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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the current status of instrumental music programs in the secondary Catholic schools of the United States through information gathered from a national survey. From the 1,203 secondary Catholic schools in the United States, 400 were randomly selected to participate in an online survey with 117 responding. Data were collected and analyzed for demographic information and program characteristics. Comparisons were made between the characteristics of programs and the schools’ size and location to determine trends found in the Catholic secondary instrumental programs.

Results showed that 88.9% of the schools have instrumental music programs with 47% located in urban, 41% in suburban, and 12% in rural areas. Many secondary school enrollments were small with 48.7% with less than 500 students of which 49.1% located in urban, 41.7% in suburban and 71.4% in rural areas. Many schools had small instrumental programs ($P = 49\%$) with 50 or less students participating in instrumental music. Factors of administrative and parental support, school scheduling, and feeder school instrumental programs affected the strength and security of the programs. Recommendations derived from the results included the development of stronger feeder school programs, designing better school schedules, promoting supportive parent booster groups, and increasing administrative support through providing proper rehearsal facilities and necessary equipment.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The condition of the nation’s parochial school instrumental music programs is as varied as the schools themselves. From no apparent program to large competition bands, from liturgical hand bell choirs to after school string ensembles, the Catholic schools may or may not contain the band and orchestral programs commonly found in most public schools. Many factors contribute to the diversity of the Diocesan school instrumental music programs, yet little is currently known about the status of these programs.

A national study devoted specifically to the status of instrumental music education in the Catholic schools of the United States has never been undertaken. Only three prior nationwide studies on combined Catholic music education (classroom, vocal, and instrumental) have been conducted. The first was a study done in 1933 by Reverend John Lamek to investigate the methods of classroom music education in Catholic elementary schools. In this doctoral dissertation he collected data through surveys received from superintendents of nine archdioceses and twelve dioceses in fourteen states. He discovered that music instruction during the late 19th century did not make the
same progress as other school subjects in the Catholic elementary schools. From the
survey results he concluded that “there was at least some type of music program
functioning in the diocesan schools and found the future of music education in the
Catholic schools to be ‘encouraging and optimistic’” (cited in Murphy, 1963, p 8).

The second was a historical analysis of the now dissolved National Catholic
Music Education Association conducted in 1953 by Rose Marie Murphy. Begun in 1942,
at a meeting at the Music Educators National Conference national convention in
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this organization served to address issues specific to Catholic
school music programs. The meeting revealed “the ineffectiveness of this Conference
[referring to MENC] in meeting the needs of Catholic music educators because of
variances in the policies, philosophies, and organizations of the public and Catholic
school systems” (Murphy, 1963, p.3) and the need for a separate organization. From their
meetings and discussions over its 34 year history, NCMEA addressed problems in music
education that are unique to Catholic schools. Murphy’s historical study described
weaknesses in the school supervision and classroom instruction of music as compared to
their public school counterparts.

In this century music instruction in the Catholic school has progressed slowly and
has often been inferior to its development in the public school. It has often been
left to the interest and initiative of each parish school because of specific
problems and circumstances in the dioceses…Music education in the diocesan
school had frequently been neglected, not only because of the lack of resources at
the superintendent’s disposal, but because the superintendent had not been
prepared to organize and implement a music program in the schools. (Murphy, 1963, p.8)
In 1976 a new organization, the National Association of Pastoral Musicians replaced NCMEA and now has a Music Education Division. “NPM-MusEd is dedicated to fostering the art and educational Power of music in a Catholic setting” (http://www.npm.org). It is affiliated with MENC (National Association for Music Education) and NCEA (National Catholic Education Association) and offers a variety of music education and liturgical workshops at state and national conferences. Musart, NCMEA’s journal, was replaced with The Catholic Music Educator, the official journal of NPM-MusEd.

The third study was the 1978 dissertation of Phyllis Nutting using a content analysis of music articles in three Catholic education journals from 1954 to 1975. Her content analysis sheds light on focus, trends, and changes of music education in the nation’s parochial schools at that time. Five key areas, philosophy of music education, liturgical music education, vocal music programs, instrumental music programs, and trends in curriculum were analyzed in the content of feature articles. Of the 481 music articles in Musart, only sixty five were related to the topic of instrumental music. The year 1971 contains the highest number of articles dealing with instrumental music methods and procedures, and these articles emphasized instrumental music as an “extra-curricular” activity. In the liturgical journal, Caecilia, only discussions of keyboard music were permitted prior to the Vatican II council in the mid 1960’s. In the journal, Momentum, only eight articles related to instrumental music had been published; all concerned piano. Nutting determined that the strength and importance of the instrumental music programs in Catholic education is considered questionable as evidenced by the lack of attention in the Catholic journals.
Considering general music studies in parochial schools since 1975, only localized small scale studies (local, diocesan, state-wide) have been carried out. Reports include those completed by Steven Ainsworth in Florida (1989), Donald DeRoche in Chicago (1988), Darlene Flynn in Rochester, New York (1978), and Sister W. J. Herlihy in New York (1980). Even less common are recent studies researching only the instrumental music programs in the Catholic schools. These two investigations include those by Sister Mary Grisez in Cleveland, Ohio (1978-79) and Charles Jahnke in Wisconsin (1996).

Prior to 1975, localized studies offering information on instrumental music included those conducted by Daniel Stupka (1960), Edward Olivares (1961), and John O’Donnell (1962).

The limited study of instrumental music in Catholic schools is likely due to the historical emphasis upon vocal music in the Catholic Church. Indeed many Catholic elementary school music programs focus primarily on general and vocal music instruction, with beginning and/or intermediate instrumental music programs offered as optional or extra-curricular programs. The origin of this emphasis on vocal music stems from the primary function of musical instruction in the Catholic schools declared by Pope Pius X’s *Moto Proprio, Inter Pastoralis Officii* in 1903. At the turn of the 20\(^{th}\) century, Pope Pius X was infuriated with the condition of the church music and therefore demanded that “Gregorian chant and polyphony were given the place formally occupied by operatic vocalizations and fearful performances of orchestras with drums, trumpets, and other impossible instruments” (cited in Weller, 1931, p. 8). In his important decree, the Catholic Church was required to “bring Christians back to full comprehension and participation in the liturgical life” (Weller, 1931, p. 9). In order to improve the quality of
music in the celebration of the Mass, a school of liturgical music was established at the
Pius X Institute in New York by Justine Ward, at the College of the Sacred Heart in
1918, which focused on preparing teachers to instruct children in the vocal music of
Gregorian chant. Counterpoint, sight-singing, music appreciation, and instrumental
music were of secondary importance in the instruction of Catholic school children
(Weller, 1931).

The Ward Method of musical instruction was widely accepted as the preferred
curriculum of musical instruction in Catholic elementary schools during the 1920s, 30s,
and 40s. Of the 21 archdioceses and dioceses (48% of total national Catholic elementary
school enrollment) surveyed in the previously mentioned study in 1933 by Reverend John
Lamek, 13 utilized the Ward Method in their music curricula. The remaining diocesan
schools used music methods such as the Hollis Dann Music Course (American Book
Company), Music Education Series (Ginn and Company), Foresman Books of Songs
(American Book Company), Catholic Education Music Course (Catholic Education
Press), and The Catholic Music Hour (Silver, Burdett and Company). All of these
commonly used music methods served to fulfill the main objectives of the Moto Proprio.
A fundamental principle in the Ward Method was “in this method the voice is the sole
instrument used in the musical training of the children” (Lamek, 1933, p. 53). The
remaining methods echoed this philosophy by disregarding instrumental musical
concepts or techniques. Therefore, beginning in the early 20th century Lamek found that
“singing, then, will be the center of elementary school music instruction. “No matter
what the other factors in the music course of study, vocal activity will be fundamental”
(Lamek, 1933, p. 76).
The emphasis on liturgical vocal music instruction in the Catholic elementary schools has been steadfast up through the 20th century. Even with the attenuation of chant after the Second Vatican Council and social changes of the 1960’s, the international board of Ward teachers began republishing revised music texts in 1976 (Bunbury, 2005, [www.grovemusic.com](http://www.grovemusic.com)). Mary Alice O’Connor, director of the graduate liturgical music degree program and the undergraduate general/choral music education program at The Catholic University of America, Washington D.C. has studied the continued development of Catholic students’ music education.

The Catholic Perspectives: Music Section of the National Standards for Arts Education emphasizes that ‘the education of Catholics also includes the formation of the child in worship. And musical liturgy is normative in the Catholic community’. The need identified both in The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and Catholic Perspectives—to produce singing congregations, discourage performance-oriented music during liturgy and further musical literacy among Catholics—lead to the conclusion that music education in Catholic schools is essential. (O’Connor, 1996, p.34)

It is clear that vocal music instruction is the main emphasis of music education in the Catholic elementary schools of the United States. Therefore, an investigation of the secondary schools would provide a better understanding of the role of instrumental music instruction.

The National Catholic Education Association has conducted national studies of their 1203 secondary schools, but none specifically geared to investigating the status of instrumental music programs offered in their schools. Window on Mission: A CHS 2000 Report on Academic and Co-Curricular Programs and Services and Religious Education Formation provides a glimpse into student involvement in co-curricular activities and clubs which includes chorus, band and orchestra. One hundred and seventy six
secondary Catholic high schools participated in their survey. Results showed that of the
top twenty activities in secondary schools, band ranked 10\textsuperscript{th} with an average of 58\% of
the schools offering this activity and orchestra ranked 20\textsuperscript{th} with an average of 30\% of
schools providing this activity. It is interesting to note that choral groups ranked 6\textsuperscript{th} with
83\% of the secondary schools offering this activity, noting once again the importance of
vocal music in all levels of Catholic education. Still it is unclear today what exactly the
status of the instrumental music programs is in the secondary Catholic schools in the
United States. The need for a specific survey devoted to instrumental music programs in
Catholic secondary schools is evident.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

A national research study devoted to the instrumental music education programs
of the Catholic schools in the United States is long overdue. A nation-wide survey is
needed to determine the status of Catholic school instrumental music programs.
Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine the current status of instrumental
music programs in the nation’s Catholic schools through information gathered from a
national survey and to use the information to make recommendations for improving
Catholic school instrumental music programs.

Research questions addressed in this study were:

1. What is the percentage of Catholic high schools in the United States with
   instrumental music programs?

2. Where are the schools located (urban, suburban, and rural areas), what is their
   enrollment size, and how stable are their populations?
3. What are the prominent characteristics of the instrumental music programs?

4. Are there any notable differences in instrumental music programs that seem to be a function of school location and enrollment size?

5. What reasons did the respondents report for students dropping out of the instrumental music programs?

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to determine the status of instrumental music programs in the secondary Catholic schools of the United States. An online survey of randomly selected secondary Catholic schools was conducted to answer the research questions.

Answers gathered from the primary music instructors at each of the responding schools are analyzed and reported in this document. Comparisons are made between enrollment size, location of the school (urban, suburban, and rural), and various aspects of their instrumental programs. A discussion of these findings and conclusions on the current status of our Catholic secondary school instrumental music programs is offered.

Chapter Two, Review of Literature, presents the background of previous studies on Catholic school music education that are pertinent to this particular study. Chapter Three, Methodology, describes the survey instrument, method of implementing the study, and process of obtaining the data. Chapter Four, Results, explains the data collection, data analysis, comparison charts, and important findings of the study. Chapter Five, Summary, Discussion and Conclusions, evaluates the significance of the findings and explores the importance of this study for the future of instrumental music in the nations Catholic schools.
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

**Catholic School:** Any parochial, diocesan, or private school listed in the National Center for Educational Statistics as being governed by the Catholic Church.

**Instrumental Music:** Any form of class, ensemble, or group where the primary mode of musical expression and study utilizes musical instruments rather than the voice. This may include but not be limited to band, orchestra, jazz groups, keyboards, guitars, world or ethnic ensembles, hand bell or tone chime ensembles. This does not include general music, choral ensembles, music theory, music history, or music appreciation classes.

**Rural:** A community or small town located outside of an urban or suburban area having fewer than 50,000 inhabitants as defined in the National Catholic Education Association 2006-2007 school report form.

**Secondary School:** According to the 2003-2004 National Center for Educational Statistics Private and Parochial School Study, a school is considered secondary if it has one or more of grades 7–12 and does not have any grade lower than grade seven. For example, schools with grades 9–12, 7–8, 10–12, or 7–9 are classified as secondary schools.

**Suburban:** A community, town, or city outside of, but tangent to a major city or metropolitan area as defined in the National Catholic Education Association 2006-2007 school report form.
Urban: Within the limits of a major metropolitan area or large city of greater than 50,000 inhabitants as defined in the National Catholic Education Association 2006-2007 school report form.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of related literature uncovered no scholarly research on the status of instrumental programs in the Catholic schools of the United States conducted in recent years. There were, however, a number of articles, books, dissertations, and videos addressing the concerns of teachers of instrumental music in parochial schools. Sources of relevant information gathered include:

1. **Historical literature of Catholic doctrine and instrumental music programs.**
   Historical studies of the Catholic Church and its relationship to the use of and study of music are presented. Scholarly publications including (but not restricted to) dissertations, thesis, and articles that investigate the history, quality, and effectiveness of school music programs from several decades are analyzed.

2. **Research literature of Catholic school music programs.** Recent scholarly literature on this topic is quite limited. No nation-wide research on Catholic music programs has been undertaken since studies by Lamek (1933), Murphy (1963), and Nutting (1978) discussed in Chapter One. Regional investigations
were limited in scope and focus. Therefore, newspaper and magazine articles, videos, conference speeches, National Catholic Education Association statistics, and other forms of current data from the last thirty years were examined as well.

**HISTORICAL LITERATURE**

An understanding of Catholic doctrine concerning the purpose of music in the Catholic Church is fundamental to understanding the manner in which music is taught in the parochial schools. This purpose is clearly stated in the *Catholic Schools in the United States; an Encyclopedia* (Hunt, 2004, p. 455-456).

Musical intelligence can be incorporated into religious education. Although often overlooked in traditional instruction, music can enhance the classroom environment. Songs can touch students in an emotional way and should be used as a tool for expression and celebration of faith. When students unite in song, a sense of community in the classroom is fostered. Musical intelligence can be nurtured through the singing of prayers or practicing the liturgical hymns and responses sung at Mass.

Pope Pius X’s Moto Proprio perhaps can be considered a critical influence on the status of instrumental music in the Catholic schools of the United States. During the start of the 20th century the Pope was distraught over the rampant social and moral evils evident at this time. He was outraged by what he considered impure music in the Catholic Mass and therefore vowed to reconstitute the purity of musical praise through his Moto Proprio decree of November 1903. “Gregorian chant and polyphony were given the place formally occupied by operatic vocalizations and fearful performances of orchestras with drums, trumpets, and other impossible instruments…to bring Christians back to full comprehension and participation in the liturgical life…lax orandi lax cantandi or the music must pray, the prayer must sing” (cited in Weller, 1931, p. 9). As a result, for
many years only the *acapella* voice or choirs accompanied by the subordinate organ were permitted. Use of other instruments was strictly forbidden unless the Ordinary was given special permission for their use. The resulting effects were the diocesan publications of “white lists” of acceptable music and “black lists” of unacceptable music. In 1918 Justine Ward began the Pius X Institute in New York at the College of the Sacred Heart, which prepared teachers and choirmasters to teach Gregorian chant to their pupils in the parochial schools, and therefore the instruction of instrumental music was seemingly unnecessary (Weller, 1931).

On December 4, 1963, the Second Vatican Council unanimously approved the constitution ‘Sacrosanctum Concilium’ on the sacred liturgy, which freed the tight restraints of the 1903 Moto Proprio, in efforts to bring the liturgy closer to the people. Of the many changes, the following were of great significance to instrumental music education:

- *The Church approves and admits to divine worship all forms of true art endowed with the proper qualities. The aim of sacred music is the glory of God and the sanctification of the faithful.*
- *Musical formation and practice must be cultivated carefully in the seminaries, in both men’s and women’s novitiates, and in other Catholic institutes and schools. We also recommend, if it be opportune, the erection of higher institutes of sacred music.*
- *The pipe organ is greatly honored as a traditional instrument in the Latin Church. Its sound is able to add marvelous splendor to the ceremonies of the Church, and to elevate souls powerfully to God and to the supreme realities. Other instruments may be admitted to divine worship, provided that they be adapted to sacred use or may be adapted to it that they be fitting to the dignity of the temple and truly favor the edification of the faithful.* (cited in Maragall, 2002, [http://www.chiesa.espressonline.it/dettaglio](http://www.chiesa.espressonline.it/dettaglio))

Since the Second Vatican Council many changes in the Catholic parish schools resulted with the specification of four goals for Catholic schools, one of which is *Integral*
Education. Catholic schools must educate the whole person, through the unification of knowledge and including all forms of knowing. Schools should offer a “well-rounded education providing experiences in the language arts, mathematics, the natural and physical sciences, the fine arts, and the health sciences and physical education” (Youniss, p. 229, 2000). With these and other changes in Catholic doctrine and practices stemming from the Vatican II council, instrumental music in the Catholic schools of the United States was born. Still, a question of its quality and prominence remained.

In her history of the National Catholic Music Educators’ Association, Sharon Gray (1988) reported that Catholic schools began in the Florida region in 1603 with the Franciscan Friars. In 1727 the first school for girls, started by the Ursuline Sisters, offered instrumental and vocal music in Louisiana. In 1745 Father Schnieder introduced singing into the Catholic school curriculum of Goshenhoppen, Pennsylvania. In 1903, Pope Pius X’s Moto Proprio provided authoritative direction to music instruction in the Catholic schools with a focus on teaching chant. This was further implemented by Justine Ward’s Catholic Music Education Course. The focus of music was to benefit liturgical usage in the Mass. Finally, in August of 1942 at Marygrove College in Detroit, the NCMEA was formed and flourished in the 1960’s at the height of growth of Catholic schools. This organization emphasized a commitment to the development of methodology and scholarly research in Catholic music education. One of the relevant outgrowths of this organization was the formation of the all-city Columbus Diocesan band and chorus directed by Gertrude Kuehefuhs of The Ohio State University, in 1956. Later, a successor organization, the National Association of Pastoral Musicians, was formed in 1976. Unfortunately, the all-city groups of the Columbus Diocese disbanded
with the final Columbus Diocesan Honor Band performance in the late 1980’s. However, the National Association of Pastoral Musicians continues today with an additional committee devoted to music education (Gray, 1988).

According to Kenneth Bartosz (1984), prominent Catholic school band director in Chicago, problems existed in many Catholic schools during the 1980s. Catholic high school band programs faced three major problems: declining enrollment, lack of administrative support, and weak primary feeder school music programs. To solve these problems and promote a secure future he suggested that parochial school instrumental program directors: 1) study their school’s philosophy and objectives, 2) align their own philosophy with that of the school’s, 3) develop a sequential set of educational goals, and 4) make every lesson promote the first three steps. He added that directors need to educate their communities of the value of their music programs, focus their instruction on the music not the performance, and encourage innovative and exciting primary school music programs (Bartosz, 1984).

In addition, Bartosz offered insight into successful band programs. He described how prominent Catholic high school music programs boast of their elaborate trips, participate in exciting festivals, and achieve superior competition ratings. Their focus evolved around performance and competition, not on musical skills, knowledge, and lifelong music making. Once students graduated from these schools, many discontinued their participation in musical organizations. He encouraged directors to make a conscious effort to monitor the attitudes of their students concerning the effect of high performance organizations, through discussions and surveys (Bartosz, 1980).
The National Association of Pastoral Musicians contains an important educational division as an important part of its organization. The Music Education Division of NPM mission statement declares the following:

The Music Education Division of NPM is dedicated to fostering the art and educational power of music in a Catholic setting. NPM-MusEd is affiliated with the MENC: National Association for Music Education and shares the mission of NPM and MENC. We strive to encourage and support quality music teaching and learning for all in Catholic educational settings and quality worship services of the Catholic Church within the United States. (http://www.npm.org/Sections/NPM-MusEd)

It endorses the MENC National Standards and has written a companion document, *Catholic Connections to Music in the National Standards for Arts Education*, which in addition to restating the National Standards, has paired each with additional expectations as applied to the unique Catholic school setting with a focus on music for the Mass. In the forward of this document the purpose is clearly stated:

Study in all the arts—dance, music, theatre, and the visual arts—is vital to Catholic education. As Vatican II reminds us: “The musical tradition of the Catholic Church is a treasure of immeasurable value, greater even than that of any other art” (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*—Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, 112). The *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* (40) also emphasizes the critical importance of singing in the celebration of the Mass, with consideration for the culture and abilities of each liturgical assembly.

If Catholic youth are to develop both as musicians and as active participants in the celebrations of the Church, they need a quality music education, a solid foundation in sacred/worship music, and a firm understanding of the structure and function of liturgy. (NAPM, 2006, p. 1)

Lauretta Linsalata (1997) pointed out that successful Diocesan-wide music events can exist. She described, for example, the Philadelphia Archdiocese Secondary Fine Arts Curriculum Committee, with its successful strong school music programs featuring Diocesan-wide performances and workshops. These programs, modeled after the
Pennsylvania Music Educators’ Association, promoted talented school musicians and were essential to the success of their school music programs. Popular events included an autumn one-day workshop for all student musicians with guest clinicians from a local college, a mid year fine arts festival with adjudicated school performances and a spring All Catholic Band, Chorus, Orchestra, and Jazz Band Concert (Linsalata, 1997).

Thomas Ponton (1996) described another successful Catholic high school instrumental music program, the DeMatha Catholic High School in Hyattsville, Maryland. Director John Mitchell developed the program into one of the top Catholic high school bands in the country. In fifteen out of seventeen consecutive years his school earned awards from the National Catholic Bandmaster’s Association. Until 1990, the band did not even have a rehearsal room, but practiced in the gym, cafeteria, classrooms, and temporary buildings. One of his success stories described a former student, Peter Bay, who is the director of the Erie Symphony Orchestra and former resident conductor of the Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra in New York. The school’s successful arts program remains enthusiastically supported by administration and student body (Ponton, 1996).

In 1975, Bands of America was founded to bring together many of the finest marching bands in the country for performances and competitions. The purpose of this nationally recognized educational organization is “to provide quality avenues for learning and excellence in music education for the nation's high school students and directors” (http://www.bands.org/public/resourceroom/about.asp). In 2000, the Marian Catholic High School Marching Band from Chicago Heights, Illinois, with a score of 95.95, won their 7th Grand National Championship, as the best marching band in the country. These
stories provide positive examples of a few programs, but the general status of the nation’s Catholic school instrumental music programs is largely unknown.

RESEARCH LITERATURE

A 1990 promotional film by the U.S. Catholic Conference Department of Education and the National Catholic Education Association, *A Genuine Choice--Catholic Schools in the United States*, introduces viewers to the Catholic schools in the United States. The film describes the benefits, values, and purpose of Catholic education in the United States. Music education is included in the film through a short vignette of an elementary music class, showing group singing accompanied by their teacher on guitar. Many interesting parochial school facts are presented in this film, including Presidential awards. On September 10, 1990, President George H. W. Bush awarded 210 schools the National School of Excellence Award of which 29 were awarded to Catholic schools. The film also points out Catholic schools’ reading, math, and science scores are consistently higher than most public schools. The film addresses the quality of education in many subject areas, but does not report the quality of musical instruction. The question still remains as to the status of instrumental music in the Catholic schools.

In September 1983, funded by the Ford Foundation and St Mary’s Catholic Foundation, the Search Institute and the NCEA launched a survey of the Catholic high schools in the United States. From the 1,063 questions, only 121 were about academic and co-curricular programs. Of the 1,464 schools invited, 910 high schools responded. Results of the 56 page survey reported the following music related data:

- 49% of all schools have no graduation requirement in the fine arts;
• 76% offer instrumental or vocal music with 18% of the students taking these courses;

• All-boys’ schools were more likely to offer band and orchestra while girls’ schools were more apt to offer choir;

• Fine arts were given a lower priority than other academic areas;

• The percentage of schools offering band or orchestra increased with the greater school enrollment from 35% in schools fewer than 300 students to 81% in schools with over 1000 students;

• The percentage of schools that had an instrumental rehearsal room as a part of its facilities increased with the enrollment size of the school from 27% in schools fewer than 300 students to 62% in schools with over 1000 students.

From this study, the NCEA made an important conclusion: “If the church is educating the whole person, is it not reasonable to expect more attention to instruction in the arts? …Perhaps a more concentrated effort to integrate liturgical services based on the aesthetic, non-verbal world would be helpful here” (NCEA, 1985, p. 62).

Each year, the National Catholic Education Association conducts a survey of the Catholic schools in the United States and submits their report on the status of Catholic education in general, one of which was the report, Window on Mission: A CHS 2000 Report on Academic and Co-Curricular Programs and Services and Religious Education and Formation. Valuable factual information, collected through a survey of a selected sample of the nation’s Catholic high schools (N = 350), was presented in a quantitative study of their programs. Data related to the current study included the following: 94% of schools required community service programs, 66% used traditional daily class period
schedules; 25% have seen a decrease in class size; 49% have acquired more co-curricular activities; 70% of the students were involved in one or more of these activities while 39% were involved in three or more; 40% of schools require 23-24 credits for graduation while 49% required more; 58% of the schools offered band and 30% offered orchestra, while 83% offered chorus. The highlight of this study emphasized that Catholic schools continue to promote community service programs that are grounded in the Catholic faith. Many music programs included an aspect of community service with 46% of choral groups, 34% of bands, and 32% of orchestras incorporating community outreach. As an outcome of this study an improvement plan was initiated including a major focus on the improvement of the arts. Reverend James Heft of the University of Dayton emphasized five themes for a vision for the future of Catholic education. Four of the themes addressed the importance of religious practices, tradition, the compatibility of science and faith, and working toward justice for the common good. However, the second theme stressed the importance of “the centrality of the arts, ritual, music, and drama” (Hudson, 2002, p.35).

Five specific regional studies give a more detailed description of the status of Catholic school instrumental music programs. The first was a 1960 study of music education in Catholic high schools located in Ohio (Stupka, 1960). Two questionnaires to instrumental and vocal music teachers and one “opinionnaire” to principals uncovered many problems in the 122 Catholic high schools surveyed. Findings showed that a lack of money and personnel are the main contributing factors for the low number of instrumental music programs ($N = 29$). At the time of this study, public high schools were spending an average of $300 per pupil while Catholic schools were spending $150
per pupil for music education. There was a low amount of religious teachers with music training and simultaneously a large amount of lay music teachers leaving the Catholic school positions for higher paying public schools. Information from this study relevant to the current study included the following: the average years of teaching experience was sixteen and one half; eighteen of twenty-nine music teachers reported having other teaching duties; seventeen had no teaching assistants; money for music budgets were mainly obtained through performance ticket sales and music fees; weak grade school or beginning instrumental programs were reported; scheduling conflicts; not enough class time; and poor facilities. In contrast, strengths reported in this study included strong student interest, supportive administrative interest, and resourceful use of school time (Stupka, 1960).

In 1961, Edward Olivares conducted a survey of the instrumental music programs in the Catholic schools in the San Antonio, Austin, and Corpus Christi dioceses of Texas. From the 195 schools in the area’s 1960 Catholic Directory, 123 schools responded, including five personal interviews with band directors teaching in eleven schools. Results showed that only 39 of the 123 schools had instrumental programs. Of the schools with instrumental programs, 29% were in schools of 100 or less total student enrollment, 16% in 100-199 school enrollment, 43% in 200-399 enrollment, and 53% in schools with 400 – 900 total student enrollment. The size of the bands ranged from less than 10 students (4%), to 10-19 students (23%), 20-29 students (20%), 30-39 students (15%), 40-49 students (23%), and 50-59 students (15%). Problems reported from the directors included: no central Catholic school instrumental program, poor administrator support, weak financial support, too many assigned duties for the directors, and too many
grade levels grouped together in one band. Twenty-six schools commented that their instrumental programs were weak but displayed evidence of growth (Olivares, 1961).

A third regional study focused on the vocal and instrumental music programs in secondary Catholic schools in eight northwestern states: California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. The study, conducted in 1962, surveyed 118 schools and produced data from 87 completed and returned surveys. Of the 87 schools, 10 schools offered an orchestral program ranging in size from 18 to 48 members and 24 schools maintained concert band programs ranging from 8 to 60 students. Various small instrumental ensembles were offered in 25 schools as extra-curricular activities (O’Donnell, 1962).

Mary Joan Grisez (1980) surveyed the secondary school instrumental music programs in the Cleveland Catholic diocese during 1978-79. Grisez found that many studies existed concerning the public schools of Cleveland from the 1950’s to the 1970’s, but none specifically for the Catholic schools. These public school surveys in the 1950’s showed strong instrumental programs granting academic credit countered with problems of funding, scheduling, and poor facilities. An investigation by the National Education Association in 1963 presented findings of increased public school music options with an emphasis on performance. Surveys during the 1970’s confirmed a strong curricular status of the public school music programs. However, Grisez found the opposite picture illustrated in the survey of the Cleveland area Catholic schools. Twenty seven Catholic high schools were surveyed in areas of program activities, student participation, teacher training/experience, and facilities/funding. Data collected illustrated that 4 out of 27 schools had no formal instrumental music instruction; student participation was less than
10% in the majority of schools; 52% of teachers acquired up to four years teaching experience; and 47% of schools received funding from parent organizations while 43% were funded through tuition. Strengths and weaknesses were openly shared in the surveys showing 73% of schools having high administrative support and 39% complaining of weak instrumental recruitment programs (Grisez, 1980).

Finally, Charles Jahnke (1996) studied parochial elementary and middle school instrumental music programs in the Wisconsin area. From a forty-question survey sent to parochial school directors of the Christian Band Association in the Fox Valley area of Wisconsin, many problems were evident. Thirteen out of eighteen surveys received revealed the following: directors’ teaching duties averaged 4.5 schools each; five schools had no budget for materials; an average of 43 minutes of rehearsal time per week; only two schools had a written curriculum; and only seven schools had a band room. Jahnke learned that the major concerns of the directors included lack of support or respect from the students, parents, staff, administration, or clergy, and lack of instruction time and quality literature. However on a positive note, six of thirteen schools had a large band enrollment with 50% of the eligible students participating in band (Jahnke, 1996).

In 1981, The Gemeinhardt Instrument Company sponsored a research project, *Identifying Problems Facing the School Band Movement*, conducted by Joseph D. Brown, Ph.D., Director of the Bureau of Business Research and Professor of Marketing at Ball State University. Data collected from a number of sources included trade magazine articles, focus groups interviews with parents and students, and surveys. With all areas of the nation represented, 2,198 band directors from the 1981 membership of the National Band Masters Association were surveyed, with a 42% return rate. Unfortunately, the
Gemeinhardt report did not delineate between public, private, and parochial school band information, so their findings can not be specifically attributed to the status of public or private school instrumental music programs. Major concerns shared by respondents in the study included recruiting, adequate funding, effective communications, supportive parents and supportive schools (Brown, 1982).

Three additional follow up Gemeinhardt reports were conducted in 1985, 1990, and most recently in 1994 with *Opportunities and Solutions for U.S. Instrumental Music Programs*. Again, the reports do not differentiate between parochial and public school instrumental music programs, but offered insight as to the status of instrumental music programs in general. Program strengths included dedicated, qualified directors providing students with quality music while expecting high standards and good classroom management. Program weaknesses included insufficient funding, conflicting class and activity schedules, inadequate facilities, and lack of parental support. From the data collected, the “SWOT” method was utilized which evaluated “the internal *Strengths* and *Weaknesses* as well as external *Opportunities* and *Threats* to an organization” (Holtz, 2001, p.41). Some of the threats to the band programs included an overemphasis on sports, parental time commitments, additional graduation requirements, expanded extra-curricular offerings, budgetary restraints, music not regarded as important by administrators, and number of periods during the day (Brown, 1994).

A national study of *The Status of Orchestra Programs in the Public Schools* (Gillespie & Hamann, 1998) was conducted to compile descriptive information about school orchestra programs for the purpose of needs assessment for school districts, universities, and professional music educator associations. Surveys were sent to 1,345
randomly selected public school orchestra programs with 652 completed surveys returned and analyzed. Some of the results of this public school study included:

- Schools with large populations were more likely to have string programs;
- String instruction often began in elementary schools with full orchestra instruction in high schools;
- Orchestra students were predominately white, suburban, with 20% of the students in the upper 10% of their graduating class;
- Although the number of students playing string instruments increased over several years, the number of teachers employed remained stable.

Implications were offered for how best to meet the needs of string programs in the public schools, from how to develop strategies to help string programs in smaller schools to how to attract different types of students. How the Catholic school orchestral programs compare to the public school string programs was not discussed in this study. With this known data in the public schools of the United States, the question still remains about the status of string music programs in the Catholic schools.

The *Handbook of Research on Catholic Education* emphasizes that improvement in Catholic education is not only encouraged but mandated in Canon Law 806-§2. “The directors of the Catholic schools, under the vigilance of the local ordinary, are to see to it that the instruction given in them is at least as academically distinguished as that given in the other schools of the region” (cited in Hunt et al, 2001 p. 83). From the historical and research literature, it is easy to see that there is a need for a contemporary national survey to examine the current status of our nation’s Catholic school instrumental music programs. It is not clear whether today’s programs are weak and riddled with problems
or strong and vibrant. The annual reports from the National Catholic Education
Association provide only limited data on the current state of our parochial instrumental
music programs. Therefore, a nation-wide survey detailing the strengths and weaknesses
of our Catholic school instrumental programs would be valuable to assessing and offering
proposals for their future.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Approval to conduct the study was granted by the Institutional Review Board on November 21, 2006 and was determined to be in the exempt category by the Office of Responsible Research Practices. Data for the study were obtained through an online survey that was designed and adapted from questionnaires used in previous music studies similar in nature. Previous surveys used in various educational research studies, cited in the literature review section, were reviewed. From the collection of various relevant surveys, the investigator developed a survey instrument to collect data for assessing the quality of the nation’s Catholic instrumental music programs.

Survey questions were designed as structured items for respondents to easily report using Likert scale and checklists methods. In addition to these closed ended responses, open-ended questions utilizing an unstructured format permitted participants to respond freely and expand on important issues. Demographic information included relevant data of urban, suburban, and rural schools, and small versus large school enrollments. Characteristics and descriptive information of the schools’ instrumental music program were solicited.
An invitation to participate in the survey, addressed to the music department of the Catholic school, was mailed on December 27, 2006 to all selected research participants, with directions to accessing the online survey (see Appendix A). Beginning on January 1, 2007 the schools’ primary instrumental music teachers were asked to submit their responses online through a link to the internet survey (see Appendix B) from the National Catholic Band Association website at www.catholicbands.org. This online survey was available until January 31, 2007 at www.zoomerang.com, an internet survey company that provided the format for the online survey. On January 22, 2006 postcards (see Appendix C) were mailed out to those school music teachers who had not responded as of that date, as a reminder that only one week remained for them to take the survey. On February 4, 2007, as a follow up to those who did not respond online, a paper version of the survey (see Appendix D) was sent in the mail with a postage paid return envelope to randomly-selected non-respondents.

SAMPLING METHOD AND SUBJECT DESCRIPTION

Instrumental music educators teaching in all Catholic secondary schools of the United States were the target population for this study. According to the 2006 data available from the National Catholic Education Association website, http://www.ncea.org/news/AnnualDataReport.asp#schools, there are 7,589 Catholic schools in the United States of which 6,386 are elementary and 1,203 are secondary schools. However, to solicit and calculate information from this large quantity of surveys was impractical due to time and financial constraints. From the total population of Catholic secondary schools in the United States, 400 schools were randomly selected
using the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) random sampling software feature. Through this process a balanced representation of Catholic secondary schools from various locations, environments, and school enrollments representing Catholic secondary school populations in the United States was sought. Individual school information on the 1,203 Catholic secondary schools was not available from the National Catholic Education Association. Therefore, in order to complete this study, information was obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics. According to the criteria established by this government agency, there are 1,026 Catholic secondary schools rather than 1,203 as stated by the National Catholic Education Association due to the difference in defining what is considered secondary school. The National Catholic Education Association School report form for 2006-2007 states that a secondary school is one that is “generally 9-12 but if a school has grades below 9 and identifies as a high school, the school should respond as secondary” ([http://www.ncea.org/UserFiles/File/NewInfo/NCEASchoolReportA.pdf](http://www.ncea.org/UserFiles/File/NewInfo/NCEASchoolReportA.pdf)). Therefore, according to this definition, even if a school may not have grades 9-12 but considers itself as secondary, it was included in the 1,203 secondary school count.

For the purpose of accuracy for this study, the NCES definition and list of secondary schools was utilized: “A school is secondary if it has one or more grades 7-12 and does not have any grade lower than grade 7; for example, schools with grades 9-12, 7-8, 10-12, or 7-9 are classified as secondary schools” (Broughman & Swain, 2006, p. A-5). The most recently published listing of private schools was available from the NCES 2003-2004 Private School Universe Survey at [http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pss/](http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pss/). Released online in March of 2006, demographic data as well as names and addresses of
all Catholic secondary schools were downloaded into excel files from the “Search for Private Schools” page at http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pss/privateschoolsearch/, by selecting for each state the criteria of Roman Catholic schools spanning grades 7-12. Catholic secondary schools were located in 49 states, including the District of Columbia and ranged from 105 schools located in California to one secondary school in Idaho. No Catholic secondary schools were listed in Wyoming. These excel files containing information such as the names, addresses; phone numbers, demographic information, and enrollment size of all 1,026 Catholic secondary schools were imported into SPSS. From the total population of 1,026 secondary schools, the SPSS random sampling procedure was used to produce a representative list of 400 schools for the survey.

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL VALIDITY

Researchers strive to eliminate any threats to internal validity that would be detrimental to the reliability of the data collected. The main source of concern when conducting research of this nature lies in the validity of the survey instrument. Does the survey measure what it is supposed to measure? When designing the survey instrument, one should always keep the purpose of the survey and the goals/objectives of the survey in mind. Referring back to the original research questions helped to keep the survey focused on its primary purpose. When designing the survey items were formulated to answer the five major research questions as seen in Table One.
According to Fowler (2002) there are four reasons why respondents may not accurately report correct responses and therefore greatly reduce the validity of the survey:

1. They do not understand the question. 2. They do not know the answer. 3. They cannot recall the answer. 4. They do not want to report the answer (p. 95-96). He recommends that survey items require responses that are “unidimensional and monotonic” (p.101). A pilot survey that offered feedback on the validity of instrument was used so that potential problems could be corrected. The pilot test online survey was launched on December 8,
2006 to six Catholic secondary school instrumental music teachers not part of the 400 schools sample. Also three university professors knowledgeable in survey methods examined the instrument. From the feedback gathered in the pilot study, only slight clarifications of wording on a few selected survey items needed to be addressed.

Confidence in the external validity of the study was achieved through random sampling that assured a balanced representation of the national population of secondary Catholic schools. One other external threat that may or may not be controlled is “participant effects” that are “associated with the way in which a study is conducted and the feelings and attitudes of the participants involved” (Gay et al, 2006, p. 245). Music teachers were instructed in the survey to set aside the appropriate uninterrupted amount of time to complete the survey using a reliable internet connection, to help eliminate this threat.

RELIABILITY PROCEDURES

Fink and Kosecoff (1998) list seven rules that were followed to help create reliable survey questions for the current study:

1. Each question should be meaningful to the respondent.
2. Use standard English.
3. Make questions concrete.
4. Avoid biased words or phrases.
5. Check your own biases.
6. Use caution when asking the personal questions.
7. Each question should have one thought.
Response alternatives were consistently offered to all respondents; a reasonable number of adequate response choices for the participant that fit the questions were provided; appropriate nominal, ordinal, interval, or ratio scales in a consistent continuum were used; and open ended responses when appropriate were provided when appropriate. The gender of the respondents was also taken into consideration that would effect the interpretation of the question and their ability to answer appropriately. These areas of concern were addressed through careful survey item writing procedures that would be gender neutral and pre-testing the survey in the pilot study for accuracy of interpretation.

VARIABLES AND SCALE DEVELOPMENT

The survey questions were categorized into six sections. Section One: “Description of School and Enrollment” disclosed information concerning the school location (urban, rural, or suburban), total school enrollment (less than 500, 500-999, and 1000-1500, over 1500), instrumental music enrollment, facilities, attrition rates and reasons for loss. Section Two: “Description of Instrumental Music Program” obtained information instrumental music courses offered, extra-curricular music programs, fine arts graduation requirement, teaching schedule, teaching assistants, scheduling concerns, curriculum, level and types of musical materials used, and feeder school status. Section Three: “Administrative Support” offered information assessing the degree of financial and general support of the instrumental music program from the schools’ administrations. Section Four: “Parental Support” described the parental support and booster organizations of their schools. Section Five: “Educator Information” contained questions asking the respondents to describe their background including their type of teaching
certificate, college degree, years of experience, possession of a contract, and childhood school background. Finally, Part Six: “Miscellaneous” was an open ended question allowing the music teacher to elaborate on any issues or concerns for their instrumental music programs.

Nominal and ordinal scales were used to record responses to part two through five where applicable. Ordinal measurement was in the form of defined Likert scales for ease, clarity, and speed of response as well as consistency throughout the survey. Sections one and six were short answer or checked responses categorized into nominal scales. Appendix B contains the online version of the survey and Appendix D includes the paper version of the survey. Data analysis and results are presented in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

RESTATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE

A national research study devoted to the instrumental music education programs of the Catholic schools in the United States has never been undertaken in the past. A nation-wide survey was therefore needed to determine the status of Catholic school instrumental music programs. The purpose of this study was to determine the current status of instrumental music programs in the nation’s Catholic schools through information gathered from a national survey and to use the information to make recommendations for improving Catholic school instrumental music programs.

Research questions addressed through the study were:

1. What is the percentage of Catholic high schools in the United States with instrumental music programs?

2. Where are the schools located (urban, suburban, and rural areas), what is their enrollment size, and how stable are their populations?

3. What are the prominent characteristics of the instrumental programs?

4. Are there any notable differences in instrumental music programs that seem to be a function of school location and enrollment size?
5. What reasons did the respondents report for students dropping out of the instrumental music programs?

RESPONSE RATE

The final number of survey respondents was 117 of the 400 randomly selected Catholic secondary schools from the entire national population. Thirteen survey invitations were returned undeliverable. Following the initial response rate of 24% return rate a postcard reminder was sent to all non-respondents and paper surveys were sent to 100 randomly selected non-respondents. This effort increased the final rate to 30.23%. Fowler (2002) states that “repeating contacts, using more than one mode to contact respondents, and offering alternative modes of responding for those who do not respond initially seem likely to be the keys to maximizing response rates” (p.50). Contact repetition and variability was achieved through postcard follow up, the National Catholic Band Association newsletter, and on the NCBA website. Alternative mode of response was provided by offering both internet and paper survey options.

According to the Division of Instructional Innovation and Assessment at University of Texas, acceptable response rate varies with the mode of survey administration:

- mail 50% adequate, 60% good, 70% very good
- phone 80% good
- email 40% average, 50% good, 60% very good
- online 30% average
- classroom paper ≥50% good
• face-to-face 80-85% good.

(http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/assessment/iar/resources/quicktips/quicktip_6-16.pdf)

Therefore, for this survey using primarily the web-based online survey, the final return rate of 30% from this online survey can be considered average.

Suskie (1992) states that “it is more important to have respondents who are representative of the group you are sampling from than to have a large return rate” (p. 46). Comparing the demographic statistics of location (urban, suburban, and rural) gathered from the National Catholic Education Association to the data of responding schools in the study suggest the sample is generally representative. The NCEA 2005-2006 Annual Statistical Report on Schools, Enrollment, and Staffing state that the nation’s Catholic secondary schools are 48% urban, 36% suburban, and 16% rural (http://www.ncea.org/news/AnnualDataReport.asp). Data from the study showed that 47% were urban, 41% suburban, and 12% were rural. (See Appendix E) The notable differences in suburban and rural may be due in part to the fact that NCEA excludes the Katrina hurricane afflicted areas of the gulf coast area, while this study included these locations.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Responses were collected from the 93 online survey respondents and the 24 paper survey respondents and entered into Version 14 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Descriptive statistics were computed, analyzed, and comparisons made to answer the research questions (see Appendix E).
Research Question #1

What is the percentage of Catholic high schools in the United States with instrumental music programs?

From the total 117 respondents answering question #5 in the survey, 88.9% (n=104) of the secondary Catholic schools offered instrumental music programs while 11.1% (n=13) did not have instrumental music programs.

Research Question #2

Where are the schools located (urban, suburban, and rural areas), what is their enrollment size, and how stable are their populations?

From the 117 respondents to this survey, 47% (n=55) of the schools were located in an urban setting, 41% (n=48) in a suburban location, and 12% (n=14) were located in a rural area. School enrollments were 48.7% (n=57) with less than 500 students, 31.6% (n=37) with 500 to 999 students, 17.1% (n=20) with 1000 to 1500 students, and 2.6% (n=3) with over 1500 students. Table 2 displays that in all locations (urban, suburban, and rural); the majority of schools have enrollments of less than 500 students. Large schools with an enrollment of over 1500 comprised only 2.6% of the population. There were no rural schools with over 1500 students.
### Table 2

**School Location and Enrollments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500-999</th>
<th>1000-1500</th>
<th>Over 1500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stability of school populations was reported through items which asked respondents to report increases or decreases in total school populations over the last three to five years. Table 3 compares the data from item #13 (percentage increase in school population) and #14 (percentage decrease in school population). While 50 schools showed no increase in their school populations, 33 ($P = 33.6\%$) of the schools showed an overall decrease in enrollment. Only 2% of the schools experienced a population decline greater than 10%. No decrease in enrollment was reported by 62 schools, with 45 schools ($P = 45.9\%$) experiencing an overall increase in enrollment. Six of these schools ($P = 6.1\%$) experienced a population increase of greater than 10% over the past 3 to 5 years. While overall increases were larger than overall decreases, 20 schools ($P = 20.4\%$) maintained a steady enrollment with no net increase or decrease in their school populations.
Table 3

School Enrollment Increases and Decreases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School increase</th>
<th>no increase</th>
<th>School decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>no decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no increase</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3% increase</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6% increase</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10% increase</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #3

What are the prominent characteristics of the instrumental programs?

Data are included in the descriptive narratives to summarize the prominent characteristics of the instrumental music programs where the responses showed large percentages. Where there was a notable distribution of responses, tables are provided for clarity. Item responses are organized into seven areas: facilities, program offerings, scheduling, performances, teacher characteristics, program stability, and miscellaneous teacher comments.

Facilities: (Question #7, #8, and #9)

Only 1.9% of the schools with instrumental music programs have no separate room designated for musical instruction. Of the 98.1% that have a room, 73.6% of these are a room designed for music instruction. Availability of practice rooms for small
groups or private practice was divided, with 50% of the schools providing practice rooms. However, 23.6% of the respondents reported their schools have no program storage facilities and 46.2% reported storage nearby but described it as insufficient.

**Program offerings:** (Question #16 through #24)

The majority of schools ($P = 87\%$) require a fine arts credit for graduation. Table 4 lists the program offerings that could be used to fulfill the fine arts requirement and the percentage of schools that offer these instrumental programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Offering</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert or symphonic band</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marching band</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pep band</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz band</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass, woodwind, or percussion ensembles</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary marching groups</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instrumental groups not listed above:</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Including: 3 various liturgical ensembles, 9 pit orchestras for musicals, 2 guitar ensemble, 7 jazz combos, 1 string quintet, 2 steel drum bands, 2 music ministry groups, 1 beginning band, 2 drum lines, 1 jazz trio, 2 hand bells, 2 chamber ensembles, 1 string quartet, 1 piano class, 1 mixed ensemble, 1 flute choir, and 1 violin class.
Scheduling (Question #15, #27 and #29)

While 42% of the schools provided music instruction only during their regular scheduled classes, 44% of the schools supplemented their regular schedules with before or after school rehearsals. Schedules varied in type from individual class periods ($P = 53.5\%$), rotating schedules ($P = 20.2\%$), block scheduling ($P = 11.1\%$), and modified block ($P = 7.1\%$). Daily rehearsals varied in accordance with the program offerings and teacher responsibilities. Table 5 shows the teaching loads of the respondents with the percentage of teachers with 1 to 5 or more music classes being taught daily.

Table 5

*Percentage of Schools with Number of Daily Music Classes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of music classes</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performances (Questions #30 through #33)

Slightly more than half of the respondents ($P = 56.9\%$) reported that they participate with their feeder elementary and or middle school instrumental music programs for performances. Table 6 shows the total number of yearly performances, the highest level of music performed, as well as competition participation. Band and orchestral literature is commonly graded according to level of difficulty as: advanced elementary level (grade 2), intermediate middle school (grade 3) and high school level (grade 4), or advanced high school level (grade 5).
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Performances</th>
<th>Level of Music</th>
<th>Competition Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many, 10 or more</td>
<td>42.6% Grade 5 or higher</td>
<td>21.2% Yes, both large ensemble and solo/ensemble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several, 5 to 9</td>
<td>23.8% Grade 4</td>
<td>31.3% Yes, large ensemble only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few, 4 or less</td>
<td>31.7% Grade 3</td>
<td>34.3% Yes, solo/ensemble only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.0% Grade 2</td>
<td>13.1% No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Characteristics (Question #25, #28, #53 through 57)

The number of teachers directing the variety of ensembles and performances at each secondary school ranged from one full time music teacher ($P = 51.5\%$) to a combination of 1 part-time and 1 full-time or 2 full-time teachers ($P = 7.9\%$ each). The majority of music teachers ($P = 74.7\%$) taught only music classes and were not required to teach other subject areas. A large majority ($P = 99\%$) possessed a teaching contract and a slight majority ($P = 56\%$) were not products of Catholic school education themselves. Higher education and years experience teaching are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Years Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>46.5% Less than 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>50.5% 6 to 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.0% 11 to 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 or more years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Stability (Question #6, #10, and #12)

The stability of the instrumental programs was examined by comparing program drop out rates and growth rates of schools with various enrollment sizes in the instrumental program. Respondents were asked to select the category that best described their program drop-out rate and growth rate. Table 8 compares the drop-out rates categories (question #10) and growth rates categories (question #12) for programs with different enrollment sizes. Categories of the rates were: 1 = 0%, 2 = 1-3%, 3 = 4-6%, 4 = 7-10%, and 5 = greater than 10%. Total drop-out rates averaged in the 1 to 3% category (category $M = 2.61$) while total growth rates averaged in 4 to 6% category (category $M = 3.05$). The greatest difference between overall drop-out rate (category $M = 2.29$) and growth rate (category $M = 3.18$) was found in the instrumental programs of 100 to 150 students. The lowest difference between overall drop-out rate (category $M = 2.90$) and growth rate (category $M = 3.06$) was found in the instrumental program with 50 to 99 students. From this comparison, each program size shows a slightly higher growth rate than drop-out rate. Programs with enrollments of 100 to 150 reported the most growth.
Table 8

*Comparison of Means of Drop-out and Growth Rate Categories to Program Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program enrollment</th>
<th>Drop out rate Categories</th>
<th>Growth rate Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SE\text{ of } M )</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouped Mdn</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SE\text{ of } M )</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouped Mdn</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>1.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SE\text{ of } M )</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouped Mdn</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SE\text{ of } M )</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouped Mdn</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( SE\text{ of } M )</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouped Mdn</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category scale: 1 = 0% rate, 2 = 1-3% rate, 3 = 4-6% rate, 4 = 7-10% rate, 5 = greater than 10%

**Miscellaneous Teacher Comments (Question #58)**

Respondents were given the opportunity to express their comments in the form of an open-ended question. Item #58 allowed unlimited space to state concerns for the future of instrumental music, personal success stories, or anything the teachers wished to
share. The open comments were examined for topical themes and tabulated accordingly in Table 9. Individual comments were extrapolated and are presented in Chapter 5.

Table 9

#58 Miscellaneous Teacher Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>Weak feeder school programs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>Extra-curricular/Sports emphasis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>Small Program enrollment/Small school size</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>Scheduling Conflicts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talented students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>Additional graduation requirements/</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>math, science, tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support is strong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>Poor Attitude toward program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low teacher wages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of teaching time/too many</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor administrative support/lack of</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hurricane Katrina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Communication/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on Vocal music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research question #3 is further answered by items that sought teachers’ opinions concerning various aspects of their programs. Using Likert scale responses (1=agree, 2=somewhat agree, 3=somewhat disagree, 4=disagree) to statements, respondents addressed the, “Description of the Instrumental Music Program” (items 34 to 40 in Section 2) “Administrative Support” (items 41 to 45 in Section 3) and, “Parental Support” (items 46 to 51 in Section 4). Descriptive statistics of the items’ frequency, means, standard deviations, and modes are summarized in Tables 10, 11, and 12.

A high level of disagreement ($M = 3.10$, Mode = 4) was reported by teachers to item “38: “This school program benefits from strong feeder school instrumental music program.” However, the teachers generally reported agreement ($M = 1.62$, Mode = 1) that their “administration models a positive attitude toward their instrumental music program” in item #44. Positive parental communication and appreciation of their students’ musical abilities was in agreement ($M = 1.30$, Mode = 1) but respondents somewhat disagreed that the programs benefit from active parent booster programs ($M = 2.77$, Mode = 4).
Table 10

*Description of Instrumental Music Program Statements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>My school instrumental music program is currently strong and secure.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>My school schedule provides for ample rehearsal time.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>My school instrumental music program has a well stocked music library.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>My school instrumental music program has adequate instruments and equipment.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>This school program benefits from strong feeder school instrumental music program.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the facilities provided for my school instrumental music program.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the abilities and achievements of my instrumental music students.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=Agree, 2=Somewhat Agree, 3=Somewhat Disagree, 4=Disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Questions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Members of the administration in my school attend all or most of our public music performances.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. My administration provides sufficient financial support to fund my school instrumental music program.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. My administration provides supportive public relations for my instrumental music program.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. My administration models a positive attitude toward my instrumental music program to teachers, students, and parents.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Overall, I am satisfied with administrative support for my instrumental music program.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=Agree, 2=Somewhat Agree, 3=Somewhat Disagree, 4=Disagree
Table 12

*Parental Support Statements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Questions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46. I experience strong parent and/or family attendance at public performances</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of my instrumental music students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Overall the parents or guardians are pleased with the students’</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.0579</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musical abilities and performances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I experience positive communications with my students’ parents or</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. My instrumental music activities are sufficiently assisted by parent</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volunteers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. My students’ parents/guardians provide their students with good quality</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Our instrumental music program benefits from an active and supportive</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parent booster organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=Agree, 2=Somewhat Agree, 3=Somewhat Disagree, 4=Disagree

**Research Question #4**

*Are there any notable differences in instrumental music programs, with respect to
selected factors, as a function of school location and enrollment size?*

After close examination of the data, the following factors were selected by the
investigator as being of particular interest when comparing school locations and
enrollment sizes:

a) Program enrollment.

b) Program drop-out rate.

c) Instrumental music teachers’ opinion of the strength and security of their
programs.
d) Satisfaction with their facilities.

e) Satisfaction with the administrative support of their programs.

f) Satisfaction with parental booster support.

g) Instrumental teachers’ years of teaching experience.

Each factor of research question #4 was answered through a three-way cross-tabulation of location (urban, suburban, and rural) and school enrollment (less than 500, 500 to 999, 1000 to 1500, and over 1500).

Table 13 displays the cross-tabulations of the factors with respect to instrumental music program enrollment. Responses were tabulated from question items #2, 4, and 6. There were no rural schools with over 1500 students or program enrollments of over 150. The highest percentages of program enrollments were found in the “50 or less” category for urban (56.0%), suburban (41.5%), and rural (46.2%) schools. While it is expected for small school enrollments to also have smaller program enrollments, suburban schools of 1000 to 1500 had a high percentage (40.0%) of small programs of “50 or less”. Urban schools of 500 to 999 had 41.2% in the “50 or less” program enrollment category.
Table 13

School Location, Enrollment, and Program Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Program Enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 50</th>
<th>50-99</th>
<th>100-150</th>
<th>Over 150</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 displays the cross-tabulation of factors with respect to instrumental program drop-out rate. Responses were tabulated from items #2, 4 and 10.

Drop-out rates with the highest percentage were in the 1 to 3% category across school locations/enrollments with the exception of one urban school of over 1500 students with a drop-out rate of greater than 10%. Percentages decreased as the drop-out rates increased except for urban schools with 19.1% \((n = 9)\) in the greater than 10% category.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Location, Enrollment, and Program Drop-out Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-3%</th>
<th>4-6%</th>
<th>7-10%</th>
<th>Greater than 10%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 shows the cross-tabulation of factors with respect to instrumental music teachers’ level of agreement that their programs are strong and secure. This was derived from responses to questions #2, 4, and 34. Rural schools showed the highest percentages in the “agree” (33.3%) and “somewhat agree” (50%) categories as compared to “somewhat disagree” and “disagree” categories (8.3% each). The highest percentage of suburban schools of less than 500 “disagree” (42.9%) while small urban schools “somewhat agree” (52.2%) and rural “agree” (44.4%) that their programs are strong and secure.
### Table 15

**School Location, Enrollment, and Program Strength and Security**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>500-999</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>1000-1500</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Over 1500</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Strong, Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 depicts the cross-tabulation of factors with respect to instrumental music teachers’ satisfaction with their schools’ music facilities. These data were collected from the answers to items #2, 4, and 39. Suburban schools showed highest dissatisfaction with facilities as shown in the total “somewhat disagree” and “disagree” categories combined ($P = 70\%$) followed by rural ($P = 66.6\%$ and urban ($P = 53.3\%$) in the combined “somewhat disagree” and “disagree” categories.

Table 16

School Location, Enrollment, and Satisfaction with Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Good Facilities</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Location, Enrollment, and Satisfaction with Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows the cross-tabulation of factors with respect to instrumental music teachers’ level of agreement with support from administration. These data were compiled from responses to questions #2, 4, and 45. Urban (n = 13, P = 59.1%) and rural schools (n = 4, P = 44.4%) of smaller school enrollments (less than 500) showed relatively higher satisfaction with administrative support than suburban schools of the same size. Generally, as school size increased, so did the level of agreement that school administration was supportive. When examining these cross-tab tables it should be remembered that, in some instances, percentages (P) may seem high but numbers (n) of schools are low. For example, the “over 1500” enrollment category of urban schools that shows 100% in the “somewhat agree” category with only one school.
### Table 17

**School Location, Enrollment, and Satisfaction with Administrative Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500-999</th>
<th>1000-1500</th>
<th>Over 1500</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Administration Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 displays the cross-tabulation of factors with respect to instrumental music teachers’ agreement with the statement that their programs benefit from a supportive parent booster organization. These data were tabulated from items #2, 4, and 51. Respondents from schools with smaller school enrollments of “less than 500” were in more disagreement with the statement than those from schools with larger enrollments. As school size increased the “disagree” category percentages decreased in all locations.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Location, Enrollment, and Parent Booster Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### School Location, Enrollment, and Parent Booster Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500-999</th>
<th>1000-1500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 summarizes the cross-tabulation of factors with respect to instrumental music teachers’ years of teaching experience. Responses to items #2, 4, and 54 were utilized to obtain these data. Rural schools reported the highest percentage of teachers (58.3%) with over 16 years experience. In nearly all school sizes with a few exceptions, 16 or more years experience was the highest percentage reported, especially in smaller schools of “less than 500” with 36.4% in urban, 46.7% in suburban, and 66.7% in small rural schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500-999</th>
<th>1000-1500</th>
<th>Over 1500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500-999</th>
<th>1000-1500</th>
<th>Over 1500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500-999</th>
<th>1000-1500</th>
<th>Over 1500</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Research Question #5: (Question #11)**

What reasons did the respondents report for students dropping out of the instrumental music programs?

Respondents were instructed to report the primary reason for their students dropping out of the instrumental music program. Only one best choice could be provided from the list of options. A high percentage ($P = 71.3\%$) reported that scheduling conflicts was the primary reason for drop-out. Table 20 displays all responses.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Responses to Primary Reason for Drop-out</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the primary reason students drop out?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Drop out of school</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Transfer to another school</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Move outside the area</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Scheduling conflicts</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Disinterest</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (Including: difficulties with 5-8 program, graduation, new teacher, schedule before school and can’t arrive on time, too easy/too difficult, athletic scheduling conflicts, too many responsibilities for upper classmen)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

RESTATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A national study specifically devoted to the status of instrumental music education in the Catholic schools of the United States has never been undertaken. Many factors contribute to the diversity of the Diocesan school instrumental music programs, yet little is currently known about the status of these programs. A nation-wide survey was needed to determine the status of Catholic school instrumental music programs. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine the current status of instrumental music programs in the nation’s Catholic schools through information gathered from a national survey and to use the information to make recommendations for improving Catholic school instrumental music programs.

Research questions addressed in this study were:

1. What is the percentage of Catholic high schools in the United States with instrumental music programs?

2. Where are the schools located (urban, suburban, and rural areas), what is their enrollment size, and how stable are their populations?

3. What are the prominent characteristics of the instrumental music programs?
4. Are there any notable differences in instrumental music programs that seem to be a function of school location and enrollment size?

The following factors were selected as being of particular interest when comparing school locations and enrollment sizes:

a) Program enrollment;

b) Program drop-out rate;

c) Instrumental music teachers’ opinion of the strength and security of their programs;

d) Satisfaction with their facilities;

e) Satisfaction with the administrative support of their programs;

f) Satisfaction with parental booster support;

g) Instrumental teachers’ years of teaching experience.

5. What reasons did the respondents report for students dropping out of the instrumental music programs?

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Research Question #1

*What is the percentage of Catholic high schools in the United States with instrumental music programs?*

The percentage of secondary Catholic schools reporting that they have instrumental music programs was 88.9% (n = 104). Comparing these results to the 1983 Search Institute and National Catholic Education Association secondary school survey results reveals that there has been an increase in the percentage of schools that offer
instrumental music. The 1983 data indicated that only 76% of secondary schools offered instrumental or vocal music. The fact that the earlier statistic does not differentiate between vocal and instrumental makes the comparison somewhat problematic although it is a reasonable assumption that the schools in the current study also offer vocal music. Therefore the increases in instrumental offerings reported in the current study may be an accurate reflection of changes since 1983. In addition, NCEA reported in their study that schools offering band or orchestra ranged from 35% in schools of less than 300 students to 81% in schools with over 1000 students. Considering these facts, over the time period of 24 years, from 1983 to 2007 there appears to be a substantial increase in the percentage of secondary Catholic schools that offer instrumental music.

Many factors may contribute to the increase in instrumental music offerings in secondary Catholic schools. In 1963, the Vatican II council relaxed the previous instrumental music restrictions of the Moto Proprio and started a slow increase of incorporating more instrumental music in the Catholic liturgy. With less emphasis on teaching Gregorian chant and more emphasis on providing instrumental instruction, the secondary Catholic schools gradually began to offer more instrumental music classes. Secondary school administrators not only wished to follow the teachings of the Vatican II council but also to offer a balanced program of instruction competitive with their public school counterparts. By developing multiple course offerings, including instrumental music, they provided choices for their students to fulfill the fine arts graduation credit. While this change began in the 1960s, it is possible that it took many years for its impact to be evident in the schools. Perhaps the current study reflects an upward trend compared to the 1980s.
Research Question #2

Where are the schools located (urban, suburban, and rural areas), what is their enrollment size, and how stable are their populations?

Results revealed that 47% of the schools were located in an urban setting, 41% in a suburban location, and 12% were located in a rural area. Teachers selected the response they felt best described the location of their school. One respondent checked both urban and suburban responses and another respondent checked suburban but commented that the student population was from inner-city urban homes. It is not unusual to think of urban as inner city or low-income and this suggests that the location of the school might not always describe the student population aptly. Since no definition of these terms was provided, respondents were asked to categorize their schools according to their own understanding. However, since only 2 of the 117 (p = 1.7%) respondents indicated any confusion or indecision over the accuracy of their responses, one can conclude that the results are generally accurate.

The enrollment size of the secondary schools ranged from 48.7% with less than 500 students, 31.6% with 500 to 999 students, 17.1% with 1000 to 1500 students, and 2.6% with over 1500 students. Nearly half of the schools have enrollments of “less than 500” students. Small schools of less than 500 students comprise 49.1% of the schools in urban locations, 41.7% of suburban schools, and a very large 71.4% of the schools in rural areas. It is not surprising that most schools are in urban or suburban areas and fewer are in rural areas. Finding most schools in rural areas to be small was also expected. However, school size in all areas is a concern to the instrumental teachers. Comments taken from Item #58 of the survey, listed below, address the teachers’ concern with their
secondary schools’ small enrollment size. School size does seem to be a factor contributing to the difficulties some teachers encounter with establishing and maintaining an instrumental music program:

1. “Our school still has a concert choir, music appreciation, and liturgical choir but does not have the enrollment to sustain the band, orchestra, or any form of an instrumental program.”
2. “We do not have enough students interested enough to start our own band…”
3. “I have a very small HS band, but…we compete well in our class size of school…we are 4 students too many to be in class 2A”
4. “We are a very small school…The students’ fine areas credit may be in Music or Art and the numbers in both of these areas are small…it is a struggle.”
5. “I am very saddened by the fact that there is no instrumental music department in our school. We also do not have a marching or concert band, but understand that as a school with less than 300 students, this would be very difficult.”

It is interesting to note that no comments, positive or negative, had to do with the location of the school but several concerns about the small size of the school being a contributing factor to the frustrations teachers must endure. Small school enrollment limits the pool from which teachers can recruit for their instrumental programs, which in turn could restrict efforts to achieve balanced instrumentation in their ensembles. Location seemed not to be an area of concern or benefit to the programs.

The stability of the school populations of the schools with instrumental music programs was examined by a cross-tabulation of school enrollment increase versus decrease. Overall, there was a 12.3% net growth in school enrollment across a three to
five year period. The results showed 20.4% of the schools remaining stable (increase and
decline are equal), 33.6% of the schools indicating enrollment decreases and no
increases with 45.9% of the schools reporting enrollment increases and no decreases.
The largest category was in the “no decrease” and the “1 to 3%” increase category with
23.5% of the schools claiming this enrollment growth, while in the “no increase” and the
“1 to 3%” decrease category, 19.4% of the schools reported this decline.

While this study shows an overall increase in enrollment for schools with
instrumental programs, the NCEA 2005-2006 Annual Statistical Report indicated a
national decline of overall secondary student enrollment from 627,877 students in 2000-
(http://www.ncea.org/news/AnnualDataReport.asp#enrollment) This decline of
enrollment is not a recent trend but began in the early 1970’s when secondary Catholic
school enrollment reached 1,008,088 then slowly declined to the present.
(http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/dt062.asp) Instrumental music programs could
possibly be one contributing factor in promoting growth in school enrollment, although
this is difficult to assess because larger schools seem generally to be more conducive to
the development of instrumental programs. One respondent commented in item #58 that
“perhaps rebuilding a viable (instrumental) program might help enrollment.” If it is true
that instrumental music contributes to school enrollment increases then all secondary
Catholic secondary schools, especially those facing declines in enrollment, might benefit
from encouraging and supporting an instrumental music program in their schools.
Research Question #3

What are the prominent characteristics of the instrumental programs?

Item responses relevant to this research question were organized into seven areas based upon common program characteristics: facilities, program offerings, scheduling, performances, teacher characteristics, program stability, and miscellaneous teacher comments. The miscellaneous teacher comments are presented according to the appropriate category.

Facilities

Only 1.9% of the respondents stated they have no separate room designated for music rehearsals, which is gratifying to find. However, of the 98.1% of the schools that do provide music facilities, 4.7% must use an auditorium/stage, 8.5% rehearse in a standard classroom, and 11.3% use other areas such as larger or double-size classrooms, poorly planned band room with bad acoustics, gym stage, trailer, in a separate building, boiler room, and a band room shared with religion classes. Still a large majority ($p = 73.6\%$) of schools provide a separate music rehearsal room. Availability of separate practice rooms for individual instruction, sectional rehearsals, and small group practice is found in only 50% of the responding schools. Convenient and ample storage facilities for instruments and equipment were only found in 23.1% of the schools. Clearly, improvement in proper facilities to sustain an instrumental music program is needed in too many of these schools. A disturbing number of instrumental teachers are trying to build a program under challenging circumstances with respect to facilities. Instrumental programs require special considerations such as acoustics, adequate and appropriate
rehearsal space and equipment storage. It is most unfortunate when facilities are not conducive to teaching and learning music.

**Program offerings:**

Responding schools with instrumental music programs indicated that 87% require a fine arts credit for graduation, compared to the 1983 NCEA/Search Institute survey with only 49% of secondary Catholic schools with a graduation requirement in fine arts. When tabulating all 117 respondents of the current survey, including those who stated they had no instrumental music program, the calculated percentage dropped from 87% to 74.4%, which is still far above the 49% rate found by NCEA in 1983. A concern of the NCEA in their 1983 study is that the fine arts were given a lower priority than other academic areas. (NCEA, 1985) With the growth in the percentage of schools requiring fine arts for graduation, it is encouraging to find that the arts are beginning to become increasingly important in the secondary Catholic schools. However, 8.1% of the teachers who commented in item #58 of the survey shared a concern of increased graduation requirements and an emphasis on advanced placement courses, which prevents students from fitting instrumental music into their class schedules. Comments included:

1. “I’m afraid that after all these new credits are required no one will be able to come back [to the instrumental program] because they will still have other credits to fulfill.”

2. “Also, counselors need to understand that instrumental music is just as important as any AP class.”
3. “With so many academic requirements and all the religion requirements students at the upper level have a difficult time getting band into their schedules.”

4. “Ideally students should be in an instrumental classroom situation for every semester, but with UC requirements and not enough periods in the day it is almost impossible.”

5. “[My] biggest problem for me is that the Catholic schools I’ve taught in (especially this one) has an overemphasis in AP/Honors level courses to get the students into college – hindering the number of music courses a student could take.”

6. “I also believe with the focus begin placed on math and science the arts continue to struggle.”

7. “The greatest concern we face in our school is the gradual increase in graduation credits mandated by our state department of education and school board. Our school requires 5 to 7 credits beyond the state requirements in theology and social studies. With new additions in state requirements, my students no longer are able to take music classes all four years of high school. Some semesters I loose as much as 30% of my instrumental music enrollment due to course conflicts.”

With an increase in graduation requirements, especially in the “core” subjects of math, science, language arts, and social studies, teachers commented that students find it nearly impossible to fit instrumental music into their schedules for all four years of high school. In addition, many of the instrumental music students are often also the same students who are enrolled in special advanced placement courses that are offered at limited times during the school day. Therefore, even though instrumental music has an important place
in the course offerings to fulfill the fine arts graduation credit, teachers commented that many students cannot find time in their schedule for instrumental music every semester.

In spite of the difficulties with additional graduation requirements, the number of instrumental program offerings has increased from the 1983 NCEA/Search Institute study and the 2000 NCEA Report of School Academic and Co-Curricular Programs. In 1983, overall 54% of the secondary schools offered band while 24% offered orchestra. In 2000, NCEA noted an increase to 58% offering band while 30% offered orchestra. In the current study, the percentage of schools with instrumental music programs that offer concert band alone has grown to 70.9% \( (n = 117) \) when including all respondents, not just those with instrumental music programs. Unfortunately, this study found that orchestra offerings have dropped to 18.8% of total responding schools \( (n = 117) \) from 1983 and 2000 levels.

**Scheduling**

As seen in the comments from the Program Offering section above, additional graduation requirements have contributed to scheduling difficulties. Scheduling clearly has an impact on the success of an instrumental program. Teachers offered specific comments on this topic (9.1% of comments) including the following:

1. “My band meets once every six days, and never all together.”

2. “Also, I think it is important to address scheduling in the Catholic schools…Being on block schedule only makes that worse.”

3. “Scheduling is the largest issue at our school.”
4. “Classes need to be available during the regular school day to allow all students the opportunity to experience instrumental music.”

5. “Also, the scheduling problems create many issues concerning student retention/recruitment.”

Teaching within limitations of the school schedule seemed to be of great importance to the secondary Catholic school instrumental teachers. As schools alter their scheduling format, administrators must take into consideration the necessity of a regular rehearsal schedule to provide for optimal student success in their instrumental music program. When changing to a block schedule or rotating schedule, this regularity of rehearsals may be in jeopardy, thus resulting in a weaker instrumental program.

A variety of scheduling options was reported by the responding schools with individual class periods still remaining to be in the slight majority ($p = 53.5\%$) over block scheduling, rotating schedules, modified block, and the various other types (rotating block, grade level scheduling, or modular). Within the varied school scheduling options, some schools provided accommodations for scheduling limitations, with 44% of the schools supplementing their regular scheduled class periods with before/after school rehearsals, 7% offered instrumental instruction only before/after school, while another 7% provided with other options (some ensembles or lessons during the day and others offered after school, students pulled out of regular classes during the school day). The number of music rehearsals/classes taught by the teacher varied with 38% teaching five or more classes.
Performances

The instrumental music programs are actively involved in performing with only 2% of teachers reporting they have no performances and 33.7% stating they do not participate in any music competitions. Of the school ensembles that perform, 42.6% have many performances with 10 or more per year and 34.7% competing in both large ensemble and solo/ensemble competitions. The grade level of music performed ranged from an intermediate level (Grade 2 to 4) to advanced level (Grade 5 and above) with 13.1% playing Grade 2, 34.3% performing Grade 3, 31.3% at Grade level 4, and 21.2% able to perform music at Grade level 5 or higher. Performing intermediate junior high level music is not surprising considering that slightly over half of the secondary schools include elementary feeder schools in their performances ($P = 56.9\%$) and several secondary schools contain junior high 7th and 8th grade ($P = 12\%$) in their school buildings. By including younger students in high school ensembles the size will increase and instrumentation may improve, however it may often lower the level difficulty of the music that is performed. Positive comments concerning the fine talent ($P = 5.1\%$) and dedication of their hard-working students ($P = 5.1\%$) were expressed in item #58 and included:

1. “The kids are hard workers in general so they become better musicians. I’ve had more students go on to become music teachers here at ____ High than the public schools I taught at and I’ve only been here 5 years.”

2. “I have a very small HS band, but they are loyal and hard working and we compete well in our class size of school in Concert, Jazz, and solo ensemble festivals, even though our band is about ¼ the size of others in our class.”
3. “_____High School Marching Band is State Champion…[Our] wind ensemble receives superior ratings at festivals.”

4. “Wonderful students – attitude and potential.”

5. “My students work hard and have a great deal of pride.”

From the comments provided, there is no question that hard work, dedication, skill, and musicianship abound in many secondary Catholic school music programs. Quality performances can occur with the combined efforts and determination of the teacher and their students. However, 33.7% of the schools responded that they do not participate in either large ensemble or solo/ensemble competitions. While many reasons could account for this low percentage, limitations in size, instrumentation, and level of music may be contributing factors.

**Teacher Characteristics**

Over half of the instrumental music teachers in the secondary Catholic schools are well educated with 53.5% possessing advanced degrees, as well as very experienced, with 45.5% having 16 or more years teaching experience. However, just under half of the teachers \( P = 46.5\% \) state that a Bachelor’s degree is their highest degree, and just under a quarter of the teachers \( P = 24.8\% \) have less than five years experience. Slightly more than half of the schools have one full time instrumental teacher \( P = 51.5\% \) and most of these teach only music classes \( P = 74.7\% \). On the other hand, just under a quarter of the responding schools have one part-time instrumental teacher \( P = 22.8\% \) and slightly over a quarter of these teachers \( P = 25.3\% \) also teach non-music subjects (3% teach 4 or more non-music classes). Therefore, about a quarter of the music
specialists may be specialists in other subjects, in order to maintain their position and a teaching contract. On a positive note, 99% of the responding teachers possess teaching contracts. Less than one half of the teachers ($P = 44\%$) report being former Catholic school students themselves. While some Catholic schools still may require their faculty to be affiliated with the Catholic faith, it appears not to be of any relevance to the qualifications of most Catholic school instrumental music teachers. Personal satisfaction with their position encompassed 5.1% of the positive remarks from teachers who responded in item #58 and included the following:

1. “I am very satisfied with my job due to the wonderful people I work with daily.”
2. “At this time, I am extremely happy with my program…I feel very safe here.”
3. “This is my first year in a Catholic school after having taught in the public schools for over 20 years. I am enjoying the experience.”
4. “This is a great situation. Life is good (if one enjoys 60 hours a week).”

Longevity of secondary Catholic instrumental music teachers suggests that in spite of the difficulties they face with small school enrollments, course requirement demands on their students, and others problems, they are happy in their careers. Satisfaction is gained from the successes of their students and the atmosphere in which they teach.

However, life is not good for all Catholic school instrumental teachers as comments concerning low wages ($P = 5.1\%$), lack of teaching time, and too many responsibilities ($P = 4\%$) were also expressed:

1. “I am making $30K$ a year with a bachelor’s [degree]. I could be making $45K$, same step, if I were in public schools…It has definitely been great here, but can’t stay forever if I want to start a family and buy a house.”
2. “My only concern would be wages. It’s tough to make a living with what Catholic schools pay compared to public schools. However, considering how better behaved the students at the Catholic schools usually are and the level of talent that the students at my school exhibit, it makes the low wages worth it.”

3. “Our two primary issues are a lack of staff and the minimal time with our junior high kids. Our system employs only 3 full time teachers for 11 schools. This includes a high school program…We are spread extremely thin.”

4. “One major problem is cutbacks to these schools and they are forced to combine vocal and instrumental positions. I am teaching 7 out of the 8 periods in the day and it is simply overwhelming.”

5. “Finances would be the greatest concern for Catholic schools both for salaries and equipment.”

6. “Lack of teaching time…lack of salary (driving good teachers to public schools).”

Salaries continue to be an issue with all Catholic school teachers as well as the strenuous work load of their positions. Job satisfaction versus job compensation is a balancing act that all teachers must weigh. Those teachers who find the greatest satisfaction in teaching in the Catholic secondary schools remain, while those who desire a better salary or a less demanding work load may only teach for a short time then leave the Catholic schools. A study conducted by the National Center for Educational statistics support’s the dissatisfaction in salary as a contributing factor to teacher turn-over:

National studies have included both private and public school teachers in analyses of teacher turnover (Ingersoll 2001). These studies have shown that teacher turnover is associated with teacher perceptions of school organizational characteristics, including low levels of administrative support, little input into
school decisions, student disciplinary problems, and insufficient salary (Ingersoll 2001). Private school teachers generally express less dissatisfaction with school organizational characteristics than do their public school counterparts (Ingersoll 2001; Holton 2003). However, teacher turnover rates are higher in private schools than in public schools; in 2000–01, 21 percent of private school teachers had switched schools or left the teaching force since the previous school year compared with 15 percent of public school teachers (Luekens, Lyter, and Fox 2004).…. Teachers in Catholic schools were more likely than others to report strong dissatisfaction regarding their salary (48 percent compared with 23 percent of other religious and 31 percent of nonsectarian school teachers). (McGrath & Princiotto, 2005)

This could explain the discrepancy between percentage of teachers with 16 or more years experience ($P = 45.5\%$) and the teachers with less than 5 years experience ($P = 24.8\%$).

**Program Stability**

Despite the concerns discussed in the previous sections, the results have shown that collectively the instrumental music programs are relatively stable with slightly higher growth rates than drop-out rates. Even though teachers are greatly concerned with students leaving their programs, there seems to be a trend of program growth in many of the schools. Based on the following response categories of the rates, 1 = 0\%, 2 = 1-3\%, 3 = 4-6\%, 4 = 7-10\%, and 5 = greater than 10\%, total drop-out rates averaged in the 1 to 3\% category (category $M = 2.61$) while total growth rates averaged in the 4 to 6\% category (category $M = 3.05$). The greatest difference in overall drop-out rate (category $M = 2.29$) and growth rate (category $M = 3.18$) was found in the larger sized instrumental programs of 100 to 150 students. The lowest difference in overall drop-out rate (category $M = 2.90$) and growth rate (category $M = 3.06$) was found in the medium sized instrumental program with 50 to 99 students. While most schools, no matter the
enrollment size, tend to have small instrumental music programs, those that have larger programs are often found in schools with large enrollments. Therefore, the schools of large enrollments have a wider pool of students from which they can recruit to join the instrumental programs. With a wider selection of recruitment, program growth can occur more readily. Comments in item #58 also reflected this trend with 8.1% of the positive comments stating that their program is growing, including:

1. “On a brighter note, the school has never had a marching band. We started last year with ten kids (mostly 8th and 9th graders), and expanded to 23 this year (7th-10th graders).”

2. “Two years ago, there were only 2 music classes and today there are 6. I feel that the program will continue to grow and attract more students.”

3. “My program is growing but very slowly.”

4. “The program has grown to include over 170 instrumental students…100 guitar students, 4 instrumental ensembles…and a string program.”

5. “This is my 2nd year teaching and the program has grown from 55 total musicians to 85.”

However, 10.2% of the negative comments in item #58 that dealt with the problems of small program enrollment, with most relating to the contributing problems in the feeder schools, including:

1. “The decline of Catholic grade schools is apparent in the 7 remaining band programs, as our numbers are static to gradually declining.”

2. “I believe my program is so small due to the lack of instrumental music in the Catholic elementary and middle schools.”
3. “My main concern is that music is being dropped in so many schools.”
4. “With small numbers at the elementaries, it is hard to find music for them (instrumentation problems) and therefore hard to keep them interested…This causes problems in retention and causes low numbers in the high school band.”
5. “Our little band has done very well the past 4 years, but we are running out of students, every year it goes down till only 3 or 4 students per class in grade school.”
6. “The two greatest problems are music in the elementary schools (private Catholic schools) which most of my student come from is non-existent. I have to fight to get kids into this program. Once they are in, they tend to stay but recruitment is very hard.”
7. “Catholic elementary music education is in bad shape…because of Hurricane Katrina. Most of these schools only offer music once a week in mixed groups.
8. “We have a beginner band in our high school to sustain the program.”

Since feeder programs are generally not aiding in the growth of the secondary school instrumental music programs, teachers must recruit students from within their own high schools. Although, overall the secondary instrumental programs seem to be growing, weak or non-existent elementary instrumental feeder programs contribute to their slow rate of growth.

Research question #3 is also addressed by the teachers’ level of agreement to opinion statements presented in the survey. Using a Likert scale (1=agree, 2=somewhat agree, 3=somewhat disagree, 4=disagree) opinions were sought concerning “Description of the Instrumental Music Program”(items 34 to 40 in Section 2) “Administrative
Support” (items 41 to 45 in Section 3) and “Parental Support” (items 46 to 51 in Section 4).

In the opinion rankings found in Section 2 “Description of the Instrumental Music Program," most teachers disagreed with the statement, “This school program benefits from strong feeder school instrumental music programs.” The mean score was 3.10 with a mode score of 4. Respondents to item #58 confirmed the data with the largest percentage of negative comments ($P = 33.6\%$) complaining of weak feeder school programs, including:

1. “My greatest concern is that only one of the ten or so schools that feed our program has a band program…This obviously has a huge effect on what we teach at the high school.”
2. “Very few elementary schools offer an instrumental program. If they do, it is after school, because administrators don’t want to give up class time.”
3. “Until Catholic elementary schools get serious about teaching music, there will be very limited musical growth on the secondary level.”
4. “I feel strongly that without a feeder string program, our group will be non-existent in the near future.”
5. “I think there needs to be stronger band programs offered at our K-8 schools so students will want to continue in high school.”
6. “The only problem with the situation is the lack of strong feeders.”
7. “Since teaching in a Catholic high school, it has been a concern of mine that the feeder schools do not allow instrumental music students a chance for
success...When I get students from the public schools, they are far ahead of the majority of my students.”

8. “Most of our feeder schools do not schedule band as a class and consequently, we have to be creative in scheduling. This is difficult to keep kids involved...Our feeder schools do not have band facilities and it is difficult to teach in those situations.”

9. “The grade schools and junior high Catholic schools in the area primarily do not have a band program because they do not have the money to fund it...I think if we funded the private grade schools, we would have a higher enrollment freshman year and many would choose band as a class.”

10. “The Catholic elementary schools are far behind their public counterparts and thus the incoming students are not prepared for high school music education.”

11. “Music does not have the equal footing in the schools as other subjects. It is treated too much, particularly on the elementary level, as an unneeded ‘extra’.”

12. “In my area...the Catholic grammar schools have finally started getting some programs going. I am sorry to say that at this time they are token programs just so the school can say they have a program. They are poor quality.”

13. “There is no music program in the elementary school, so there is no feeder school for the high school and consequently it is difficult to try to teach all the fundamentals in one year’s time.”

Once again, the lack of strong feeder instrumental programs was a major complaint of the secondary Catholic instrumental music teachers. From the responses to question #27, 38% of the responding teachers state that they teach 5 or more classes of music per day,
leaving 62% teaching 4 or fewer classes. Also as seen in the responses to question 55, a large majority \((P = 76.8\%)\) teaches in only one school (see Appendix E). Therefore, to strengthen their feeder schools, it would seem feasible for the secondary music teachers with fewer than 5 music classes per day, few duties, and teaching in only their secondary school, to assist in their feeder elementary instrumental programs. This would not only help to strengthen the elementary programs, but create a stronger bond between the feeder and secondary instrumental programs, perhaps increase recruitment, and boost the growth of the secondary music programs.

Overall, teachers were pleased with the support of their instrumental music programs from the administration. In four of the five statements in Section 3, the mean score ranged from 1.62 to 1.82 in the “agree” to “somewhat agree” ranking, with the mode score of 1. These data were supported by the fact that the highest percentage \((P = 9.1\%)\) of the comments from the respondents were complimentary of their administrative support. Positive comments included:

1. “Our music program benefits greatly from a wonderful school administration which holds the arts to be an essential element in the spiritual education of our students…Their support is crucial to our department.”

2. “Perhaps the greatest asset of this job is the administrative support.”

3. “Our program is pretty solid for the most part due to the support of our administrators at the high school level.”

4. “The administration has been very supportive of all that I have done as well as the goals that I am aiming for.”
5. “This is my first year at the school and the administration is GREAT, they are extremely supportive.”

6. “Positives…supportive administration and parents.”

Only one statement in this section of the survey: “My administration provides sufficient financial support to fund my school instrumental music program,” received a mean score of 2.16, showing slightly more disagreement. Only 4% of the comments from the respondents had to do with the lack of administrative support and included:

1. “In the absence of administrative support, not even John Philip Sousa can make a program successful.”

2. “Administrators do not see the need to change ‘the way it always been’ because they do see music as an ‘activity’ and not academic discipline.”

3. “Both the students and the administration ignore the band.”

Administrative support is crucial to the success of any school instrumental music program. Not only do they need to support it financially to supply the necessary equipment, instruments, music, and facilities, but they also need to support it through scheduling. As seen previously, scheduling difficulties are a major concern of many of the responding teachers. Administrators must prioritize scheduling accommodations to benefit their instrumental music programs, by providing for regular participation of all instrumental music students throughout their four years of high school.

Parental support (see Table 12 in Chapter 4) was generally high with mean scores ranging from 1.30 or “agree” (item 47 and 48) to 2.19 or “somewhat agree” (item 50). Teachers generally agreed that they experienced positive parental support through performance attendance, parents pleased with their students’ abilities, positive
communication, assistance at events, and providing good instruments. This is also shown in the item #58 with 3% of the comments praising the efforts of the parents, including:

1. “Our parents are very supportive and involved.”

2. “Parents can usually afford lessons and good instruments.”

However, there was notable disagreement to item #51, “Our instrumental program benefits from an active and supportive booster program” (M=2.77 and mode=4). Yet only one comment from the respondents in item #58 pertained to the lack of a booster organization stating, “We need a booster club for fine arts.” It was surprising that even though this survey item received the lowest ranking of “disagree” occurring most frequently as the mode score, it only received one comment in item #58. While the statement, “This school program benefits from strong feeder school instrumental programs” (item #38) received the same mode score of “disagree” as item #58, it received over 33% of the complaints. Secondary school teachers commented more about their lack of strong feeder schools than the lack of strong parent booster organizations, yet both can be considered important to the success of secondary school instrumental programs and should be considered when determining the underlying causes for weaknesses in their programs.

**Research Question #4**

*Are there any notable differences in instrumental music programs, with respect to selected factors, as a function of school location and enrollment size?*

The following factors were selected a being of particular interest when comparing school locations and enrollment sizes:
a) Program enrollment;
b) Program drop-out rate;
c) Instrumental music teachers’ opinion of the strength and security of their programs;
d) Satisfaction with their facilities;
e) Satisfaction with the administrative support of their programs;
f) Satisfaction with parental booster support;
g) Instrumental teachers’ years of teaching experience.

Small program enrollments of 50 or less students dominate the majority of Catholic secondary schools whether located in urban ($P = 56\%$), suburban ($P = 41.5\%$), or rural ($P = 46.2\%$) settings, with the largest percentages found in schools of less than 500 students (79.2\% urban, 71.4\% suburban, and 55.6\% rural schools). One would expect the program enrollment to rise as the school enrollment size increased but this was not generally the case. In urban schools of 500 to 999 students, the largest percentage of schools had program enrollments of less than 50 ($P = 41.2\%$). Even in suburban schools of enrollments of 1000 to 1500 the largest percentage of schools had program enrollments of 50 or less students ($P = 40.0\%$). Small program size is a major complaint of secondary instrumental music teachers, which affects their choice of music literature, causes instrumentation problems, and limits their participation in organized competitions. Concern for the small size of the instrumental programs along with school enrollment comprised 10\% of the comments from respondents, including these 5 statements:

1. “We play jazz, blues, and dance band music because there is only 17 kids in the band.”
2. “We share a band program with the local public school…We do not have enough students interested to start our own band.”

3. “[I] could never enter organizational contest due to lack of instrumentation…It’s a challenge in the small school (85 students, all female).”

4. “Our school still has a concert choir, music appreciation, and liturgical choir but does not have the enrollment to sustain the band, orchestra, or any form of an instrumental program.”

5. “Now I have twelve students, but instrumentation is still odd and unbalanced.”

Even though program size is small, it is encouraging to note that drop out rates remained low across all sizes and locations of schools, mainly in the 1 to 3% range.

Suburban schools of less than 500 enrollments did well with 23.1% of the schools with 0% drop-out rate and 38.5% with 1 to 3% drop-out rate, with 15.2% in the greater than 10% drop-out rate. However, small rural schools (less than 500 enrollments) did best with 22.2% in the 0% rate, 66.7% with 1 to 3% rate, and 0% in the greater than 10% drop-out rate. Comments from respondents, while they did not mention the size/location as a contributing factor for drop out, did complain of scheduling problems (listed previously) and 10.2% of the concerns on overemphasis of sports and extra-curricular offerings:

1. “All Catholic schools probably fight the same fights: students who must choose between athletics and music. Too few bodies, WAY too many extra-curricular activities tugging them in different directions.”

2. “Parents prioritize athletic PRACTICES over music PERFORMANCES.”
3. “The Catholic schools I’ve taught in …has an overemphasis on athletics – a way for the school to look competitive with their public school neighbors.”

4. “Concerns: students being over booked with too many activities.”

5. “Too many students are involved in too many things to meet after school. Frustrating.”

6. “Students have more extra-curricular and social activities available to them which I believe has a negative impact on participation in ensembles especially those outside the school day.”

7. “Students are so involved with sports there isn’t anytime for music lessons.”

It is evident from these comments that a contributing factor to the drop-out rates is scheduling difficulties due to over-extending the students with the demands of so many extra-curricular offerings. Students are often forced to choose between marching band and football, pep band or basketball, orchestra or drama club, or any of the dozens of conflicting time constraints. Creative scheduling is needed to accommodate all the activities that schools demand upon their students. Flexibility and understanding of these scheduling issues are required by all high school faculty and staff if instrumental programs are to thrive.

Teachers’ opinions on the strength and security of their instrumental music programs were compared to their location and school enrollments. Rural schools across all enrollment sizes had the highest overall percentages in the “agree” category ($P = 33.3\%$) and “somewhat agree” category ($P = 50\%$). Small suburban schools of less than 500 enrolled had the least "secure and strong" programs reporting a 42.9% percentage in the disagree category. As the suburban school enrollment size increased the more
agreement that their programs were both strong and secure was expressed. The majority of the urban schools rate “strong and secure” with over half of their schools in all enrollment sizes reporting the “agree” \( (P = 29.2\%) \) and “somewhat agree” \( (P = 37.5\%) \) categories. Complaints of a poor attitude toward the instrumental music programs from school personnel and student body was expressed in 5.1\% of the comments from item #58. These comments may reflect in part, the instability of some Catholic school instrumental programs:

1. “The band this year has come to have a more positive attitude than when I first started working with them, however, the rest of the school still has a negative attitude towards the bands abilities…I’m hoping with more exposure the school will learn to support the band.”

2. “We often are toward the bottom of the list in terms of recognition.”

3. “I’ve heard coaches ridicule the band just to convince student that they needed to stay in sports. I hope that my situation is an exception and the rule.”

Since small suburban schools of less than 500 enrolled had the least “secure and strong” programs, it appears simply that program size is a factor in the negativity they experience. Concern over small size may also be exacerbated by location. Suburban public school counterparts often maintain high profile large instrumental music programs with large marching bands and award winning ensembles, which are both strong and secure. Small suburban Catholic school instrumental programs cannot compete with these large public school programs and may feel their strength and security threatened. This in turn could possibly contribute to the negative attitudes encounter in these Catholic schools. As the suburban school size increased and the program size increased, with
24.4% with programs of 100 or more students (see Table 13 in Chapter 4), so did their strength and security of their programs.

The strength and security of instrumental music programs can also be a factor of the small size and unbalanced instrumentation of their ensembles. Schools with smaller program enrollments (50 or less) may consider developing curriculums that will foster positive educational experiences to highlight the unique qualities of their performing groups. As previously stated in Chapter Two, Bartosz (1984) suggests that teachers align their own philosophy with that of the school’s and develop a sequential set of educational goals. Since 40.2% of the schools have ensembles such as church bands, music ministry teams, and liturgical ensembles, these non-competition groups can easily align with the philosophy of the Catholic schools’ mission while helping to promote strong and secure programs.

Teachers in suburban schools showed the most dissatisfaction with their facilities, regardless of school enrollment sizes (32.5% in the “somewhat disagree” category and 37.5% in the “disagree” category). Both urban and rural teachers were somewhat dissatisfied with their program facilities as well, with 33.3% urban schools and 58.3% rural schools in the “somewhat disagree” categories. Little differences in facility satisfaction were shown by school size. Comments associated with facilities were paired with funding and administrative support, both in positive comments as well as negative comments. The amount of support from the administration through funding for appropriate facilities plays a role in the success or failure of the secondary Catholic school music programs. The negative affects of Hurricane Katrina was a major cause in the lack of facilities for the gulf coast.
1. “Even though we have serious limitations in rehearsal space and equipment, I know that my administrators will do their best within our limited means to help our students grow as musicians.”

2. “The school at which I teach has greatly increased its support for the arts and all activities. A new performing art facility is in the works which will include a new band room with two practice rooms, a new choir room, three hallway practice rooms, and three ensemble rooms along with a nine hundred seat auditorium.”

3. “Catholic school has placed so much focus on everything else that the fine arts have been neglected. We have a band but no instruments and a terrible facility.”

4. “The main draw back is the rehearsal room isn’t ideal and no auditorium (so we rent one for concerts/musicals.)

5. “Hurricane Katrina destroyed our music program. Students currently attend band classes at a neighboring school.”

Teacher satisfaction with administration support of their instrumental programs was varied. Small urban and rural schools of enrollments of less than 500 showed higher satisfaction than the suburban schools. Overall, satisfaction with administration was highest in the “agree” categories of urban (P = 55.3%) and rural schools (P = 58.3%) as compared to only 39% in the agree category of suburban schools. Perhaps expectations of administrative support are higher in the Catholic suburban schools when they compare themselves to their public school counterparts. Often, suburban public schools have modern facilities and more funding for their fine arts programs while urban and rural public schools do not. Generally as school size increased in the suburban and rural schools so did the level of agreement in positive administrative support. Administrative
support varied as well, as shown in the comments expressed in item #58 with 9.1% positive and 4% negative. These comments were shared in a previous section.

Support from parent booster organizations was reported as lacking in the smaller schools. Schools with under 500 students reported a higher percentage in the “disagree” category than larger schools (urban 60.0%, suburban 71.4%, and rural 55.6%). As school enrollments increased so did the level of agreement that their programs benefited from an active and supportive parent booster organization. Therefore, there appears to be a need for more active parent booster groups in the smaller schools. Smaller schools often do not have the resources to fund instrumental music programs. Parent booster groups would be crucial for assistance in fundraising activities to help provide for necessary instruments, equipment, music, and other needs of their programs.

The Catholic secondary school music teachers are experienced. In all areas, urban, suburban, and rural, the responding instrumental music teachers reported the highest percentage in the “16 or more years of experience” category, especially in schools with smaller enrollments. Urban schools included experienced teachers in all sizes of schools except in the large school category of over 1500. Smaller suburban schools in the “less than 500” and “500 to 999” categories each had 46.7% of teachers with 16 or more years of experience. In the rural schools, the “less than 500” category had 66.7% of their teachers in the “16 or more years of experience category." With all the difficulties teachers in Catholic schools face, they are dedicated and devoted to teaching their Catholic school students. As seen previously, the satisfaction they receive from hardworking students, supportive administration and parents, often outweighs the problems of scheduling difficulties, low wages, and weak feeder programs.
Research Question #5

*What reasons did the respondents report for students dropping out of the instrumental music programs?*

The vast majority ($P = 71.3\%$) of respondents concluded that “scheduling conflicts” was the primary reason for students dropping out of their instrumental music programs. Even though 8.5% of the teachers responded by selecting “other, please specify” in item #11, closer look at the specifications revealed scheduling related reasons including:

- schedule before school and can’t arrive on time
- athletic scheduling conflicts
- too many responsibilities for upper classmen

Scheduling conflicts manifest in the form of school scheduling design, over-emphasis on athletics and extra-curricular participation, and higher graduation requirements. This problem is confirmed by the large percentage of negative comments dealing with scheduling related issues in item #58 of the survey already shown. Scheduling conflicts encompassed 9.1% of the comments in item #58 plus scheduling-related issues, such as extra-curricular/sports emphasis (10.2%) and additional graduation requirements (8.1%), reinforced this factor contributing to program drop-out. Therefore, all forms of scheduling conflicts must be dealt with in a positive manner by administrators and extra-curricular activities coordinators. This will serve to aid in the development of the growth, stability, strength, and security of Catholic secondary instrumental music programs.
CONCLUSIONS

1. The percentage of secondary Catholic schools that have instrumental music programs is high \( (P = 88.9\%) \). This is an increase from the 1983 NCEA data stating that 76\% of secondary schools offer instrumental or vocal music, showing an improvement in status of the Catholic instrumental music programs.

2. Of the schools that offer instrumental music 47\% are located in urban settings, 41\% in suburban locations, and 12\% in rural areas. Most schools have small enrollment sizes with 48.7\% with less than 500 students, 31.6\% with 500 to 999 students, 17.1\% with 1000 to 1500 students, and only 2.6\% with over 1500 students. Overall the study revealed a growth in school enrollment from schools with instrumental music programs with the average increase of 4 to 6\% replacing the average decrease of 1 to 3\%.

3. Most schools offer separate music rehearsal rooms with half of the schools providing practice rooms. However, the majority of the respondents find storage for equipment and instruments inadequate. A large number of schools require a fine arts credit for graduation but the increase in other graduation requirements is a concern of the respondents. More schools offer band but less schools offer orchestra compared to previous years. Slightly over half of the schools offer instrumental music during individual class periods and 44\% supplement the schedule with before/after school rehearsals. A large majority of schools
instrumental groups perform regularly with slightly over half performing with feeder schools. Over half of the directors have 16 or more years of experience with advanced degrees. Collectively, the average instrumental music programs growth rate of 4 to 6% overshadows the average drop-out rate of 1 to 3%, with programs of 100 to 150 students showing the most growth. Weak feeder school programs are the greatest concern that undermines the growth of the secondary school instrumental music programs. Secondary school administrative and parent support is strong but booster organizations are lacking in the majority of schools.

4. There are several notable differences of school instrumental programs with respect to school location and size. The majority of all schools have small instrumental music programs of 50 or less students even though some have large school sizes. Drop-out rates remain low although many teachers report that too few students in their programs are a result of an over-emphasis on athletics. The majority of all sizes of rural schools have strong and secure programs while small suburban school programs are more insecure. Most schools are dissatisfied with their facilities showing slightly more dissatisfaction in suburban schools. Small urban and rural schools show higher administrative support than the suburban schools. Parent booster organizations are more active and supportive in the larger schools and lacking in the smaller schools. Small rural schools have the highest percentage of teachers with 16 or more years of experience.
5. A large majority of instrumental music teachers report that the primary reason their students drop-out of their instrumental music programs is due to scheduling conflicts. Scheduling problems due to increased graduation requirements and strong emphasis on athletic or extra-curricular participation contribute to the drop-out rate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the results and conclusions, several recommendations to improve the instrumental music programs in the secondary Catholic schools are offered below:

1. Develop stronger feeder school instrumental music programs with support from elementary and secondary school administration through additional funding, scheduling, and staffing. Secondary teachers should be more involved with the feeder programs.

2. Design creative school scheduling that accommodates the higher academic requirements, the athletic program, and extra-curricular participation but allows for students to participate fully in the instrumental music programs.

3. Provide support with strong parent booster organizations in all secondary schools to serve to help and fund the additional costs associated with active instrumental music programs.

4. Improve the programs by the administration providing proper rehearsal facilities, storage areas, and necessary equipment exclusively for the needs of the instrumental music programs.
5. Develop non-traditional music ministry ensembles that promote the mission of the Catholic Church and better highlight the musical abilities often found in smaller instrumental music programs.

As suggested by the results of this study, instrumental music programs can be a benefit to secondary Catholic schools. Increasing the enrollment, strength, and security of the instrumental music programs might, in turn, increase the enrollment, strength, and security of Catholic secondary schools in general. Further study is needed to identify which schools have strong secondary schools instrumental music programs and determine the characteristics of these particular programs to use as a model for all secondary Catholic schools.

Additional and extensive study of the status of instrumental programs in the United States is also recommended. This study was limited to the 117 respondents from the 400 randomly selected schools of the total population of 1,026 Catholic secondary schools in the United States. As with all survey research with voluntary respondents, generalizing to larger populations must be done with caution. The survey response rate of 30.23% of this online survey can be considered average (see Chapter 4) yet representative of the population demographics.

Since no e-mail addresses were readily available for this study, invitations to participate in the online survey were sent via the United States Postal Service to the 400 randomly selected secondary Catholic schools. They were instructed to visit the National Catholic Band Association website that provided the link to the survey. E-mail invitations, if they were available, would have provided a direct link in the text of the
e-mail and perhaps would have made access to the survey more convenient to the respondents.

Another concern was the lack of availability of a current directory of addresses for the secondary Catholic schools in the United States. The most recent public listing of schools was obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics website from their 2003-2004 Private School Universe Survey. Since its publication, some of the secondary schools have closed resulting in 13 surveys returned undeliverable. If a more recent listing was available, the number of undeliverable surveys would have been reduced.

Finally, the lower return rate may be related to the number of discarded or unopened surveys. The surveys were addressed to the music departments at the secondary Catholic schools. If there was no music department, perhaps the survey was discarded unopened and therefore not read, completed, or returned.

Future national surveys of the Catholic school instrumental music programs should use multiple means of communication and invitation to participate, including school e-mail addresses and music department phone numbers. Also, a separate survey to elementary feeder schools would provide additional insights to the status feeder school instrumental music programs with first hand information from the music teachers assigned to teach in those schools. Surveys to the parents of school instrumental music students as well as administrators of the Catholic schools would clarify further their role in the support given to the music programs. Follow-up studies could include qualitative case studies of secondary Catholic school instrumental music programs identified as “strong and secure” which can further identify the specific characteristics that make their
programs successful. Model program designs could be developed from this information and utilized by many of the secondary Catholic schools across the country for the improvement of the nation’s Catholic school instrumental music programs.
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APPENDIX A

SURVEY INVITATION
Dear Instrumental Music Teacher:

Greetings! My name is Caron Collins and I am currently completing my doctoral degree in music education at The Ohio State University. My dissertation topic concerns the status of instrumental music programs in Catholic school in the United States. This is a topic for which I have special interest. I was an instrumental music teacher in the Catholic Schools in Columbus, Ohio for 25 years, so I have some insights into the unique issues associated with teaching in this setting. My advisor, Dr. Jere Forsythe and I hope that you will be willing to assist me in gathering information that could be very helpful as we look at the future of instrumental music education in Catholic schools.

The purpose of this study is to determine the current status of instrumental music programs in our nation's Catholic schools through information gathered from a national survey. While some local studies of Catholic school programs have been conducted, there has never been a comprehensive national study until now. I am pleased to report this study has the support of the national Catholic Band Association. I hope that you will share my enthusiasm for this project by participating.

I will be obtaining my information through an on-line survey. It will take only about 20 minutes to complete. All information will be confidential. No personal information, names, addresses or locations will be used in the summary report. All information will be collected, analyzed, and summarized collectively and no individual results will be reported. I will use a code identifier only to check on my returns and to do follow up where needed. Of course your participation is totally voluntary, and your completion of the survey will serve as confirmation of your willingness.

To participate in this survey you must be the principal music teacher at your school, even if you are part time. If there is no instrumental music program at your school, please answer only the first few questions as directed on the survey. You are encouraged to complete the entire survey if there is a program that offers instruction in instrumental music at your school. This survey will be available online until January 31, 2007. A summative report will be available online in the summer of 2007. To participate, simply go to the following National Catholic Band Association web site, enter your identification code found at the top of this letter, and follow the online instructions: www.catholicschoolbands.org.

If you have any questions about the survey or you would like to obtain a personal copy of the results, please contact me or my advisor at the email addresses or phone numbers below. I hope you find the study to be interesting. I thank you very much for your assistance!

Musically yours,

Caron L. Collins  
collins.639@osu.edu  
614-519-0013

Dr. Jere Forsythe  
forsythe.1@osu.edu  
614-292-4659
APPENDIX B

ONLINE SURVEY
Survey of the Catholic Secondary School Instrumental Music Programs

SECTION ONE: Description of School and Enrollment

1. Name the state where your school is located and the code number at the top of your invitation.

   State: 
   Code number: 

2. What is the location of your school?

3. What are the grade levels offered in your school?

   - 7-12
   - 8-12
   - 9-12
   - 10-12
   - Other, please specify
4.
What is the total enrollment of your school?

5.
Does your school offer an instrumental music program? If NO, please answer and you will skip to section 6 of this survey.

6.
What is the total enrollment in your instrumental music program?

7.
Does your school have a separate room designated for musical instruction?

   - no
   - yes, a music rehearsal room
   - yes, a standard classroom
   - yes, auditorium or stage
   - yes, other room, please specify

8.
Does your school provide practice room(s) for small groups or individual practice?

   - YES
   - NO
9. Does your school provide separate storage room(s) for equipment, instruments, or uniforms?

- yes, ample storage and located near rehearsal room
- yes, ample storage but not located near rehearsal room
- yes, storage room nearby but is not sufficient
- yes, but storage room is neither ample or nearby
- no separate storage room

10. What is the percentage of students that drop out of your school instrumental music program each year, prior to graduation?

- [ ]

11. What is the primary reason students drop out?

- [ ] Drop out of school
- [ ] Transfer to another school within the area
- [ ] Move outside the area
- [ ] Scheduling conflicts
- [ ] Disinterest
- [ ] Other, please specify

- [ ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 What is the growth rate of new students joining your school instrumental music program each year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Over the past 3 to 5 years, what is the approximate percentage increase in the total student population of your school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Over the past 3 to 5 years, what is the approximate percentage decrease in the total student population of your school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey of the Catholic Secondary School Instrumental Music Programs

SECTION TWO: Description of Instrumental Music Program

15 Describe when instrumental music instruction is offered in your school.

- All classes and rehearsals are scheduled during the school day.
- Scheduled during the school day and supplemented with before/after school practices.
- All instruction is offered before or after school but students earn credits.
- All instruction is extra-curricular (before or after school) and no credit given.
- Other, please specify

16 Does your school have an orchestra?

- YES - NO

17 Does your school have a concert or symphonic band?

- YES - NO
18 Does your school have a marching band?

[YES] [NO]

19 Does your school have a pep band?

[YES] [NO]

20 Does your school have a jazz band?

[YES] [NO]

21 Does your school have brass, woodwind, or percussion ensembles?

[YES] [NO]

22 Does your school have other instrumental groups not listed above?

[YES] [NO]

If yes, please list groups:

[Text Box]
23  Does your school have auxiliary marching groups?

[YES] [NO]

If yes, please list groups:

24  Does your school require a fine arts credit for graduation?

[YES] [NO]

25  How many instrumental music teachers does your school have?

- One: part-time
- One: full-time
- Two: one full-time and one part-time
- Two: both full-time
- Other, please specify

26  Does your school instrumental music program have a booster organization?

[YES] [NO]
27. On average how many music classes or rehearsals do you teach per day?

28. On average how many non-music classes do you teach per day? (Do not include duties.)

29. How does your school organize the daily class schedule?
   - Individual class periods
   - Block scheduling
   - Rotating schedules
   - Modified block schedules
   - Other, please specify

30. On average how many total public performances do your instrumental music students perform per year?
31
What is the highest level of music that your school instrumental groups perform?

32
Do your school instrumental music students participate in competitions?
- Yes, large ensemble competitions
- Yes, solo and ensemble competitions
- Yes, both large ensemble and solo/ensemble competitions
- No

33
Does your school instrumental music program perform or participate with feeder school music programs?

34
In your opinion state your level of agreement with the following statements:

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

My school instrumental music program is currently strong and secure.

My school schedule provides for ample rehearsal time.
My school instrumental music program has a well stocked music library.

1  2  3  4

My school instrumental music program has adequate instruments and equipment.

1  2  3  4

My school program benefits from strong feeder school instrumental music programs.

1  2  3  4

I am satisfied with the facilities for my school instrumental music program.

1  2  3  4

I am satisfied with the abilities and achievements of my instrumental music students.

1  2  3  4
### SECTION THREE: Administrative Support

**35**

In your opinion state your level of agreement with the following statements:

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

- Members of the administration in my school attend all or most of our public music performances.
  - 1
- My administration provides sufficient financial support to fund my school instrumental music program.
  - 1
- My administration provides supportive public relations for my instrumental music program.
  - 1
- My administration models a positive attitude toward my instrumental music program to teachers, students, and parents.
  - 1
- Overall, I am satisfied with the administrative support for my instrumental music program.
  - 1
### SECTION FOUR: Parental Support

**36**

In your opinion state your level of agreement with the following statements:

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

I experience strong parent and/or family attendance at public performances of my instrumental music students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the parents or guardians are pleased with the students' musical abilities and performances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I experience positive communications with my students' parents or family members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My instrumental music activities are sufficiently assisted by parent volunteers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My students' parents/guardians provide their students with good quality instruments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our instrumental music program benefits from an active and supportive parent booster organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**SECTION FIVE: Educator Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 What type of state license or certificate do you currently hold?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 What is your highest college degree earned?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 How many total years have you taught?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 In how many schools do you teach?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Do you possess a teaching contract?</td>
<td>[Yes][No]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did you attend Catholic schools as a child? If so, what grade levels?

YES  NO

Additional Comment

Survey of the Catholic Secondary School Instrumental Music Programs

SECTION SIX: Miscellaneous

In the space provided please share any concerns you might have for the future of instrumental music in the Catholic Schools; personal school music success stories; or anything else you care to expand upon:
APPENDIX C

POSTCARD REMINDER
Dear Catholic School Music Teacher,

A few weeks ago I sent to you an invitation to participate in the first national **Secondary Catholic School Instrumental Music Survey.** Whether your school program is large or small, vibrant or struggling, your help is needed to get an accurate description of current status of instrumental music in our nation’s Catholic schools. Please go online today to the National Catholic Band Association website at [www.catholicbands.org](http://www.catholicbands.org) and click on **“links”** to be directed to the survey. Follow the online instructions and be sure to enter your code # __________ in question #1. The entire survey will take about 20 minutes to complete and the deadline to respond is January 31st. If you have any questions, please feel free to e-mail me at collins.639@osu.edu or call me at 614-519-0013. Thank you for your help!

**Caron Collins, doctoral candidate, OSU School of Music**
APPENDIX D

PAPER SURVEY
SURVEY OF CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC PROGRAMS

Instructions: Thank you for taking the time to answer this survey. The information you provide is an integral part of the entire picture of the Catholic secondary school instrumental music programs of the United States. If you teach at more than one school, please answer all questions as they pertain to the school to which this survey was sent. Please complete this survey in a private, uninterrupted environment with a reliable internet service. You are strongly encouraged, but not required, to answer all questions. Select the one best answer for each question or statement. Your answers will remain entirely confidential. The entire survey should take approximately 20-30 minutes.

Section One: Description of School and Enrollment

1. Name the state where your school is located ___________________Code #
   ______

2. What is the location of your school?
   ___ a. Urban
   ___ b. Suburban
   ___ c. Rural

3. What are the grade levels offered in your school?
   ___ a. 7-12
   ___ b. 8-12
   ___ c. 9-12
   ___ d. 10-12
   ___ e. other _____________

4. What is the total enrollment of your school?
   ___ a. Less than 500 students
   ___ b. 500 – 999 students
   ___ c. 1000-1500 students
   ___ d. Over 1500 students
5. Does your school offer an instrumental music program?
   ____a. yes
   ____b. no (if no, please skip to Section Six)

6. What is the total enrollment in your instrumental music program?
   ____a. Less than 50 students
   ____b. 50-99 students
   ____c. 100-150 students
   ____d. Over 150 students

7. Does your school have a separate room designated for musical instruction?
   ____a. yes, a music rehearsal room
   ____b. yes, a standard classroom
   ____c. yes, auditorium or stage
   ____d. yes, other room, please specify _______________________________
   ____e. no

8. Does your school provide practice rooms for small groups or individual practice?
   ____a. yes
   ____b. no

9. Does your school provide separate storage room(s) for equipment, instruments, or uniforms?
   ____a. yes, ample storage and located near rehearsal room
   ____b. yes, ample storage but not located near rehearsal room
   ____c. yes, storage room nearby but is not sufficient
   ____d. yes, but storage room is neither ample or nearby
   ____e. no separate storage room

10. What is the percentage of students that drop out of your school instrumental music program each year, prior to graduation?
    ____a. 0%
    ____b. 1-3%
    ____c. 4-6%
    ____d. 7-10%
    ____e. greater than 10%

11. What is the primary reason students drop out? (choose one)
    ____a. drop out of school
    ____b. transfer to another school within the area
    ____c. move outside the area
    ____d. scheduling conflicts
    ____e. disinterest
    ____f. other, please specify _________________________________________
12. What is the growth rate of new students joining your school instrumental music program each year?
   ____a. 0%
   ____b. 1-3%
   ____c. 4-6%
   ____d. 7-10%
   ____e. greater than 10%

13. Over the past 3 to 5 years, what is percentage increase in the total student population of your school?
   ____a. no increase in enrollment size
   ____b. 1-3% increase
   ____c. 4-6% increase
   ____d. 7-10% increase
   ____e. greater than 10%

14. Over the past 3 to 5 years, what is the percentage decrease in the total student population of your school?
   ____a. no decrease in enrollment size
   ____b. 1-3% decrease
   ____c. 4-6% decrease
   ____d. 7-10% decrease
   ____e. greater than 10%

**Section Two: Description of Instrumental Music Program**

15. Describe when instrumental music instruction is offered in your school.
   ____a. all classes and rehearsals are scheduled during the school day
   ____b. scheduled during the school day and supplemented with before/after school practices.
   ____c. all instruction is offered before or after school but students earn credits.
   ____d. all instruction is extra-curricular (before or after school) no credit given.
   ____e. other, please specify

16. Does your school have an orchestra?
   ____a. yes,
   ____b. no

17. Does your school have a concert or symphonic band?
   ____a. yes
   ____b. no
18. Does your school have a marching band?
   ____ a. yes
   ____ b. no

19. Does your school have a pep band?
   ____ a. yes
   ____ b. no

20. Does your school have a jazz band?
   ____ a. yes
   ____ b. no

21. Does your school have brass, woodwind, or percussion ensembles?
   ____ a. yes
   ____ b. no

22. Does your school have other instrumental groups not listed above?
   ____ a. yes, please list ____________________________
   ____ b. no

23. Does your school have auxiliary marching groups?
   ____ a. yes, please list ____________________________
   ____ b. no

24. Does your school require a fine arts credit for graduation?
   ____ a. yes
   ____ b. no

25. How many instrumental music teachers does your school have?
   ____ a. one: part-time
   ____ b. one: full-time
   ____ c. two: one full-time and one part-time
   ____ d. two: both full-time
   ____ e. other: please describe ____________________________

26. Does your school instrumental music program have a booster organization?
   ____ a. yes
   ____ b. no

27. On average how many music classes or rehearsals do you teach per day?
   ____ a. 1
   ____ b. 2
   ____ c. 3
   ____ d. 4
   ____ e. 5 or more
28. On average how many non-music classes do you teach per day? (Do not include duties.)
   ___ a. none
   ___ b. 1
   ___ c. 2
   ___ d. 3
   ___ e. 4 or more

29. How does your school organize the daily class schedule?
   ___ a. individual class periods
   ___ b. block scheduling
   ___ c. rotating schedules
   ___ d. modified block schedules
   ___ e. other, please specify __________________________________________

30. On average how many total public performances do your instrumental music students perform per year?
   ___ a. Many, 10 or more
   ___ b. Several, approximately 5-9
   ___ c. Few, 4 or less
   ___ d. None

31. What is the highest level of music that your school instrumental groups perform?
   ___ a. Grade 1
   ___ b. Grade 2
   ___ c. Grade 3
   ___ d. Grade 4
   ___ e. Grade 5 or higher

32. Do your school instrumental music students participate in competitions?
   ___ a. yes, large ensemble competitions
   ___ b. yes, solo and ensemble competitions
   ___ c. yes, both large ensemble and solo/ensemble competition
   ___ d. no

33. Does your school instrumental music program perform or participate with feeder school music programs?
   ___ a. yes
   ___ b. no
In your opinion state your level of agreement with the following statements:

34. My school instrumental music program is currently strong and secure.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

35. My school schedule provides for ample rehearsal time.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

36. My school instrumental music program is has a well stocked music library.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

37. My school instrumental music program has adequate instruments and equipment.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

38. This school program benefits from strong feeder school instrumental music programs.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

39. I am satisfied with the facilities provided for my school instrumental music program.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree
40. I am satisfied with the abilities and achievements of my instrumental music students.
   ___ a. agree  
   ___ b. somewhat agree  
   ___ c. somewhat disagree  
   ___ d. disagree

Section Three: Administrative Support

41. Members of the administration in my school attend all or most of our public music performances.
   ___ a. agree  
   ___ b. somewhat agree  
   ___ c. somewhat disagree  
   ___ d. disagree

42. My administration provides sufficient financial support to fund my school instrumental music program.
   ___ a. agree  
   ___ b. somewhat agree  
   ___ c. somewhat disagree  
   ___ d. disagree

43. My administration provides supportive public relations of my instrumental music program.
   ___ a. agree  
   ___ b. somewhat agree  
   ___ c. somewhat disagree  
   ___ d. disagree

44. My administration models a positive attitude toward my instrumental music program to teachers, students, and parents.
   ___ a. agree  
   ___ b. somewhat agree  
   ___ c. somewhat disagree  
   ___ d. disagree

45. Overall, I am satisfied with administrative support of my instrumental music program.
   ___ a. agree  
   ___ b. somewhat agree  
   ___ c. somewhat disagree  
   ___ d. disagree
Section Four: Parental Support

46. I experience strong parent and/or family attendance at public performances of my instrumental music students.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

47. Overall the parents or guardians are pleased with the students’ musical abilities and performances.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

48. I experience positive communications with my students’ parents or family members.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

49. My instrumental music activities are sufficiently assisted by parent volunteers.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

50. My students’ parents/guardians provide their students with good quality instruments.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree

51. Our instrumental music program benefits from an active and supportive parent booster organization.
   ____ a. agree
   ____ b. somewhat agree
   ____ c. somewhat disagree
   ____ d. disagree
Educator Information

52. What type of state license or certificate do you currently hold?
__________________

53. What is your highest college degree earned?
___ a. Bachelors
___ b. Masters
___ c. Doctorate

54. How many total years have you taught?
___ a. less than 5
___ b. 6-10 years
___ c. 11-15 years
___ d. 16 or more years

55. How many schools do you teach?
___ a. 1
___ b. 2
___ c. 3
___ d. 4
___ e. 5 or more

56. Do you possess a teaching contract?
___ a. yes
___ b. no

57. Did you attend Catholic schools as a child?
___ a. yes during the following grade levels: ________________
___ b. no

Section Six: Miscellaneous

58. In the space provided please share any concerns you might have for the future of instrumental music in the Catholic Schools; personal school music success stories; or anything else you care to expand upon:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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APPENDIX E

SURVEY DATA
SURVEY OF CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC PROGRAMS

Instructions: Thank you for taking the time to answer this survey. The information you provide is an integral part of the entire picture of the Catholic secondary school instrumental music programs of the United States. If you teach at more than one school, please answer all questions as they pertain to the school to which this survey was sent. Please complete this survey in a private and uninterrupted environment. You are strongly encouraged, but not required, to answer all questions. Select the one best answer for each question or statement, by marking your choice with an “X” and if applicable, short responses. Your answers will remain entirely confidential. The entire survey should take approximately 20-30 minutes.

Section One: Description of School and Enrollment

1. Name the state where your school is located ________________ Code #

   (Information was used for tracking purposes only.)

Table 21

States of Responding Teachers,
Frequency and Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is the location of your school?
   47%  a. Urban
   41%  b. Suburban
   12%  c. Rural

3. What are the grade levels offered in your school?
   12%  a. 7-12
   2.6%  b. 8-12
   79.5% c. 9-12
   0%  d. 10-12
   7%  e. other: K-12, PK-12, 12, ungraded age 6-21,

4. What is the total enrollment of your school?
   48.7% a. Less than 500 students
   31.6% b. 500 – 999 students
   17.1% c. 1000-1500 students
   2.6%  d. Over 1500 students
5. Does your school offer an instrumental music program?
   88.9% a. yes
   11.1% b. no (if no, please skip to Section Six)

6. What is the total enrollment in your instrumental music program?
   49.0% a. Less than 50 students
   30.8% b. 50-99 students
   16.3% c. 100-150 students
   3.8% d. Over 150 students

7. Does your school have a separate room designated for musical instruction?
   1.9% a. no
   73.6% b. yes, a music rehearsal room
   8.5% c. yes, a standard classroom
   4.7% d. yes, auditorium or stage
   11.3% e. yes, other room, please specify: 2 standard classrooms with the wall removed, band on gym stage, poorly planned band room with bad acoustics, trailer, separate building on campus, band/choral/instrument room, a larger classroom which accommodates vocal/hand bells, a large room with chairs/stands/lockers, choral room only with instrumental in studios, boiler room, band room shared with religion classes, shared music theatre.

8. Does your school provide practice rooms for small groups or individual practice?
   50% a. yes
   50% b. no

9. Does your school provide separate storage room(s) for equipment, instruments, or uniforms?
   25.5% a. yes, ample storage and located near rehearsal room
   0% b. yes, ample storage but not located near rehearsal room
   46.2% c. yes, storage room nearby but is not sufficient
   4.7% d. yes, but storage room is neither ample or nearby
   23.6% e. no separate storage room

10. What is the percentage of students that drop out of your school instrumental music program each year, prior to graduation?
    13.3% a. 0%
    49.0% b. 1-3%
    15.3% c. 4-6%
    8.2% d. 7-10%
    14.3% e. greater than 10%
11. What is the primary reason students drop out? (choose one)
   0% a. drop out of school
   6.4% b. transfer to another school within the area
   3.2% c. move outside the area
   71.3% d. scheduling conflicts
   10.6% e. disinterest
   8.5% f. other, please specify: difficulties in K-8 program, graduation, new
       teacher, orchestra is before school they can’t arrive on time, too easy/too
       difficult, athletic conflicts, too many responsibilities for upper classmen.

12. What is the growth rate of new students joining your school instrumental music
    program each year?
    7.1% a. 0%
    33.7% b. 1-3%
    21.4% c. 4-6%
    22.4% d. 7-10%
    15.3% e. greater than 10%

13. Over the past 3 to 5 years, what is percentage increase in the total student
    population of your school?
    49.5% a. no increase in enrollment size
    26.7% b. 1-3% increase
    13.9% c. 4-6% increase
    4.0% d. 7-10% increase
    5.9% e. greater than 10%

14. Over the past 3 to 5 years, what is the percentage decrease in the total student
    population of your school?
    62.6% a. no decrease in enrollment size
    22.2% b. 1-3% decrease
    6.1% c. 4-6% decrease
    6.1% d. 7-10% decrease
    3.0% e. greater than 10%
Section Two: Description of Instrumental Music Program

15. Describe when instrumental music instruction is offered in your school.
   42% a. all classes and rehearsals are scheduled during the school day
   44% b. scheduled during the school day and supplemented with before/after school practices.
   7% c. all instruction is offered before or after school but students earn credits.
   0% d. all instruction is extra-curricular (before or after school) no credit given.
   7% e. other, please specify

16. Does your school have an orchestra?
   21.8% a. yes,
   78.2% b. no

17. Does your school have a concert or symphonic band?
   82.2% a. yes
   17.8% b. no

18. Does your school have a marching band?
   40.4% a. yes
   59.6% b. no

19. Does your school have a pep band?
   64.4% a. yes
   35.6% b. no

20. Does your school have a jazz band?
   56.6% a. yes
   43.4% b. no

21. Does your school have brass, woodwind, or percussion ensembles?
   40% a. yes
   60% b. no

22. Does your school have other instrumental groups not listed above?
   40.2% a. yes, please list: string quintet, pit orchestras for musicals, steel drums, church band, music ministry team, drum lines, jazz trio, hand bells, jazz combos, chamber ensembles, jazz/rock ensembles, wind ensemble, symphonic band, piano, guitar ensembles, flute choir, violin, full orchestra, liturgical ensembles.
   59.8% b. no
23. Does your school have auxiliary marching groups?
   22.7% a. yes, please list: students participate in public school marching band, flag corps, dance team, color guard, winter guard, indoor drum line, rifles, honor guard.
   77.3% b. no

24. Does your school require a fine arts credit for graduation?
   87% a. yes
   13% b. no

25. How many instrumental music teachers does your school have?
   22.8% a. one: part-time
   51.5% b. one: full-time
   7.9% c. two: one full-time and one part-time
   7.9% d. two: both full-time
   9.9% e. other: please describe: four full time, one full time teaching Instrumental/vocal/theory/music appreciation, three full-time, two full-time with feeder school assignments, one full-time with 7 adjuncts, two part-time

26. Does your school instrumental music program have a booster organization?
   40% a. yes
   60% b. no

27. On average how many music classes or rehearsals do you teach per day?
   12% a. 1
   17% b. 2
   22% c. 3
   11% d. 4
   38% e. 5 or more

28. On average how many non-music classes do you teach per day? (Do not include duties.)
   74.7% a. none
   11.1% b. 1
   6.1% c. 2
   5.1% d. 3
   3.0% e. 4 or more
29. How does your school organize the daily class schedule?
   53.5% a. individual class periods
   11.1% b. block scheduling
   20.2% c. rotating schedules
   7.1% d. modified block schedules
   8.1% e. other, please specify: music non-rotating while others rotate, modular
   college prep, 5 day permanent schedule, rotating block schedules, class
   periods according to grade level.

30. On average how many total public performances do your instrumental music
   students perform per year?
   42.6% a. Many, 10 or more
   23.8% b. Several, approximately 5-9
   31.7% c. Few, 4 or less
   2.0% d. None

31. What is the highest level of music that your school instrumental groups perform?
   0% a. Grade 1
   13.1% b. Grade 2
   34.3% c. Grade 3
   31.3% d. Grade 4
   21.2% e. Grade 5 or higher

32. Do your school instrumental music students participate in competitions?
   9.9% a. yes, large ensemble competitions
   21.8% b. yes, solo and ensemble competitions
   34.7% c. yes, both large ensemble and solo/ensemble competition
   33.7% d. no

33. Does your school instrumental music program perform or participate with feeder
   school music programs?
   42.2% a. yes
   57.8% b. no

In your opinion state your level of agreement with the following statements:

34. My school instrumental music program is currently strong and secure.
   25.7% a. agree
   39.6% b. somewhat agree
   16.8% c. somewhat disagree
   17.8% d. disagree
35. My school schedule provides for ample rehearsal time.
   24.8% a. agree
   39.6% b. somewhat agree
   14.9% c. somewhat disagree
   20.8% d. disagree

36. My school instrumental music program is has a well stocked music library.
   19.8% a. agree
   28.7% b. somewhat agree
   20.8% c. somewhat disagree
   30.7% d. disagree

37. My school instrumental music program has adequate instruments and equipment.
   13.9% a. agree
   29.7% b. somewhat agree
   31.7% c. somewhat disagree
   24.8% d. disagree

38. This school program benefits from strong feeder school instrumental music programs.
   9% a. agree
   21% b. somewhat agree
   21% c. somewhat disagree
   49% d. disagree

39. I am satisfied with the facilities provided for my school instrumental music program.
   17.5% a. agree
   20.6% b. somewhat agree
   36.1% c. somewhat disagree
   25.8% d. disagree

40. I am satisfied with the abilities and achievements of my instrumental music students.
   29% a. agree
   50% b. somewhat agree
   12% c. somewhat disagree
   9% d. disagree
Section Three: Administrative Support

41. Members of the administration in my school attend all or most of our public music performances.
   59%  a. agree
   27%  b. somewhat agree
   5%   c. somewhat disagree
   9%   d. disagree

42. My administration provides sufficient financial support to fund my school instrumental music program.
   32%  a. agree
   32%  b. somewhat agree
   24%  c. somewhat disagree
   12%  d. disagree

43. My administration provides supportive public relations for my instrumental music program.
   42%  a. agree
   31%  b. somewhat agree
   16%  c. somewhat disagree
   11%  d. disagree

44. My administration models a positive attitude toward my instrumental music program to teachers, students, and parents.
   61%  a. agree
   22%  b. somewhat agree
   11%  c. somewhat disagree
   6%   d. disagree

45. Overall, I am satisfied with administrative support for my instrumental music program.
   49%  a. agree
   32%  b. somewhat agree
   7%   c. somewhat disagree
   12%  d. disagree

Section Four: Parental Support

46. I experience strong parent and/or family attendance at public performances of my instrumental music students.
   63.6% a. agree
   30.3% b. somewhat agree
   4.0%  c. somewhat disagree
   2.0%  d. disagree
47. Overall the parents or guardians are pleased with the students’ musical abilities and performances.
73.7% a. agree
24.2% b. somewhat agree
0% c. somewhat disagree
2.0% d. disagree

48. I experience positive communications with my students’ parents or family members.
74.5% a. agree
22.4% b. somewhat agree
2.0% c. somewhat disagree
1.0% d. disagree

49. My instrumental music activities are sufficiently assisted by parent volunteers.
38.8% a. agree
23.5% b. somewhat agree
22.4% c. somewhat disagree
15.3% d. disagree

50. My students’ parents/guardians provide their students with good quality instruments.
23.2% a. agree
46.5% b. somewhat agree
18.2% c. somewhat disagree
12.1% d. disagree

51. Our instrumental music program benefits from an active and supportive parent booster organization.
23.5% a. agree
22.4% b. somewhat agree
8.2% c. somewhat disagree
45.9% d. disagree

Educator Information

52. What type of state license or certificate do you currently hold?
(Various types listed. Information utilized for tracking purposes only.)

K-12 music, 2 year provisional, permanent, non-tax, lifetime, instrumental, 5 year, state certificates, Special type K-12, and initial.

None = 4 respondents
53. What is your highest college degree earned?
   46.5% a. Bachelors
   50.5% b. Masters
   3.0% c. Doctorate

54. How many total years have you taught?
   24.8% a. less than 5
   17.8% b. 6-10 years
   11.9% c. 11-15 years
   45.5% d. 16 or more years

55. How many schools do you teach?
   76.8% a. 1
   11.1% b. 2
   5.1% c. 3
   6.1% d. 4
   1.0% e. 5 or more

56. Do you possess a teaching contract?
   99% a. yes
   1% b. no

57. Did you attend Catholic schools as a child?
   44% a. yes during the following grade levels: K-2 and College, K-3 and 8-12,
   K-4, K-5, K-6, K-8, K-9, K-12, K-College, 1-2, 1-5, 1-6, 1-12, 1-College, 4-12, 6-12,
   7-12, 9-12, elementary, high school, all
   56% b. no

Section Six: Miscellaneous

58. In the space provided please share any concerns you might have for the future of
in instrumental music in the Catholic Schools; personal school music success stories; or
anything else you care to expand upon:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________