient have similar values based on those variables. This type of “nearest neighbor” (Schoier, 1999) or “deterministic” hot-decking (Andridge & Little, 2010) is built upon real data, rather than assumed, and is considered a strength of this type of calculation. Historically, the hot-
decking method tends to preserve distributional properties of data related to survey non-response. Therefore, three filter variable criteria were developed to determine those datasets that had the most in common with missing data: teacher role (specialist or multi-discipline), years in the profession, and district type (urban, suburban, or rural). Given the concerns of higher degrees of bias associated with assumed data, hot decking was used on the 11 incomplete datasets from the group of participants that completed at least 88% of the survey. The rest were discarded.

The hot decking procedure has been used and discussed by several researchers. Kalton and Kasprzyk (1982) discussed the necessity of imputation as a way to complete non-responses in survey research. They describe two types of hot decking as deterministic and stochastic (p.22-23), which was simplified by Andridge & Little (2010) as random and deterministic (p.41). While they understood this to be a reasonable way to determine missing data, caution was raised that too much imputed data from participant responses would be analyzed as completed responses (Kalton & Kasprzyk, 1982, p. 30). The authors indicated that the amount of imputation should be limited, for an unintended introduction of bias would exist in the calculation. Conversely, Sande (1983) indicated that hot decking, especially with small data samples, allowed for easier data calculation. Durrant (2005) indicated there have been improvements made regarding hot decking methods with growing research and its continued use in the social sciences.

One last consideration for the final survey was the concern regarding the amount of returned e-mails from the pilot e-mail solicitations. The database for the study was supplied by the music education department at Kent State University as part of research performed in the 2006-2007 academic year. The list of 1,671 teachers was visually
inspected and those names that did not meet the criterion of specialist and multi-disciplined high school teachers as defined in this study were judgmentally removed. This produced a final listing of 792 prospective candidates for the survey. After the process of determining 30 randomly sampled participants for the pilot survey, a final list of 571 e-mails for potential participants remained. This difference of 28% (221 e-mails) between the pilot database and the final e-mail directory created a concern for robust data collection using random sampling. It was decided to exhaust the remaining e-mails through convenience sampling to achieve as much response as possible during the 30-day final survey period in January, 2009. Cozby (2000) defined this type of non-probability sampling as haphazard or “take-them-where-you-can-find-them” (p. 110). This method of sampling allows for a very rapid way to understand trends in data early in a research study. Yet, external validity can be compromised, as bias is commonly associated with this type of sampling. In other words, teachers who choose to complete the survey might be teachers who have particular success in implementing the Ohio benchmarks. The opposite could also be true with teachers whose implementation is not the same as their counterparts. In order to reduce any possible bias, data would be viewed in terms of how it was distributed across certain criteria, i.e., rural, suburban, and urban demographics.

Understanding the bias issue, there was no other sampling method available to the researcher with the limitations of living outside the state of Ohio and an aging e-mail database. The convenience sampling method was a necessary change to generate as much data as possible to best represent both educator groups.
Treatment of the Data

Hypothesis #1 stated there would be no significant difference between multi-discipline and specialist teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. The first independent variable was defined as teacher role, i.e., the areas of instruction as multi-discipline and specialist music teachers. All possible permutations of music discipline were stratified into subgroups of teaching in the first part of the survey instrument, i.e., band, orchestra, and choral. The second independent variable was the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music with the five content standards representing five levels of this variable. Fifteen sub-levels of this variable further qualified these standards by itemizing the 15 benchmarks associated with the five standards. The primary analysis of the data compared participants from two groups of music educators, those high school teachers teaching in multi-discipline music positions and those teaching as specialist music teachers. These groups represent two levels of the independent variable of teacher role. Survey participants were asked to provide opinions regarding the effect of their own training, musical ability, availability of resources, availability of assistance, available time, interest, and sense of responsibility on their ability to implement each of the 15 benchmarks. These questions were formatted using a Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Each respondent’s rating for the seven professional resource items were summed for each of the benchmarks. This sum score of the seven professional resource items served as a scale (dependent variable) subjected to statistical calculations. Using a repeated measures analysis of variance, a between-group
effect was computed to identify differences with respect to teacher role (specialist teachers versus multi-discipline teachers).

The second null hypothesis stated there would be no significant difference between music teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across each of the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Byo (1997) indicated that elementary generalist teachers were most comfortable implementing those national music standards that were not music content specific. Comparisons for this study were made to reflect differences in teachers’ responses across the 15 Ohio benchmarks in the content standards regardless of role. Data was subjected to a repeated measures analysis of variance including a within-group comparison computed to identify differences in benchmark means.

The final null hypothesis stated there would be no significant interaction between multi-discipline and specialist teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Byo (1997) indicated that an interaction occurred regarding the two independent variables of teacher role and national standard. Since all high school music teachers in Ohio have the same type of college training/background regardless of position, it was posited they should be able to implement the standards equally. A repeated measures analysis of variance using a within-group comparison was computed to investigate a possible interaction with respect to teacher role and benchmark.
Demographic information was obtained through participant answers in the first section of the survey. Demographic data was descriptively analyzed to provide a background understanding of the participants from each population. An *a priori* alpha level of $\alpha = 0.05$ was determined to be an appropriate measure of significance.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Results of the survey questions were compiled and analyzed based on the null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between multi-discipline and specialist teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

2. There is no significant difference between music teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across each of the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

3. There is no significant interaction between multi-discipline and specialist teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

Demographic Analysis

The final calculated response rate of the survey was 25.7% ($N=147$). Data indicate $n_1=122$ of the participants were specialist teachers, while $n_2=25$ were multi-discipline. Demographic responses were included to glean possible reasons for responses by participants in the survey. Of the respondents, 56 were female and 91 were male. Specialist and multi-discipline teachers were balanced proportionately regarding their district demographic of rural ($n_1=49, n_2=10$), suburban ($n_1=54, n_2=11$), and urban ($n_1=19$, $n_2=4$).
Additional analysis of the data revealed that of the specialists who responded (a) 70 were band directors, (b) 39 were choral directors and (c) 13 were orchestra directors. Likewise, an itemization of multi-discipline teachers indicated 17 were band/choral, 6 were band/orchestra, and 2 were choral/orchestra directors. No choral/orchestra/band directors responded to this survey. The respondents represented all levels of degree programs: (a) 31 held a bachelor’s degree, (b) 88 a master’s degree, and (c) 4 with doctoral degrees (in the specialist group only). There were 6, 19, and 0 participants in the multi-discipline category with bachelors’, masters’, and doctoral degrees, respectively. Except for 2 teachers, all respondents had at least 5 years of experience vested in the education profession. The majority of teachers represented in the survey had 15 or more years of experience. All demographic and reliability tests were exported from the SurveyMonkey.com (2007) website to Microsoft Excel (2004). All ANOVA were calculated using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (2004) and an alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests.

Analysis of Data

The data collected in the survey was based on a Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. This scale was applied to the seven professional items under study (training, musical ability, availability of resources, availability of assistance, available time, interest, and sense of responsibility) for each of the 15 benchmarks within the five Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. For each benchmark, the seven professional ratings were summed to provide insight regarding teachers’ opinions in implementing each benchmark. These means were
compared in a repeated measure two-way analysis of variance with a between-subject variable of teacher role and within subject variable of benchmark.

The first null hypothesis stated that there is no significant difference between multi-discipline and specialist teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Survey participants were asked to provide responses regarding the effect of their training, musical ability, availability of resources, availability of assistance, available time, interest, and sense of responsibility on their opinions of their ability to implement each of the 15 benchmarks. Means for the seven resource and professional items were summed for each of the benchmarks (Table 2). Possible means range from 5 to 35 with a higher mean indicating a higher rating (strongly agree). With respect to the independent variable of teacher role, there was no significant difference \([F(1,145)=.028, p>.05]\) between the overall means among specialist \((M=26.21)\) and multi-discipline \((M=26.04)\) teachers.

The second operating null hypothesis stated there would be no significant difference between music teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across each of the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Comparisons were made to reflect differences in the responses across the 15 benchmarks in the content standards. With respect to the seven professional items across the benchmarks, it was determined that there was a significant difference \([F(14, 2030)=46.05 p<.001]\) and the null hypothesis was rejected.

The third null hypothesis stated there would be no significant interaction between multi-discipline and specialist teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully
implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Byo (1997) indicated an interaction occurred regarding the two independent variables of teacher role and national standard. Since all high school music teachers in Ohio have the same training regardless of position, it was posited they should be able to implement the standards equally. A repeated measures analysis of variance using a within-group comparison revealed there was no interaction \[ F(14, 2030)=1.41, \ p>.05 \] between teacher role and benchmark. Those benchmarks associated with performance (general participation, understanding conducting gestures, and performing diverse literature) ranked higher among all music teachers (Table 3). Those benchmarks associated with musical context, music as an avocation, musical preference, influences of composers upon culture, and uses of technology were rated lower.
Table 2

*Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations of Teacher Role by Benchmark*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>30.44</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>28.32</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>24.98</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>27.67</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>24.88</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>1.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>23.28</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Top 5 and Bottom 5 Benchmark Means Listed in Rank Order*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIA: Sing and/or play, independently or in ensembles, …</td>
<td>31.61</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIIB: Analyze and respond to conducting patterns and gestures in relation …</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIB: Read, perform or compose music repertoire using a variety of tonalities …</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIID: Apply appropriate, established criteria to evaluate a variety of …</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIIA: Analyze and evaluate music selections based upon established criteria.</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IVB: Explain how people differ in their music preferences based on their …</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IB: Research and explain how music and composers both influence … culture.</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK VD: Articulate music avocation and career opportunities found in various cultures…</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK VB: Apply technology in creating, performing, and/or researching music.</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>0.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK VC: Compare and contrast several cultures’ music works based on the …</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This is an amended table from Appendix H, which has a full list in rank order.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship of teacher role and music teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the 15 benchmarks associated with the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Specifically, empirical procedures were developed to test whether multi-discipline and specialist teachers had differing opinions of their ability to implement these benchmarks.

A comprehensive review of the literature was conducted to describe the basic evolution of instrumental and choral positions in public schools. From the one-room schoolhouse of early American education to present day, the increasing complexity of music education over time resulted in a shift from generalized to more specialized music instruction in the classroom. Choral and instrumental positions were highlighted as both similar, yet distinct, teaching domains relative to their respective historical development.

The review continued with an overall analysis of current trends in licensure and teacher preparation. Notwithstanding the specialized music knowledge required for the classroom, Greher & Tobin (2006) reported a growing trend of non-stratified music education licensure that favors a generalized K-12 music certification. However, colleges and universities do not train pre-service teachers to be equally proficient in all grade levels (Conway, 2002). According to Conway, professors can only do so much to prepare music students for the profession. Possibly, this is due to music teacher training being based on a students’ major applied area of study, i.e., vocal or instrumental, with a limited focus on the area of educational interest, i.e., elementary, middle, or high school.
Some universities have begun to adjust their music education programs in recognition of the trend of broad K-12 certification (Greher & Tobin, 2006, p.53). These institutions and others like them may serve as possible models for pre-service student music preparation prior to entering the music education profession. Even with this effort, situations arise where school districts make administrative and managerial decisions that may displace teachers from their area of expertise (Ingersoll, 2001, 2005). Ingersoll found that placing teachers in positions for which they are not adequately trained (operationally defined as “out-of-field” placements) weakened the quality of learning experiences for both the teacher and student. By extension, it can be posited that the incongruity between teacher expertise and teacher role could impede educators' ability to implement educational standards effectively. In the context of music education, Byo (1997) found that elementary general educators and music educators differed in their perceived abilities to implement the National Standards for Arts Education (1994). While Byo's work established a methodological approach to examine the relationship teacher role had on elementary general education and music teachers’ ability to implement national standards in music, it remained unclear as to whether such an effect existed between two specialized groups of music educators. The current study intended to address the paucity of research in this area.

Questionnaire responses were systematically collected and analyzed in order to test the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between multi-discipline and specialist teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.
2. There is no significant difference between music teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across each of the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

3. There is no significant interaction between multi-discipline and specialist teachers’ opinions of their ability to successfully implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music.

The final questionnaire design was based on Byo’s research, but was also informed by other levels of inquiry. Initially, a grounded research interview process was performed with Ohio teachers randomly selected from a database provided by National Association of Music Education (known as MENC). Results of these interviews defined the set of items included in the pilot web-based questionnaire. The pilot study results refined the overall usability and reliability of the questionnaire as well as finalized research administrative procedures. Utilizing a teacher database obtained by the music education department at Kent State University, a convenience sample was derived consisting of high school music teachers in Ohio public schools. The final version of the web-based questionnaire utilized the services of SurveyMonkey.com (2007). Potential respondents were invited via e-mail notification to complete the questionnaire.

In the first section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to provide demographic information, e.g., gender, age, degree, area of expertise, current position, years of experience, and school population size. Descriptive statistics were computed for these demographic items. Additionally, all possible permutations of teacher role were
classified by subgroups of teaching, i.e., band, orchestra, and choral. These subgroups were further classified into the categories of multi-discipline and specialist teaching as defined in Chapter 1. The second section of the questionnaire solicited teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music by rating seven professional and resource items, i.e., training, musical ability, availability of resources, availability of assistance, available time, interest, and sense of responsibility, for each benchmark. In the final section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked about their participation in college music ensembles, and their opinions regarding maintaining balanced music programs, determining whether or not one could teach any subject within a K-12 certification, and stratified certification. These responses were elicited for potential future research studies.

Conclusions

For the first hypothesis, ANOVA results failed to show a significant overall mean difference \([F(1,145)=.028, p>.05]\) between specialist \((M=26.21)\) and multi-discipline \((M=26.04)\) teachers' opinions of their ability to implement the 15 benchmarks. Given that this study was an extension of Byo’s research, it was posited \emph{a priori} that the main effect of teacher role would be similar between the two studies. The results of the current study differ from those of Byo (1997) who found a significant overall mean difference between general educators’ and music educators' perceived ability to meet the National Standards for Arts Education (1994). The two samples of teachers in Byo’s study were more disparate in their respective licensure requirements, pre-service preparation, and education training. Conversely, music teachers from the current study came from more similar backgrounds in education and pre-service training. In this sense, it is likely the
current study required more statistical power to detect a potentially smaller effect between the more comparable groups of music educators.

A confounding factor inherent in this study's design was the bias of self-report measures. Donaldson & Grant-Vallone (2002) indicated respondents would under-report behaviors deemed inappropriate while over-report behavior deemed more appropriate. This was also found in Walker, Schmitt, & Miller (2006) in surveying how daily responsibilities may affect math education in grades K-8. The researchers were concerned that the end results would be compromised by response bias due to teachers' self-report of their own work and that of their colleagues. In the current study, teachers may have inflated their responses given the social desirability of implementing benchmarks in their classrooms. For instance, some respondents may have shown bias due to uncertainty as to whether the study results would be used for administrative and/or managerial purposes. Though respondents were informed about the confidential nature of this study, self-report bias was likely present and may have had a more pronounced effect given the small participant sample.

The second hypothesis addressed whether significant differences existed between music teachers’ opinions of their ability to implement the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music across each of the 15 benchmarks of the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. ANOVA results indicated a significant within-subject effect \[F(14, 2030) = 46.05, p < .001\] using the 15 benchmarks as a repeated measure. As expected, the means of the summed professional and resource item scores differed from benchmark to benchmark. There are likely several factors that define why music ensemble directors would vary in their ratings from benchmark to benchmark.
There is nothing on the Ohio Department of Education website that indicates the Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music are anything but voluntary. Additionally, since Ohio does not require music as a requirement on the Ohio Graduation Test (ODE, 2008), it follows that music teachers would vary in their opinions as to what benchmarks would be prioritized in favor of variables surrounding the seven resource items within a particular school or district. Those benchmarks associated with performance (general participation, understanding conducting gestures, and performing diverse literature) ranked highest in implementation among all participants (Appendix H). As this study only surveyed high school ensemble teachers, these rankings are understandable given that performance ensembles would need mastery in performance related areas. Those benchmarks associated with musical context, music as an avocation, musical preference, influences of composers upon culture, and uses of technology were rated the lowest in implementation (avocation and careers, use of technology, compare and contrast of culture). Given the current climate of indicating success in music programs through competition or state festivals, the ability to attain high performances standards is likely paramount to evaluations related to a broader music curriculum, e.g., music theory and music history.

Another possible influence for lower benchmark ratings may be the non-musical demands music teachers confront. These may have a causal relationship with the choices teachers make for their curricula. Gordan (2000) discussed various areas of stress that are pervasive in public music education. In particular, the areas of non-musical expectations (management of the program, administrative policies, etc.) and preparation for the overall curricula create an excessive demand on music teachers. Conway (2004) submitted there
are non-musical aspects of music positions that burden music teachers, especially those teachers that are new to the profession. Hewitt (2003) highlighted other non-musical issues that may have a greater influence on teacher approaches and learning outcomes than those of a musical nature. In his study, teachers often found themselves developing awareness regarding deficits in students’ ability to learn. He posited “in a situation where the teacher believes the pupil to lack motivation, the attempt to develop motivation will take precedence over other aspects of learning and teaching” (p.56). Given non-musical pressures combined with performance expectations of music programs, teachers may decide to choose benchmarks that would contribute to more immediate successes of performances by students.

Test results of the third hypothesis revealed no significant interaction between teacher role and benchmark \([F(14, 2030)=1.41, p>.05]\). While the results reported in Appendix H do not indicate a significant interaction effect \((p=.14)\), there were differences between the groups on select benchmarks that suggest one may exist. To illustrate results more clearly, benchmark means were represented graphically (Figure 1). The similarity of the data regarding performance and ensemble expectations (as previously stated) may be a foregone conclusion given that all teachers are high school ensemble directors. For example, the means found most similar between specialists and multi-discipline music teachers were as follows:

1. I-A: Identify music forms from various cultures and historical periods and create or perform representative repertoire with stylistic accuracy.
2. II-B: Read, perform or compose music repertoire using a variety of tonalities while demonstrating an understanding of the language of music.
3. II-A: Sing and/or play, independently or in ensembles, demonstrating technical and stylistic accuracy and musical expressiveness with appropriate responses to a leader's cues and gestures.
4. V-A: Articulate similarities and differences between music and other content
areas.
5. III-D: Apply appropriate, established criteria to evaluate a variety of music performances.

Figure 1. Graphical comparison of means of teacher role by benchmark

While the means in Figure 1 are congruent and indicate a non-significant result, there are those that indicate an inference of possible interaction effect. There were four benchmarks rated higher by multi-discipline teachers:

1. III-A: Analyze and evaluate music selections based upon established criteria.
2. I-B: Research and explain how music and composers both influence and are influenced by society and culture.
3. III-B: Analyze and respond to conducting patterns and gestures in relation to interpretation of music performance literature.
4. V-C: Compare and contrast several cultures’ music works based on the function music serves, role of the musicians, and conditions under which the music is performed.

Conversely, specialist teachers rated the following benchmarks higher:

1. IV-B: Explain how people differ in their music preferences based on their personal lives.
2. II-C: Analyze common harmonic progressions in selected repertoire aurally.
3. IV-C: Develop and apply specific criteria for making informed, critical judgments about quality and effectiveness of music works both written and performed.
4. V-D: Articulate music avocation and career opportunities found in various cultures and music settings and identify experiences necessary for success.
5. V-B: Apply technology in creating, performing, and/or researching music.
6. IV-A: Articulate and justify personal philosophies regarding music in their lives and cite examples that contributed to this thinking.

The four benchmarks for multi-discipline teachers and six for specialists indicate the strongest potential for interaction. These could be investigated in a future study to distinguish what professional and resource items underlie the differences between groups of multi-discipline and specialist music teachers. For instance, it is possible the largest inconsistency between these benchmarks are associated with the findings relative to differences found in the results of the seven professional and resource items (Table 4).

The items of “interest,” “responsibility,” and “resource” contained the highest variability in mean and standard deviation differences. Of the aforementioned items, “interest” and “responsibility” frame how the training of a teacher will most likely be implemented in a music position. In Chapter 1, “interest” was defined as value placed upon the choices of topics to be highlighted or de-emphasized, and “sense of responsibility” was defined as the awareness of the trust assigned to the charge of disseminating Ohio Fine Arts Academic Content Standards in Music. Once a teacher has decided on a program of study and is vested in it, resources need to be obtained in order to actualize a plan over a course of time. “Availability of Resources” was operationally defined as materials with which to teach (books, recordings, music for performance or study) and musical equipment (including instruments, media, technology), and proper facilities.

With regard to these three items, teacher role may be having an effect on the data. A multi-discipline music teacher might find the demands of a music position very taxing. Therefore, a teacher would likely make choices of prioritizing the benchmarks to meet
Table 4

*Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations of Teacher Role by Resource Item*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>62.51</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>62.44</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>1.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>60.36</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>59.72</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>2.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>1.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>57.13</td>
<td>11.07*</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>59.20 (2.07)</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>1.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>47.46</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>45.80 (1.66)</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>2.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>52.84</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>52.80</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>2.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>51.75</td>
<td>13.67*</td>
<td>1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Discipline</td>
<td>49.16 (2.59)</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>2.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Largest mean differences are highlighted in parentheses. Largest standard deviation differences are asterisked. Some items have been abbreviated for spacing concerns, e.g., “Availability of Resources” is called “resources.”
performance responsibilities and to adhere to a positive, yet general, experience in music education. The specialist teacher might realize more flexibility in determining a more specialized study in instrumental or choral music. In a specialist job position, the scope of responsibility is far more particular to meeting the needs of a defined set of students. In this sense, “interest” and “responsibility” become unique and distinct factors of multi-discipline and specialist music teachers. Yet one persistent strain, regardless of position, is that of resources. Ponce (1994) investigated job satisfaction among high school choral directors in Ohio. Finding that there were many factors that contributed to a positive job experience, choral directors were least satisfied with issues surrounding facilities and resources. While not discussed in Ponce’s work, it is possible that this issue may also exist in instrumental programs. The effect of multi-discipline and specialist positions may have contributed to the mean differences in Table 4. Additionally, that effect may have contributed to the variability of rankings of the benchmarks (Appendix H).

Byo (1997) indicated a significant interaction between teacher role and national standard. Her data made it possible to suggest in-service training opportunities for those national standards having lower overall mean values between elementary generalist and music teachers. She suggested implementing interventions or designing workshops related to the national standards for music that had the widest variability in scores to facilitate meeting the standards more closely. Suggesting interventions for lower scoring benchmarks is beyond the scope of the current study. However, the results may indicate differentiation between benchmark items.

As indicated earlier regarding the magnitude of the effect of teacher role (between group effect), the power of the study, particularly due to small sample and sampling
error, is likely insufficient to detect an interaction effect with similar groups of music educators. If this were a significant interaction effect, it could be interpreted as multi-discipline teachers favoring standard ensemble benchmarks and those associated with a generalized experience in music. In addition to performance-based benchmarks, specialists tend to focus on those that analyze the internal structures of music and develop ways of bringing critical analysis with their musical experience. This is difficult to assert with any assurance given the inconclusive results of the study.

Limitations

Any inferences drawn from this study must be based on the perspective of limitations that developed as a result of the methodology. Some of these were expounded upon as part of the Chapter 3 narrative, i.e., re-wording of a question, hot-decking for participant non-response, and also in the account of this chapter.

While it has always been understood that the teachers in the current study were very similar with regard to training, it was assumed that multi-discipline and specialist teachers were different enough to discuss them in the same manner as in Byo’s study. It became apparent that sampling procedures were not robust enough to provide an adequate size of participants to understand subtle nuances between groups that may exist. It became clear upon the conclusion of analyses that multi-discipline and specialist music teachers were closer in professional background than anticipated and more closely related than those teachers studied by Byo. The initial intention of recruiting the assistance from the Ohio Music Educators Association was not possible, and an alternative means of contacting music educators had to be considered. Therefore, the teacher database used in the study was obtained from the music education department at Kent State University.
This created a primary historical effect given the e-mail list was generated during the spring of the 2006-2007 academic year. By the time the second pilot test had been implemented in the fall of 2008, the list had already aged one-and-a-half years. In order to reach a balanced sample size of 15 participants per teacher group, 221 e-mails had been used. This precipitated the decision to change from random sampling to convenience sampling, which exhausted the rest of the e-mail database in the final implementation in January 2009.

Implications and Future Study

Given these limitations, broad implications are difficult to articulate as the researcher concedes that external validity is difficult to illustrate given the inconclusive results. However, much was learned through the course of this research to promote a more precise and robust research model for implementation in future studies. In an article to colleagues, Altman & Bland (1996) explained that the “absence of evidence does not mean evidence of absence” (p.485). The slight interaction between teacher role and benchmark in this research presents the possibility there may be underlying effects worth investigating. An improved sampling strategy to increase the quality of the sample size might provide the statistical power necessary to detect a possible larger effect size, thereby, increasing the study's external validity.

It may also benefit future researchers to systematically investigate one academic music standard at a time with its related benchmarks. The questionnaire could be amended to investigate a smaller cluster of benchmarks having the highest variability as per the results of this study. Even though it was determined in the pilot study that the questionnaire was easy to use and complete, a smaller instrument might be preferable in
future research to work against fatigue effect by participants. In that scale, a future design
will want to consider order effect. While the researcher randomly chose in what order the
questions from each standard would appear on the questionnaire, they did not vary from
participant to participant. Proper randomization of the questionnaire would remove
another level of possible bias. Current and up-to-date contact information should be used
and not allowed to age. In an effort to better define teacher groups, one method might be
to define types of public school demographics (rural, suburban, and urban), then control
for continuous variables within teacher demographics.

One other consideration would be to implement the study in a state where K-12
certification is the predominant form of licensure. In Ohio, music teacher licensure is
highly stratified with several types of licensure and endorsements available (Ohio
Department of Education, 2010). While multi-discipline positions may still occur given
the certification structure of Ohio, teachers can choose their specialty and job positions.
The researcher posits that multi-discipline positions are likely more prevalent in states
with non-stratified certifications which could be further studied. By having all licensure
the same, the variable of certification could be better controlled. This would help further
define specialist and multi-discipline teachers. Longitudinally, a body of knowledge
could be aggregated with respect to these groups of teachers with an eventual goal of
determining if teacher role has an effect on standards implementation.

There was no intent to polarize multi-discipline teachers and their specialist
counterparts in this investigation. There are music educators with broad experiences in
both areas. This researcher is familiar with many multi-discipline teachers with such high
musical abilities that their programs rival those with only specialist teachers. In that
sense, teacher role may not always be a predictor of negative effect, and the current study was not conducted with any like assumption in mind. Simply, there is no extant research available that specifically discusses or investigates the implications of music teachers placed in multi-discipline and specialist assignments. This necessitates examining these groups of professionals, which remains a unique feature of this study. It is critical to investigate the various strata of specialties that are inherent in music education. The effectiveness and efficiency of implementing standards amidst the continually changing face of education will always remain a challenge for teachers regardless of discipline.
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Dear «First_Name»,

My name is Michael Martin and I am working on my Ph.D. in Music Education at Kent State University. I am writing to you to ask for your help in this primary activity of my research. With help from the School of Music and through special permission through MENC, I was able to contact you directly, which helps me in these beginning stages.

My research study is entitled, “An Investigation of the Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of Multi-Discipline High School Music Teaching Positions in Ohio.” It is here where you and I have something in common: we have worked in our school districts as a teacher of band/chorus, band/orchestra, or chorus/orchestra. For 18 years, I worked as either a band/choral or band/choral/orchestra director in selected Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts schools. According to MENC, you have self-reported that you work in this type of position for your school. For this dissertation topic, I wanted to avail my research into this very area in order to answer some questions that I hope will...
contribute to our profession:

1. Is the multi-discipline position a manifestation of demographic issues?
2. Is the multi-discipline position a manifestation of generalized state licensure?
3. Are these teachers adequately trained to meet a general approach to state licensure?
4. Is the multi-discipline position a manifestation of lack of awareness by administrators?
5. What are the perceived educational advantages/disadvantages of such a position?

If you agree to help me, I plan to keep the time involved for you to an extreme minimum.

Here is the plan:

1. Whether you can or cannot assist in this study, it would be helpful if you would contact me either by e-mail or by phone (listed above) within three days of receiving this letter.
2. If the answer is “no,” you will not hear from me again until the fall when the final survey instrument is completed in both paper and online form.
3. If the answer is “yes,” then I will need to conduct a simple 10-minute phone interview with you. Please contact me either by phone or e-mail and leave me the following details:
   a. Your phone number
   b. The best time to call you
4. The information obtained in the phone interview will be held anonymously and reported back to you in the form of a pilot survey. You will complete it,
add comments to me as necessary, and mail back the survey. I will pay all postage. If you request it, I will give you the results of this pilot. The final dissertation results will only mention that randomly selected Ohio teachers in multi-discipline positions completed the original pilot.

5. Once this is completed, you will not be contacted again. Your participation at this point helps me to create the final instrument for hopeful use in a dissertation project for all other multi-discipline music teachers in Ohio.

I hope I can count on your help! After 18 years of teaching as the “music department” of the schools at which I taught, it would be helpful to begin a dialogue regarding the implications (positive and negative) of such multi-discipline music positions. I would like the entire pilot process completed by September 30.

With appreciation,

Michael Martin
G.A. / Ph.D. Music Education
Kent State University
APPENDIX B

Participant Consent Form

An Investigation of the Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of Multi-Discipline High School Music Teaching Positions in Ohio

Before beginning, I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in the beginning stages of this study. The interview and subsequent pilot survey will form the necessary basis for communicating to multi discipline teachers in a much broader demographic area. I could not do this without your help.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the advantages and disadvantages of multi-discipline music teaching from a population of teachers serving in this capacity in the state of Ohio and possibly beyond. Issues regarding teacher attrition, preparation, and the ability to perform the demands required of the position are central to the study. Insight into music educators’ opinions concerning teacher attrition, preparation, and the ability to perform the demands required of these multi positions are central to the study and will be explicated through this investigation. You are under no obligation to participate in this study and may cease your participation at anytime. You will not be identified in any way and all responses will be held in the strictest confidence. Upon completion of the phone interview, a pilot survey will be compiled and sent to you to not only answer, but review for the researcher. Once completed, the survey will be mailed back to me concluding your involvement.

This project has been approved by Kent State University. Information about the rules for research can be obtained from Dr. John L. West, Vice President and Dean,
Division of Research and Graduate Studies (330) 672-2851. Further permission has been secured directly from Deputy Executive Director Michael Blakesee of The National Association for Music Education (MENC). If you would like to know more about the finished results of this study, you may contact me through the e-mail address below.

Sincerely,

Michael Martin
mmartin5@kent.edu

I agree to take part in this project and realize that I may stop at anytime. Please sign and return this copy to me.

__________________________  _______________________
Signature                  Date

__________________________
Printed name
APPENDIX C

Telephone interview questions for pilot survey

An Investigation of the Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of Multi-Discipline High School Music Teaching Positions in Ohio

Script:

Thank you for getting in touch with me! The following questions are meant to be a guide to discuss your position as a multi-discipline music teacher. We do not need to stay “on script” should our discussion take us in other directions. That kind of discussion is encouraged. Feel free to discuss any aspect of the following questions freely and anonymously as indicated in the consent form.

1. What was your college degree and specialty area?
2. In what ways do you feel you were exceptionally prepared for teaching?
3. Given your experience, what aspects of teaching did you learn “on the job?”
4. Is this your first job?
   If yes, skip to #5:
   If not, please itemize with a brief description and years in each position.
5. What is the make-up and population of your current school?
6. Describe your current position.
7. What made you take this job?
8. How long do you intend to stay in this position?

9. Describe a typical day or week in your current position.

10. How many concerts will you perform in a year?

11. Are you ever been asked to provide additional performances in addition to the ones your contract/stipend specifically requires/intends?

12. Do you have extra-curricular activities? Do you receive a stipend for them?

13. What elements of the position make it enjoyable? Not enjoyable?

14. If you were working in a department of music teachers, how would that change the scope of your teaching?

15. If you were working in a department of music teachers, how would that change what your students learned?

16. What sort of support (e.g. administrative, schedule, etc.) allows you to teach efficiently?

17. Are there constraints that do not allow for effective teaching?

18. Do you feel isolated from your colleagues in music?

19. Does your job allow you to form cooperative collegial relationships with other teachers?

20. Do you feel isolated from your colleagues the school?

21. Do you feel your colleagues from the other disciplinary areas understand the scope of your position?

22. Are there other teachers in your school in other discipline areas that you feel teach in a multi- or multi-discipline capacity?
23. Is there an expectation of you to create a balanced program from parents? Administrators?

24. Does this position fulfill your needs as an educator?

25. Given the job and its requirements, do you feel you meet the needs of the students?

26. Why do you think these positions exist?

Thank you for your time! You will be hearing from me via mail with the pilot survey.

Again, completing the survey instrument will end your participation in this process. You will not be contracted to complete the final survey.
I. **Historical, Cultural, and Social Contexts**
Students demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a variety of music styles and cultures and the context of musical expression or events, both past and present. Students identify significant contributions of composers and performers to music heritage. Students analyze the historical, social and political forces that have influenced the function and role of music in the lives of people. (much more of survey of history or literature course).

**Benchmark I-A:** Identify music forms from various cultures and historical periods and create or perform representative repertoire with stylistic accuracy.
**Benchmark I-B:** Research and explain how music and composers both influence and are influenced by society and culture.

II. **Creative Expression and Communication**
Students sing, play instruments, improvise, compose, read and notate music (this concerns performance area expertise).

**Benchmark II-A:** Sing and/or play, independently or in ensembles, demonstrating technical and stylistic accuracy and musical expressiveness with appropriate responses to a leader's cues and gestures.
**Benchmark II-B:** Read, perform or compose music repertoire using a variety of tonalities while demonstrating an understanding of the language of music.

III. **Analyzing and Responding**
Students listen to a varied repertoire of music and respond by analyzing and describing music using correct terminology. Students evaluate the creating and performing of music by using appropriate criteria (although this is a more theoretical aspect of music and intimates content within a music theory class, aspects of this Standard are incorporated in performance ensembles).

**Benchmark III-A:** Analyze and evaluate music selections based upon established criteria.
**Benchmark III-B:** Analyze and respond to conducting patterns and gestures in relation to interpretation of music performance literature.
**Benchmark III-C:** Analyze common harmonic progressions in selected repertoire aurally.
**Benchmark III-D:** Apply appropriate, established criteria to evaluate a variety of music performances.

IV. **Valuing Music/Aesthetic Reflection**
Students demonstrate an understanding of reasons why people value music and a respect for diverse opinions regarding music preferences. Students articulate the significance of music in their lives (although this is a more philosophical aspect of music and intimates content within a music literature class, aspects of this Standard are incorporated in performance ensembles).

**Benchmark IV-A:** Articulate and justify personal philosophies regarding music in their lives and cite examples that contributed to this thinking.
**Benchmark IV-B:** Explain how people differ in their music preferences based on their personal experiences.
**Benchmark IV-C:** Develop and apply specific criteria for making informed, critical judgments about quality and effectiveness of music works both written and performed.
V. **Connections, Relationships, and Applications**

Students identify similarities and differences between music and other arts disciplines. Students recognize the relationship between concepts and skills learned through music with knowledge learned in other curricular subjects, life experiences, and potential careers in and outside the arts. Students develop a desire for lifelong learning in music.

**Benchmark V-A:** Articulate similarities and differences between music and other content areas.
**Benchmark V-B:** Apply technology in creating, performing, and/or researching music.
**Benchmark V-C:** Compare and contrast several cultures’ music works based on the function music serves, role of the musicians, and conditions under which the music is performed.
**Benchmark V-D:** Articulate music avocation and career opportunities found in various cultures and music settings and identify experiences necessary for success.
APPENDIX E

Survey of Multi-Discipline Teachers (Pilot)

Section 1

General Information: please write or check your answer below

1. Gender
   □ Male □ Female

2. Age
   ______

3. Highest degree earned:
   □ Bachelors □ Masters □ Doctoral

4. Undergraduate Degree:
   Bachelor of _______________________________
   Primary area of study: Instrumental □ Vocal □

5. Graduate degree:
   Master of _________________________________
   Primary area of study: __________________________

6. Graduate degree:
   Doctor of _________________________________
   Primary area of study: __________________________

7. Amount of years teaching
   ______

8. Amount of positions held within years of teaching (check one):
   □ 1 – 2 □ 3 – 4 □ 4 – 5 □ 5+

9. Current HS assignment is check one:
   □ band □ band/orchestra
   □ choral □ choral/orchestra
   □ orchestra □ choral/orchestra/band
   □ band/choral

10. My position at the HS level is considered:
    □ full time □ part time

11. My position includes assignments in the lower grades
    Yes □ No

12. Number of yearly performances of high school ensembles (inclusive)
    ______

13. I receive a stipend for extra-curricular/extended year work.
    Yes □ No

14. I intend to stay in this position for ________ year(s).

15. My school district would be considered:
    □ rural □ suburban □ urban

16. Number of students in the district (approximate)
    ______
17. Number of students in the high school grades only       
18. Number of students in the high school music program  

Section 2

Please circle only ONE number

A positive high school experience influenced me to become a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was highly active in instrumental and choral ensembles during high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was highly active in instrumental and choral ensembles during college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel that students learn best from a teacher employed in a multi-discipline position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working with students is the most enjoyable aspect of my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colleagues in music are readily available to offer counsel regarding teaching issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel isolated from colleagues in other disciplines in my high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel that colleagues from other disciplines understand the scope of my position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel that my administrators understand the scope of my position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was well-prepared by my college program to teach HS performance ensembles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was well-prepared by my college program to develop class management strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was well-prepared for teaching HS general music by my college program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was well-prepared by my college program to develop budgets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was well-prepared by my college program to anticipate educational politics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am expected to maintain a balanced program (equal opportunities for music students) by parents and administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The depth of being the administrator of my program often overwhelms me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel qualified to teach any area within my K-12 certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disagree                      Agree

I believe that state certifications should be more specific as to areas of qualification.
   1                      2                      3                      4                      5
   Strongly                Strongly
   Disagree                Agree

The scope of my position allows me to create depth in my course offerings.
   1                      2                      3                      4                      5
   Strongly                Strongly
   Disagree                Agree

I feel that I adequately meet the instructional needs of the students in each of the
discipline areas within which I teach.
   1                      2                      3                      4                      5
   Strongly                Strongly
   Disagree                Agree

I feel that non-music school issues have caused me to question my ability to remain in the
profession.
   1                      2                      3                      4                      5
   Strongly                Strongly
   Disagree                Agree

I am well-supported by a schedule that gives the optimum opportunity for students to join
the music program.
   1                      2                      3                      4                      5
   Strongly                Strongly
   Disagree                Agree

I enjoy serving the community in the capacity of my current position.
   1                      2                      3                      4                      5
   Strongly                Strongly
   Disagree                Agree
Section 3
Ohio Benchmarks

I am able to meet the outcome goals of the following Ohio Benchmarks on a regular basis (please check “YES” or “NO” per benchmark in the tables on the next pages)

I. Historical, Cultural and Social Contexts
Students demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a variety of music styles and cultures and the context of musical expression or events, both past and present. Students identify significant contributions of composers and performers to music heritage. Students analyze the historical, social and political forces that have influenced the function and role of music in the lives of people.

A. Identify music forms from various cultures and historical periods and create or perform representative repertoire with stylistic accuracy.

B. Research and explain how music and composers both influence and are influenced by society and culture.

II. Creative Expression and Communication
Students sing, play instruments, improvise, compose, read and notate music.

A. Sing and/or play, independently or in ensembles, demonstrating technical and stylistic accuracy and musical expressiveness with appropriate responses to a leader's cues and gestures.

B. Read, perform or compose music repertoire using a variety of tonalities while demonstrating an understanding of the language of music.

III. Analyzing and Responding
Students listen to a varied repertoire of music and respond by analyzing and describing music using correct terminology. Students evaluate the creating and performing of music by using appropriate criteria.

A. Analyze and evaluate music selections based upon established criteria.

B. Analyze and respond to conducting patterns and gestures in relation to interpretation of music performance literature.

C. Analyze common harmonic progressions in selected repertoire aurally.

D. Apply appropriate, established criteria to evaluate a variety of music performances.

IV. Valuing Music/Aesthetic Reflection
Students demonstrate an understanding of reasons why people value music and a respect for diverse opinions regarding music preferences. Students articulate the significance of music in their lives.

A. Articulate and justify personal philosophies regarding music in their lives and cite examples that contributed to this thinking.
B. Explain how people differ in their music preferences based on their personal experiences.

C. Develop and apply specific criteria for making informed, critical judgments about quality and effectiveness of music works both written and performed.

V. Connections, Relationships and Applications
Students identify similarities and differences between music and other arts disciplines. Students recognize the relationship between concepts and skills learned through music with knowledge learned in other curricular subjects, life experiences and potential careers in and outside the arts. Students develop a desire for lifelong learning in music.

A. Articulate similarities and differences between music and other content areas.

B. Apply technology in creating, performing and/or researching music.

C. Compare and contrast several cultures' music based on the function music serves, role of the musicians and conditions under which the music is performed.

D. Articulate music avocation and career opportunities found in various cultures and music settings and identify experiences necessary for success.
APPENDIX F

Statements of Usability

Some questioned the need for having to know what type of degree was earned by teachers, in addition to knowing what level of degree had been attained (Bachelor, Master, or Doctorate). An additional question was asked in the pilot version that was not asked in the final design. The researcher recognized that music teachers have responsibilities that vary depending on the time of year. For instance, band directors might be more reticent to participate in a survey during football season. Choral directors may not want to take the time in March during state competitions or musicals. Therefore, teachers were asked what month of the year would be the best month within the school year was in which to participate. Based on the pilot feedback, 38% of participants indicated that January would be the best month of the year in which to contribute to this project. These comments were addressed in the final survey design.

Other comments included the following feedback and these were addressed in the final design:

**Comments on usability:**

1. The scales of strongly agree or strongly disagree were sometimes reversed from one page to another.

2. On most of the questions answer range was not the same -- on some questions Agree was to the right and Disagree was to the left -- on other questions that was reversed.
3. Teach band and general music. Not an option on this survey. Also I have a Masters of Ed, again not an option.

Are there any other questions, concerns, or positive reactions you would like to include?

1. Thank you for the survey (sic)... It actually made me realize once again where I need to concentrate (sic) more attention. I just wish the class periods were longer and the resources better. Then of course, we would not have time for contests etc... Great survey. Good luck on the final product.

2. Finding ways to incorporate standards based teaching in performance oriented classes is very tough, but in my school without other class options such as music theory or music appreciation, the only place that all standards can be addressed is the performing classroom.

3. No. The biggest problem we have is time to teach the benchmarks/standards. We have all the resources but not enough time.
APPENDIX G

Survey On The Relationship Of Teacher Role and Teacher Opinions to Implement the Ohio Academic Standards In Music

Section 1

General Information: please write or check your answer below

1. Gender  □ Male  □ Female
2. Age ______
3. Highest degree earned:  □ Bachelors  □ Masters
4. Undergraduate Degree:  Bachelor of ______________________________
   Primary area of study: Wind Strings Percussion
   Vocal
5. Graduate degree:  Master of ______________________________
   Primary area of study: ___________________________________________
6. Amount of years teaching ______
7. Amount of positions held within years of teaching (check one):
   □ 1 – 2  □ 3 – 4  □ 4 – 5  □ 5+
8. Current HS assignment is check one:
   □ band  □ band/orchestra
   □ choral  □ choral/orchestra
   □ orchestra  □ choral/orchestra/band
   □ band/choral
9. My position at the HS level is considered:  □ full time  □ part time
10. I have been _______ year (s) in my current position.
11. I intend to stay in this position for ________ year(s).
12. My school district would be considered:  □ rural  □ suburban  □ urban
13. Number of students in the district (approximate) _______
14. Total population of high school (only) 

15. Number of students in the high school music program 

16. Number of seniors considering a major in music education 

Section 2
Ohio Standards

I. Historical, Cultural, and Social Contexts
Students demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a variety of music styles and cultures and the context of musical expression or events, both past and present. Students identify significant contributions of composers and performers to music heritage. Students analyze the historical, social and political forces that have influenced the function and role of music in the lives of people. (much more of survey of history or literature course).

Benchmark A: Identify music forms from various cultures and historical periods and create or perform representative repertoire with stylistic accuracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this standard.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmark B: Research and explain how music and composers both influence and are influenced by society and culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5
I am able to effectively teach this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5
I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5
I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help. 1 2 3 4 5
I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5

II. Creative Expression and Communication

Students sing, play instruments, improvise, compose, read and notate music (this concerns performance area expertise).

**Benchmark A:** Sing and/or play, independently or in ensembles, demonstrating technical and stylistic accuracy and musical expressiveness with appropriate responses to a leader's cues and gestures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this standard.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark B:** Read, perform or compose music repertoire using a variety of tonalities while demonstrating an understanding of the language of music (it’s important to note that this benchmark contains all of the technical aspects of performance).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Analyzing and Responding
Students listen to a varied repertoire of music and respond by analyzing and describing music using correct terminology. Students evaluate the creating and performing of music by using appropriate criteria (although this is a more theoretical aspect of music and intimates content within a music theory class, aspects of this Standard are incorporated in performance ensembles).

**Benchmark A:** Analyze and evaluate music selections based upon established criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark B:** Analyze and respond to conducting patterns and gestures in relation to interpretation of music performance literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmark C: Analyze common harmonic progressions in selected repertoire aurally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmark D: Apply appropriate, established criteria to evaluate a variety of music performances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teaching this benchmark.

I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.

I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.

I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.

I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.

I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.

I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark.

IV. Valuing Music/Aesthetic Reflection

Students demonstrate an understanding of reasons why people value music and a respect for diverse opinions regarding music preferences. Students articulate the significance of music in their lives (although this is a more philosophical aspect of music and intimates content within a music literature class, aspects of this Standard are incorporated in performance ensembles).

**Benchmark A:** Articulate and justify personal philosophies regarding music in their lives and cite examples that contributed to this thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark B:** Explain how people differ in their music preferences based on their personal experiences.
I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5
I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5
I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5
I am able to effectively teach this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5
I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5
I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help. 1 2 3 4 5
I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark. 1 2 3 4 5

**Benchmark C:** Develop and apply specific criteria for making informed, critical judgments about quality and effectiveness of music works both written and performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. **Connections, Relationships, and Applications**

Students identify similarities and differences between music and other arts disciplines. Students recognize the relationship between concepts and skills learned through music with knowledge learned in other curricular subjects, life experiences, and potential careers in and outside the arts. Students develop a desire for lifelong learning in music.
**Benchmark A:** Articulate similarities and differences between music and other content areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark B:** Apply technology in creating, performing, and/or researching music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark C:** Compare and contrast several cultures’ music works based on the function music serves, role of the musicians, and conditions under which the music is performed.
**Benchmark D:** Articulate music avocation and career opportunities found in various cultures and music settings and identify experiences necessary for success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for effectively teaching this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trained to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have instructional time to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively teach this benchmark in conjunction with additional specialist help.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to effectively teach this benchmark.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3 – Extended interest

Please circle only ONE number

I was highly active in instrumental and choral ensembles during high school.

1 Strongly Disagree
2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

I was highly active in instrumental and choral ensembles during college.

1 Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

I am expected to maintain a balanced program (equal opportunities for music students) by parents and administrators.

1 Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

I feel qualified to teach any area within my K-12 certification.

1 Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

I believe that state certifications should be more specific as to areas of qualification.

1 Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIA: Sing and/or play, independently or in ensembles, …</td>
<td>31.61</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIIB: Analyze and respond to conducting patterns and gestures in relation …</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIB: Read, perform or compose music repertoire using a variety of tonalities …</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIID: Apply appropriate, established criteria to evaluate a variety of …</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIIA: Analyze and evaluate music selections based upon established criteria.</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IA: Identify music forms from various cultures and historical periods …</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK VA: Articulate similarities and differences between music and other content areas.</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IVC: Develop and apply specific criteria for making informed, critical judgments…</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IVA: Articulate and justify personal philosophies regarding music in their lives …</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IIIC: Analyze common harmonic progressions in selected repertoire aurally.</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IVB: Explain how people differ in their music preferences based on their …</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK IB: Research and explain how music and composers both influence … culture.</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK VD: Articulate music avocation and career opportunities found in various cultures…</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK VB: Apply technology in creating, performing, and/or researching music.</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>0.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK VC: Compare and contrast several cultures’ music works based on the</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>