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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the impact of *No Child Left Behind* on music education in the State of Ohio. To accomplish this goal, the researcher sought to determine the attitude toward music education among Ohio’s public school principals and the relative status of the music programs in their schools since the passing of this federal legislation.

Survey research methods were employed to obtain the necessary data. A 25-item questionnaire was created by the researcher, validated by experts, and pilot tested with a small group of Ohio principals. Ten Likert-type items were utilized to measure principals’ attitudes while the remaining items helped the researcher determine the relative status of music programs with regard to staffing, student access, instructional
time, and course offerings. The questionnaire was sent to a random sample of 246 public school principals in Ohio. Usable returns were received from 179 principals, resulting in a response rate of 73%.

The overall attitude toward music education among Ohio principals was favorable. On a scale ranging from 6 to 36, the mean attitudinal score among principals was 25.1 with a standard deviation of 3.1. Significant differences between the attitudes of principals serving in “excellent” or “effective” schools and the principals of “academic watch” or “academic emergency” schools were revealed. When considering the expectation of principals that music teachers devote some of their instructional time to other subjects, 43% of Ohio’s music programs record a weaker status since the passage of No Child Left Behind. Finally, testimonials provided by several principals confirm that No Child Left Behind remains a contributing factor in principals’ policy decisions that affect music education.
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INTRODUCTION

In the latter decades of the Twentieth Century, the role of the arts in school curricula remained a topic of debate. A lack of distinction between art and entertainment blurred the public’s perception of the value of arts education, automatically placing the arts in an inferior position to conventional subjects (Hope, 1985). As a result, arts educators and advocates continuously had to refute the belief that their disciplines were extra-curricular. They were forced to address the notion that the arts were more akin to vocational training rather than an integral part of a complete education, and that instruction in the arts should be provided only for those identified as talented (Fowler, 1996). Despite these perceptions, the efforts of educational leaders did improve the arts’ academic standing. The Goals 2000: Educate America Act, passed by The United States
Congress in 1994, established the arts as a core subject. In official parlance, this Act made the arts equally important as reading, mathematics, social studies, science and foreign language in the education of a child, successfully elevating the arts beyond mere entertainment. In keeping with the spirit of this legislation, content standards were established for each of the arts disciplines: music, visual art, theatre and dance. Subsequently, a large-scale effort was initiated to align state and local curricula and assessment strategies with these standards. On the threshold of the Twenty-first Century, the arts looked forward to a brighter future. Growing evidence suggests, however, that continued optimism may not be warranted.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, renamed the No Child Left Behind Act when it sought reauthorization by Congress in 2001, currently influences education systems in myriad ways. Signed into law by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002, No Child Left Behind represents the federal government’s renewed response to a perceived deterioration of education in America. As many supporters of this law note, portions of a longitudinal study conducted by the Center on Educational Policy suggest that No Child Left Behind is having a positive effect on the academic achievement of the students of our nation (Jennings & Rentner, 2006). However, this celebrated result does not come without a price.

Evidence exists that No Child Left Behind may be punitive to the arts. The era of accountability catalyzed by the Act forced officials in one school district to eliminate a music teaching position in order to secure additional funds for reading and mathematics (Anonymous, 2005). Even more devastating, however, was the diminished importance of music conveyed by the district superintendent. His statement, expressing the notion that
if music were truly important it would be among the tested subjects (Anonymous, 2005), is likely echoed among many administrators desperately trying to negotiate testing mandates and achievement benchmarks. In fact, another anecdote that details the demise of an interdisciplinary project between English, history, foreign language, music, and art, culminated in another administrator proclaiming that “art [was] a luxury for a school now on probation” (Hommel, 2005). Furthermore, elementary schools in Bellingham, Washington are reported to devote up to seventy percent of instructional time on reading and mathematics, leaving little time for other subjects and taking the joy out of school for many of the students (EveryHope, 2007). These anecdotes, and many others, detail a potentially negative effect of *No Child Left Behind*: the unprecedented narrowing of the curriculum (Jennings & Rentner, 2006).

Although *No Child Left Behind* refers to music and the other arts as core subjects, the legislation does not encourage achievement in the core subjects with equal fortitude. Currently, schools and districts are held accountable only for students’ achievement in reading and mathematics, with science slated as the next discipline to be subject to accountability measures. As noted, schools and districts, fearful of the sanctions that accompany failing test scores, have focused attention and resources almost exclusively on these subjects (Meyer, 2003). This practice has left the arts and other core disciplines vulnerable to devastating cutbacks and extinction. By virtue of neither endorsing nor criticizing such curricular decisions (Dillon, 2006), the federal Department of Education implies that these truncated curricula remain part of “a clear and detailed plan for making our public schools excellent, so that every child in this country can have access to a quality education” (Paige, 2001). While the Department of Education may be content to
ignore the narrowing effect of *No Child Left Behind*, others fear the ramifications of a limited educational palette.

According to a key policy document from the National Endowment for the Arts, “A balanced education is essential to an enlightened citizenry and a productive workforce, and a balanced education must include comprehensive and sequential study in the three great branches of learning – the arts, humanities, and sciences” (1988). Likewise, the Council for Basic Education believes that access to a well-rounded, arts-inclusive education is a “largely unacknowledged prerequisite to equal opportunity,” and, therefore, remains an essential birthright of every American (Zastrow & Janc, 2004). Few would argue against these statements. Yet, many school officials sense pressure to marginalize the curricular position of the arts in an effort to ensure student success in reading and mathematics. While this effort may help schools meet the accountability mandates outlined in *No Child Left Behind*, will the students of these schools gain a deep appreciation and understanding of our culture and civilization? Will they develop the creativity needed to interact with an ever-changing, technology-infused world? Will they acquire the tools of communication required to effectively engage our increasingly global society? These questions illustrate a sampling of what schools risk losing from their educational programs when the role of the arts is marginalized. Responsible citizens and educators objectively must weigh these risks against any benefits that *No Child Left Behind* promises. Failure to do so may narrow education in ways unacceptable to students, parents, and society as a whole.
Statement of Purpose

Since 2002, narrowing the public school curriculum represented a means by which schools and districts might meet the accountability demands outlined in *No Child Left Behind*. As anecdotal evidence suggests, narrowing the curriculum previously has been accomplished by marginalizing school music programs in every corner of our nation. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to ascertain the impact that *No Child Left Behind* has had on music education in the State of Ohio. The researcher hopes that the results of this study will fortify the thrust of the anecdotal accounts that inspired the inquiry, offer a current description of Ohio’s public school music programs, and provide a foundation for future research.

Statement of the Problem

In order to determine the impact that *No Child Left Behind* has had on music education in Ohio, the immediate problem undertaken by the researcher was to investigate the curricular stature of the state’s music programs. Additionally, the researcher sought to uncover the prevailing attitude toward music education among Ohio’s public school principals. This effort was thought necessary because attitude, by definition, remains a predisposition to respond in a particular manner. Since school curricula are often modified to account for the testing and achievement mandates of *No Child Left Behind*, principals’ attitudes may determine the extent to which music programs are affected.
Research Questions and Objectives

As noted, one potential effect of *No Child Left Behind* could be that music programs become marginalized in the core curriculum. As such, determining if Ohio is experiencing some of these reported trends, or if its principals have found a successful way to negotiate the legislation without detriment to the music programs of their schools, remains the primary focus of the study. To accomplish this endeavor, the following research questions were developed to provide direction for the inquiry:

1. What is the attitude toward music education among Ohio principals?
2. What is the status of Ohio’s public school music programs with regard to staffing, student access, instructional time and course offerings?
3. What is the relationship between principals’ attitudes and the status of their school music program?
4. What is the relationship between the status of the music program and the academic rating of the school?
5. What is the relationship between the status of the music program and the educational level of the school?
6. What is the relationship between the status of the music program and the educational community of which the school is a part?
7. Have the requirements and pressures associated with *No Child Left Behind* had an impact on the status of Ohio’s music programs?
8. If an impact is noted by Ohio principals, which areas of the music program are affected most?
Definitions of Essential Terms

ACADEMIC RATING: The academic ratings of Ohio schools correspond to the higher of the number of state indicators met by the school or its overall performance index score. This school characteristic is public knowledge and was obtained by the researcher from the Ohio Department of Education’s website: www.ode.state.oh.us. While grade configuration may lead some schools to remain unrated, most schools will be classified according to the following rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th># of indicators met</th>
<th>Performance index score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>24 or 25</td>
<td>100 – 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>19 – 23</td>
<td>90 – 99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>13 – 18</td>
<td>80 – 89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement*</td>
<td>0 – 18</td>
<td>0 – 89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Watch</td>
<td>9 – 12</td>
<td>70 – 79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emergency</td>
<td>0 – 8</td>
<td>0 – 69.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) goals, regardless of the number of indicators met or overall performance index score, may achieve a rating of Continuous Improvement.

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP): As defined by the Ohio Department of Education, AYP is the federal mandate that holds schools accountable for the performance of all students and all student subgroups. “The goals for schools, districts, and states are to meet or exceed annual objectives or make progress over the previous year” (www.ode.state.oh.us).
ATTITUDE TOWARD MUSIC EDUCATION: Principals’ attitudes toward music education indicate the level of favorableness they feel toward music and its importance in the education of children. Accordingly, “attitude toward music education” is operationally reflected in the summated score of the responses that principals provide on six of the ten Likert-type items, scaled 1 to 6, contained in the researcher-generated instrument titled “NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education.” Attitudinal scores will be classified using the following rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudinal Score</th>
<th>Attitudinal Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 9</td>
<td>Extremely Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 14</td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 20</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 26</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 – 32</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 32</td>
<td>Extremely Favorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY: Educational community refers to the general size and scope of the area in which a school exists. For this study, subjects will self-select their educational community as either “urban,” “suburban,” or “rural” in item 23 of the measurement instrument titled “NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education.”
MUSIC PROGRAM STATUS: The status of a music program refers to the relative condition of the program since the implementation of the *No Child Left Behind Act* in 2002. Status designations will be “stronger,” “weaker” or “unchanged.” Music program status is operationally defined as a summation of the net gain/loss of certified music staff, student access, course offerings, and time allotted for music study reported by Ohio principals in items 11 through 22 in the measurement instrument titled “NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education.” A rationale for these policy practices will also be solicited from the respondents.

*Need for the Study*

Society trusts its lawmakers to keep the public’s interest in mind as they create and propose policies that will govern the daily lives of its people. However, despite lawmakers’ best intentions, not all of their policies serve the greater good. As a relatively new law, the lasting impact of *No Child Left Behind* has yet to be determined. While many credit the law with advancing education in America, others perceive it to complicate the already difficult task of improving the academic achievement of our nation’s youth. For this reason, studies measuring the effects of *No Child Left Behind* are needed to keep both policy makers and stakeholders informed about the ongoing influence of the legislation, especially since some effects may not be initially obvious.

Not until the third installment of *From the Capitol to the Classroom* did the Center on Educational Policy report a narrowing of the public school curriculum as an
effect of *No Child Left Behind*. Regarding the arts, the same report stated 43% of school districts that require their schools to devote a specific amount of instructional time to reading language arts and/or mathematics have, to some degree, reduced instructional time for art and music (Rentner et al., 2005). Specifically, 23% of the districts reduced instructional time for art and music “minimally,” while 11% of the districts report their reductions as “somewhat.” The districts making up the final 9% reduced art and music instruction “to a great extent” (Rentner et al., 2005). When considering these data, the question that emerges among arts education policy researchers is whether such findings will develop into a trend.

In its fourth year, *From the Capitol to the Classroom* continued to cite the narrowing of the public school curriculum as an effect of *No Child Left Behind*. In this year, however, 46% of schools lessened instructional time for art and music, indicating a 3% increase over the previous year (Rentner et al., 2006). Among the districts that require their schools to devote a specific amount of instructional time to reading language arts and/or mathematics, 24% reduced instructional time for art and music “minimally,” 13% reported reductions as “somewhat,” and 9% reduced time for art and music “to a great extent” (Rentner et al., 2006). While these data seem to confirm an emerging, negative trend, the data may not fully capture the extent to which art and music programs have been affected by *No Child Left Behind*. Beyond an inability to ascertain the discrete impact felt by either visual art or music, the response questionnaire utilized by the Center on Educational Policy fails to define the terms “minimally,” “somewhat,” and “to a great extent,” leaving their interpretation to the district representative who completed the questionnaire. The present study, which strives to solicit data at higher levels of
measurement, may help to illuminate recent findings and better determine the impact of No Child Left Behind on music. To date, no studies have been found that isolate the legislation’s impact on music or the other arts.

In many ways, No Child Left Behind remains a belated response to the recommendations set forth in A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. This document might have banished music and the other arts to the curricular fringe when it recommended a more rigorous curriculum grounded in the “Five New Basics:” English, mathematics, science, social studies, and computer science. (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). However, despite being alluded to as curricular desserts, the arts continued to flourish in most schools, and ultimately achieved core status in 1994. Now, as No Child Left Behind embraces and reaffirms the recommendation of A Nation at Risk with a mandated emphasis on reading and mathematics, the position of music and the other arts appears to be at risk of becoming more peripheral.

In examining both scientific and anecdotal sources, sufficient evidence exists to suggest that No Child Left Behind is having an impact on music programs across the country. The magnitude of this impact, however, has not been thoroughly defined. This study is needed to quantify perceived consequences of the legislation and ensure that policy makers remain cognizant of its impact on student learning and achievement in all of the core subjects. By uncovering a more precise depiction of Ohio’s music programs in the wake of No Child Left Behind, this study may help to guarantee that future students will be offered a comprehensive, arts-inclusive curriculum that provides the best chance for success in our global society.
Assumptions of the Study

The researcher made several assumptions in conducting this study. These assumptions are:

1. That, by virtue of random sampling, schools of various educational communities, grade levels, and academic ratings will be properly represented in the study;
2. That each school will have met the minimum conditions of the Ohio operating standards by having included music in its comprehensive curriculum and established a course of study for each of the music courses offered;
3. That considering the net gain/loss of certified staff, instructional time, course offerings, and student access constitutes an appropriate measure of the status of music programs;
4. That principals’ attitudinal responses are truthful presentations of their personal beliefs; and
5. That principals new to buildings will consult with other faculty or administrators to determine what has occurred in the school since 2002, thus giving an accurate history of the music program uninfluenced by the short tenure of the principal.
Limitations of the Study

As this study attempts to determine the impact of *No Child Left Behind* on music education in the State of Ohio, identifying and accounting for every outcome, either positive or negative that may have resulted from this legislation, remains impossible. Therefore, in light of the assumptions, the following limitations are acknowledged:

1. The study remains focused on the issues represented in the questionnaire items. The researcher makes no claim that such issues represent an exhaustive list of the issues and concerns associated with *No Child Left Behind*.

2. Although *No Child Left Behind* remains a federal mandate, results of this inquiry may be generalized to public schools and public school principals only in the State of Ohio.

Overview of the Study

The first chapter of this study, intended primarily as an introduction, has familiarized the reader with *No Child Left Behind* and contextualized the inquiry. In doing so, the researcher articulated both the purpose of the study and the immediate problem addressed. Chapter Two will highlight selected literature related to the study. The reader can expect that research investigating principals’ attitudes toward music education and the effects of policy on music education will be explored. Research procedures, including sampling technique, the development of the measurement
instrument, and the conduct of the study, will be described in Chapter Three. A presentation of the study results as they relate to the specific research questions will be offered in Chapter Four. Finally, Chapter Five will contain a discussion of the study results in light of current literature, a summary of the study findings, and suggestions that might encourage future inquiries of this timely topic.
LITERATURE REVIEW

In an ideal world, most school administrators would exercise a positive attitude toward the study of music and the other arts. Evidence for this claim is reflected in the overwhelming support of The National Association for Music Education (MENC) statement regarding “The Value and Quality of Arts Education” (1999). The American Association of School Administrators and both National Associations for Elementary and Secondary School Principals have championed the beliefs outlined in this resolution. Among these beliefs are that every student in the nation, pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade, should have an education in the arts. Additionally, the arts should be recognized as serious, academic subjects and part of a core curriculum (MENC, 1999). Considering
that the world of education is far less than ideal, one might reasonably ask if these beliefs can be sustained under less than desirable conditions.

*Attitudes of Administrators*

In the State of Ohio, several studies have attempted to illuminate a discrepancy between administrators’ ideal beliefs about music and the actual position of music in the curricula of their schools. One of the first of these studies was conceived by Jones in 1961. Conducted in a previous era of educational reform, this study addressed the necessity to defend the position of music and other subjects in the curriculum as education sought to emphasize science and mathematics. This emphasis was catalyzed by a perceived technology gap between the United States and the Soviet Union, vividly evidenced by the success of Sputnik and the failure of the United States’ Vanguard Project (NASA, 2007). Ultimately, a diminished opinion of music was revealed when 78% of the principals participating in the study reported that although music was important, it should be considered an *elective* (Jones, 1961). The status of music slipped further when 50% of the principals claimed that music was not equally important as other non-compulsory courses. Only 38% of principals believed that music held the same curricular position as trigonometry, physics, foreign languages, and other recognized electives (Jones, 1961).

Jones’ study also revealed that while 16% of secondary school principals believed that all students should study music during high school, only nine percent of the principals’ schools offered a curriculum that could provide all students with musical
experiences. These results were lower than those recorded by Dahlinger (1957), who, prior to the Sputnik launch, reported that 35% of Ohio administrators favored requiring a general music course in high school.

Another Ohio-based study was conducted by Clay in 1972. In many ways, this inquiry provided a replication for Jones’ 1961 study. According to Clay (1972), 100% of the administrators participating in the study believed that music programs were an important component of American schools. Only 45% of administrators, however, believed whole-heartedly that all kindergarten through eighth grade students should be required to study music. Even fewer administrators believed that students should have some musical experiences in high school. Only 23% of the respondents indicated this belief (Clay, 1972). As such, a clear opinion among administrators emerged: being musically educated was not necessary for using or enjoying music. Valuing music did not equate with valuing music education. This belief was further advanced when Clay reported that 52% of the administrators said they would be willing to eliminate music in order to retain academic programs (1972). Considering that 64% of the parents indicated they would support such action, one can speculate that the curricular position of music became less firm in the decade leading up to Clay’s investigation.

Beyond Ohio, researchers were uncovering similar results. A study conducted by Fields, measuring the beliefs about music among California’s elementary school principals, revealed that in times of budgetary crisis, music programs, especially those in instrumental music, would be among the most vulnerable to cutbacks (1982). The significance of this finding was that principals maintained this belief in spite of an articulated philosophy regarding the role of music in the school curriculum. As such,
Fields concluded that the most important factor that would protect instrumental music programs from significant reductions was administrative support (1982).

In Kansas, Radocy (1987) found that the overall opinion toward music among school district superintendents was favorable. Furthermore, music programs appeared to be the best supported among all the areas of arts instruction. When forced to make a decision, however, administrators believed that arts courses, including music, were less important than academics and should not be required for graduation. Radocy, like other researchers throughout history, concluded that statements of endorsement from administrators are of little value and in no way guarantee music a place in the public school curriculum (Jones, 1961; Radocy, 1987; Lehman, 1992). As Samuel Hope noted in 1985, “all those spouting rhetoric about the arts are not brimming with interest in the rigorous educational processes necessary to develop significant knowledge and understanding of the arts disciplines among the American people.”

Like Radocy, Wise (1987) determined the prevailing attitude toward music education among Florida’s secondary principals to be generally favorable. Notably, a majority of the principals participating in this study indicated that they evaluate the effectiveness of a music program by considering awards, competition results, and student enrollment. In this regard, principals remained significantly different from music professionals. Thus, Wise concluded that principals tend to regard music’s extrinsic values more highly than its intrinsic values (1987).

Monroe extended the work of Jones and Clay with another comparative study of the opinions of music teachers, principals, and professors of music education in the State of Ohio. Monroe’s study found that 82% of principals reported that music [was]
important, but should be considered an elective for all who desire to study [it] (Monroe, 1994). Furthermore, Monroe reported only 12% of the principals expressed the opinion that every high school student had a need for musical development. In lieu of these results, the researcher was not surprised that only 21% of principals believed that an education in music was valuable in and of itself and 24% of administrators expressed that classes like music history, music theory, or music appreciation were too specialized to be included in the high school curriculum (Monroe, 1994). Instead, principals recommended that students pursue such interests outside of the school curriculum.

*Accountability Systems*

In his most recent State of the Union Address, President George W. Bush credited the *No Child Left Behind Act* with raising standards in our nation’s schools and facilitating increased student achievement in reading and mathematics (2007). As mentioned in Chapter One, selected findings of the Center on Educational Policy that point to increased student test scores may indeed support the President’s statement. Several educational leaders, however, question the true impact of *No Child Left Behind* on our nation’s schools.

The research of Carnoy, Elmore, and Siskin confirmed, as most would expect, that individual schools respond differently to accountability systems like the one outlined in *No Child Left Behind* (2003). It is equally true, then, that schools should expect varying results. Contrary to this logic, schools’ results have remained remarkably similar. In a study spanning four states that subscribe to high-stakes testing, high schools
report only slight to modest gains in standardized test scores. Furthermore, these gains consistently fail to correlate with students’ grades, SAT scores, graduation rates, and other measures of student achievement (Carnoy, Elmore, & Siskin, 2003). These data contribute to the frustration of George H. Wood, principal of Federal Hocking High School in Stewart, Ohio, who has “searched in vain to find any study that says our children graduate as better employees, college students, or citizens as a result of taking more tests” (2004). Other similarities focus on the type of school most often identified for improvement. According to the Center on Educational Policy, middle-level and urban-district schools are more likely to struggle with meeting accountability standards (Rentner, et. al., 2005). The number of Title 1 middle schools failing to meet adequate yearly progress goals under No Child Left Behind increased from 18% in the 2002-2003 school year to 36% in the 2004-2005 school year. Similarly, 42% of all Title 1 schools failing to meet adequate yearly progress goals come from urban school districts (Rentner, et. al., 2005).

Testing is currently driving education. As expressed by Wood, “School people are no fools. Tell them what they will be measured on and they will try to measure up” (2004). As an example, Maine and Maryland have abandoned successful performance assessment systems in favor of the testing requirements of No Child Left Behind (Berger, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2004). Many schools in Texas require teachers to spend a large percentage of instructional time drilling students on commercial, test-preparation materials (McNeil, 2004). Mindful of the sanctions that accompany failing test scores, school administrators are quick to support transmission models of teaching. These officials rationalize that such practices remain more predictable in assuring students
acquire necessary information needed to pass mandated tests (Brooks & Brooks, 1993). Teachers, too, have reluctantly embraced “skill and drill” teaching methods. According to *No Child Left Behind*, teachers also face reprimand or dismissal if their students do not perform well on standardized tests. This reality has convinced educators to “teach to the test,” despite knowing that such practices are not in the best interest of students (Snow-Gerono & Franklin, 2007; Olsafsky, 2006).

Another consequence of accountability systems, then, is frustration and job dissatisfaction among educators. An often-cited frustration with *No Child Left Behind* is that it influences teaching practice without soliciting input from teachers (Proctor, 2005). As Ingersoll warns, if accountability systems continue to increase pressure on teachers while at the same time reducing their resources and autonomy, many teachers will ultimately choose to leave the profession (2004). Already, as many as 46% of our nation’s teachers leave the profession within five years (Ingersoll, 2002). Additional resignations among educators may hinder the goal of *No Child Left Behind* to assure that all of our students learn from a “highly qualified teacher” (Darling-Hammond, 2004).

Disagreement about the value and nature of accountability systems has led many schools and districts to adopt extreme courses of action. Since the start of the 2002-2003 school year, at least twenty states and a number of schools and districts have officially protested the *No Child Left Behind Act*, withdrawing from participation, withholding local funding, and/or imposing a line-item veto on specific provisions contained in the law. Vermont has even threatened to refuse federal funding in order to preserve its state assessment system (Darling-Hammond, 2004).
Many scholars believe that *No Child Left Behind*, or any accountability system with an uncompromising aim at 100% compliance, will ultimately do more harm than good for students and schools (Darling-Hammond, 2004). A study by Nichols, Glass and Berliner suggests that the increased testing pressure *No Child Left Behind* places on our students is directly related to a larger number of school drop outs (2005). Schools fare no better. According to Wiley, Mathis and Garcia, nearly all of the schools in the Great Lakes Region will be labeled “failing” by 2014 for missing adequate yearly progress goals (2005).

In Ohio, despite consistent and notable gains in standardized test scores and graduation rates, the number of schools that successfully meet adequate yearly progress goals has steadily decreased since 2003 (Ohio Department of Education, 2006). Eighty-three percent of Ohio’s schools met their progress goals in the 2003-2004 school year. Only 61% of the state’s schools met their goals in the 2005-2006 school year (ODE, 2006). By 2014, the number of Ohio schools meeting progress goals is projected to be only 12% (Wiley, Mathis & Garcia, 2005). Under the constraints of a rigid accountability system like *No Child Left Behind*, the question is not if a school will fail, but rather, when a school will fail.
In the 1980’s, a considerable amount of research in education focused on the concept of time. Investigators, perhaps reacting to the call-to-action sentiment of *A Nation at Risk*, sought to determine the influence of instructional time on student learning and achievement. Now, in an era of greater accountability, instructional time has become a discretionary resource, and demand for time far exceeds supply. Indeed, all subject specialists wish for more instructional time. The problem, of course, is that time remains a finite resource. As such, the line of research that follows may aid school administrators as they strive to make sensitive and informed allocations of instructional time among all content disciplines.

In their meta-analysis, Hossler, Stage and Gallagher identified five strategies commonly employed to increase instructional time: lengthen the school year, lengthen the school day, reallocate time within the school day, improve resources and teachers’ time management skills, and increase student homework (1988). While cost analysis indicates that investing in teachers and teaching resources remains the most cost effective strategy (Levin, 1984), no definitive method for increasing instructional time was identified (Hossler, Stage & Gallagher, 1988). Furthermore, the reviewed research generally supported the claim that increasing instructional time only modestly benefits learning. The relationship between instructional time and student achievement, however, was not as strong. Accordingly, the researchers warned policy makers that implementing any time-increasing strategy would not guarantee noticeable gains in student achievement (Hossler, Stage & Gallagher, 1988).
One study that did show a positive relationship between allocated instructional time and student achievement was conducted by Jacobson in 1980. Through experimentation, Jacobson noticed that third-grade students attained greater achievement in mathematics when instructional time was increased (1980). While less frequently observed, the results of Jacobson’s study are not unique. The student-participants of another study conducted by Brown and Saks also experienced improvement in mathematics and reading as a result of increased instructional time (1986). Furthermore, Dewalt and Rodwell observed that the achievement of middle-level students enrolled in remedial science classes also increased when learning time was extended (1988).

Contrary to these findings, educational leaders must not overestimate the effect of increasing instructional time. According to Levin, the true impact of increased instructional time on student achievement cannot be determined without considering the interaction of time with other determinants of learning, most notably the students (1984). Time, combined with the students’ capacity to learn, academic effort, and the availability of quality teachers and resources is most often the catalyst for increased student achievement (Levin, 1984). Aware of the ability of thoughtful and skilled teachers to inspire learning in all students, Paul Lehman suggested that the most pressing need for education today was not an increase of instructional time, but rather “a massive, systematic, and focused effort to improve the quality of instruction” (2004). Lowe and Gervais, who reported that too much instructional time is being wasted in today’s classrooms, agree (1988).
Research and practice suggest, rather vehemently, that increasing instructional time alone has little effect on student achievement (Levin, 1984; NEA, 1987; Nelson, 1990). As noted by the Virginia Department of Education, instructional time and student achievement share a complex, non-linear relationship; an increase in one does not necessitate or guarantee an increase in the other (1992). The abundance of confounding variables embedded within the teaching and learning process has prevented researchers from delineating the true relationship between increased instructional time and achievement.

Music Education and No Child Left Behind

Standards can legitimize a content area and elevate its importance within schools and districts (Siskin, 2003). Indeed, the formation and adoption of standards ultimately led to the arts’ “core” status under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994. According to Paul Lehman (2004), former president of the National Association for Music Education, standards have empowered the music education profession to accomplish the following:

- Identify and focus the efforts of music education on its highest priorities;
- Clarify and bring equity to teachers’ expectations of students;
- Develop a seamless music curriculum between educational levels;
- Demonstrate that music education in not merely entertainment;
• Justify requests for additional resources;
• Provide a means for assessing student learning in music;
• Provide a basis for professional development.

Despite these legitimizing gains, the federal government has not completely or convincingly embraced the arts. “Too many schools still lack the staff, time, and other resources required to implement [arts’] standards fully” (Lehman, 2004). When President Bush, at the signing of the No Child Left Behind Act, proclaimed that the job of our nation’s schools was “to teach the basics and teach them well” (2002), the role of the arts in a child’s education was implicitly devalued. The greater importance of reading and mathematics, clearly illustrated by No Child Left Behind, destines music and the other arts to remain relatively unimportant.

Although little scientific evidence exists to support the claim that No Child Left Behind is having a negative effect on music education, the sheer volume of anecdotal evidence is noteworthy. Many educators, in addition to those cited in Chapter One, have documented varied consequences of the legislation. A music teacher from the Evanston School District #65 outside of Chicago, Illinois, reports that students are pulled from arts classes to focus more on basic skills. Furthermore, after-school intervention groups were created to provide remedial help for students in many academic areas, precipitating a notable decline in student participation in performance ensembles that regularly meet outside of the school day (Allen, 2007). In the Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation in Indiana, the elementary instrumental music program was ultimately
eliminated, as well as nine teaching positions held by instrumental music specialists (Lichtenberg, 2007).

A music teacher turned middle school principal experienced first-hand the dilemma that many administrators face when simultaneously trying to maintain exemplary music programs and meet the minimum accountability standards demanded by No Child Left Behind. During a two-year period, his school eliminated one full-time music position, beginning band instruction, two performing groups, and canceled the school musicals (Conrad, 2006). The pro-music reputation of his school was not enough to thwart the reductions. While consequences of this magnitude cannot be disguised, other consequences of No Child Left Behind are more subtle, and go unnoticed.

Future music teachers should be prepared to devote some of their instructional time to other subjects, especially reading and mathematics. In fact, Lyn McCarty, a school administrator from Sacramento, California, believes that teachers who are able to “articulate a philosophy related to the teaching of reading” will be among the most employable in future years (2001). Furthermore, McCarty states that many administrators “are rethinking how much of the time traditionally spent teaching core content can be shifted over to the direct instruction of functional reading in all [content] classrooms” (2001). Music advocacy groups have also recognized this trend. “No Child Left Behind and What it Means for Music Educators,” a web-based article sponsored by The Music Education Madness Site, encourages music specialists to routinely incorporate the teaching of reading in their lessons and document the practice in stated objectives (www.musiceducationmadness.com, Rec. 2). The same article also encouraged music
educators to actively pursue interdisciplinary lessons with other classroom teachers (www.musiceducationmadness.com, Rec. 5). Music educators know that these efforts will ultimately benefit students, evidenced by the “healthy and desirable collaboration that music teachers and classroom teachers have enjoyed in the past” (Kassner, 2002). But now, in the era of No Child Left Behind, such efforts are motivated by survival rather than students’ best interest.

These phenomena, part of the narrowing of public school curricula, have garnered the attention of the Center on Educational Policy. Its longitudinal study, From the Capitol to the Classroom, has been documenting the marginalization of the arts and other academic disciplines as an effect of No Child Left Behind. This report stated that in 2005, 43% of school districts that require their schools to devote a specific amount of instructional time to reading language arts and/or mathematics have, to some degree, reduced instructional time for art and music (Rentner et al., 2005). The percentage of school districts reducing instructional time for art and music increased to 46% in 2006 (Rentner et al., 2006). While data for the current year are not yet available, many arts constituencies wonder if this negative trend will continue.

The combination of anecdotal and scientific evidence that supports the belief that No Child Left Behind is detrimental to music programs has not escaped the attention of the MENC leadership. Recent past presidents of the National Association for Music Education have gone on record to express the concerns of the music education profession. Willie Hill recognized that the educational reform called for in No Child Left Behind would usurp a larger amount of already limited resources. Consequently, Hill warned
music educators that the inevitable shortage of time and money could lead to a significant loss of music programs across the nation (2003). To minimize potential losses, Hill used his position as MENC President to encourage the profession to reconnect with communities. According to Hill, increased advocacy efforts regarding the value of music to both individuals and schools were necessary to ensure continued support for music education (2003).

During his tenure as MENC President, David Circle also acknowledged the increasing influence of No Child Left Behind on music education. As predicted by Hill, reports of limited resources and reduced instructional time for music increased during Circle’s presidency (2003). Circle viewed this negative reality as symptomatic of the perception that music and other non-high-stakes testing disciplines were less important than other, tested subjects. Circle’s response, then, aimed at reminding stakeholders of music’s unique ability to touch all facets of human existence; the mental, physical, and emotional (2004).

Despite warnings and advocacy initiatives, music teachers are more frequently and prematurely opting to leave the teaching profession, citing a lack of administrative support and dissatisfaction with workplace conditions as primary reasons (Luekens, Lyter & Fox, 2004; Madsen & Hancock, 1995). In Ohio, teacher departures occur most often in urban and high-poverty schools, as well as schools that are rated either “Academic Watch” or “Academic Emergency” (ODE, 2005). Indeed, as Flinders asks, “will teachers want to invest their careers in a school that has already been declared ‘failing’?” (2007). Nationally, the American Association for Employment in Education estimates that 30 to
50% of teachers, regardless of content specialty, will leave teaching within five years (2001). Attrition rates in Ohio remained steady at approximately 7% between 1998 and 2002, but increased dramatically at the end of the 2003-2004 school year. The 10,202 teachers that departed from the profession was the highest number in recent years and represented 11% of Ohio’s teaching force (ODE, 2005). Considering music, 56% of the discipline’s available positions for the 2004-2005 school year were created by teacher attrition. Furthermore, 14% of these positions were either left unfilled or offered to an educator that was not licensed to teach music (ODE, 2005), perhaps indicating a smaller number of music teachers are choosing to enter the teaching profession.

Making the Case for Music Education

Numerous doctoral dissertations, journal articles, and other research-based manuscripts have resulted from inquiries exploring the relationship between music study and academic achievement. A recent meta-analysis of this literature was conducted by Hodges and O’Donnell, who arrived at no more than a “mid-position” on the issue (2007). “At one extreme the data do not support the contention that music will necessarily improve academic performance and at the other extreme there is certainly no basis for saying that music instruction has no effect on academic achievement” (Hodges & O’Donnell, 2007). As in the discussion of Student Achievement and Instructional Time, too many confounding variables have prevented researchers from uncovering the true relationship between music study and academic achievement. Considering that No
Child Left Behind endeavors to increase students’ academic success, a definitive and more positive relationship between music study and achievement might have assured music a prominent role in the education of our nation’s children. Other musical values, however, provide an even stronger rationale for including music in school curricula.

Music and the other arts embody civilization’s past, present, and future, and bring us “face to face with ourselves, and what we sense lies beyond ourselves” (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994). Just as Greek heritage is known to us through the Parthenon and the epics of Homer (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988), the arts we create and consume will say much about who we have become as a people. The arts tell the stories of our lives. Conversely, when the arts and other cultural resources have been limited, censored, or politicized, societies collapse (Gates, 2000). Indeed, the arts play an integral part in creating cultures and building civilizations. While music, visual art, theatre and dance make unique contributions to culture, society, and the lives of individuals, their summation and interconnectedness provide a foundation on which people may thrive (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994).

Another value of music study is its ability to foster the development of creativity. People speak of the “art” of politics, for example, because study of the arts fosters “artistic modes of problem solving, which bring an array of expressive, analytical, and developmental tools to every human situation” (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994). An arts education, then, can help students develop reasoning and problem-solving skills that remain “essential to a productive workforce and learning in other subjects” (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988). No other discipline encourages
and demands divergent thinking like music and the other arts. Elliot Eisner, in *The Arts and the Creation of Mind*, advances the belief that “the most complex and subtle forms of thinking take place when students have an opportunity either to work meaningfully on the creation of images – whether visual, choreographic, musical, literary, or poetic – or to scrutinize them appreciatively” (2002).

Finally, the arts are forms of communication. Already, schools teach writing through an exploration of literary masterworks that communicate a host of thoughts, feelings, and ideas. But in addition to words, the arts also communicate through visual images, sounds, and movement (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988). Today, more and more information is transmitted to society through television and the internet. These media employ all the arts, communicating in ways that are more aural and visual than traditional newspapers. As such, the arts teach students to recognize, understand, and utilize the nuances of nonverbal communication (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988), enabling them to effectively engage our increasingly technical and global society.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This research is descriptive in nature. Data about attitudes toward music education and the status of school music programs since the passing of the *No Child Left Behind Act* were sought from a sample of Ohio principals via a mailed questionnaire. The sample (n=246) was randomly drawn from a 2006-2007 directory of Ohio public schools (N=3791) supplied by the Ohio Department of Education. Although the desired subjects were principals and not schools, the data set supplied by the Ohio Department of Education remained capable of being sorted by principals’ names. As is often the case, a small percentage of the directory failed to identify the current principal. When such an entry was randomly selected, the researcher contacted the school and retrieved the name of its administrator, eliminating any bias and assuring that these principals would have
the opportunity to participate in the study. By using the most current directory available and ensuring that all data contained in the directory were complete, the researcher is confident that frame error was minimized. Selection error was also controlled by purging the complete frame of all duplicate entries.

Principals of adult, vocational, and other special schools were not included in the frame. These administrators were not considered part of the target population and were ineligible to be randomly selected as part of the study sample. The rationale employed by the researcher that led to these exclusions was based on the assumption that music programs established in these types of schools, if any, would be governed by considerably different policies than the music programs in typical public schools. Their omission was thought necessary to avoid any distortion in the data that might hinder the researcher in formulating an accurate description of the music programs in Ohio public schools.

The size of the sample was determined using the formula developed by Cochran (1977) for use with research involving continuous variables, shown here:

\[ n = \frac{t^2 \cdot s^2}{d^2} \]

All calculation values were based on the variable “attitude toward music education” because it was believed to provide the greatest amount of variability, and thus, a larger sample size. As such, the researcher employed a confidence level of \( \alpha = .05 \) with a corresponding critical value of \( t = 1.96 \). Rather than using data from the pilot test to determine standard deviation, the researcher decided to embrace the recommendation of Cochran (1977) and estimate this measure of variability by dividing the possible range of attitudinal scores by four, producing a more conservative value of \( s = 8 \). With a level of
precision of $d = \pm 1$, the following equation illustrates how the researcher arrived at the given sample size.

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2 (8)^2}{(1)^2} = 245.8$$

The ratio of the sample to the population may indicate that finite population correction was warranted ($n / N > .05$). Since this procedure would ultimately reduce sample size, the researcher, remaining conservative, decided to ignore this procedure and utilize the larger sample. By utilizing random sampling technique and securing a sufficiently-sized assembly of public school principals, sampling error was ultimately controlled. Thus, the researcher remains 95% confident that the sample of $n = 246$ will yield a mean attitudinal score that lies within 1 point of the true population mean.

**Development of the Measurement Instrument**

With the two-fold intent of measuring the attitudes of Ohio principals and determining the status of their schools’ music programs since the passage of *No Child Left Behind*, the researcher developed a measurement instrument incorporating Likert-type items, open-ended questions, and checklists meant to quantify these variables. Inspiration for this instrument came from two sources. The first of these was a questionnaire created by Robert A. Monroe titled “*Music Education in Ohio Schools: A Comparative Study of the Opinions of Music Teachers, Principals, and Professors of Music Education*” (1994). Specifically, the “Basic Purpose of Music in the High School” and “Music Classes: Theory, History, and Appreciation” sections of this document aided the researcher in determining the type of questions that might be asked of public school
administrators. Further, Monroe’s questionnaire provided a good model for presenting questions in a non-judgmental manner. This, the researcher believed, remained an essential characteristic that could have an impact on response rate.

The other, more-influential source considered by the researcher comes from the Center on Education Policy. Its longitudinal study, titled “From the Capital to the Classroom,” has documented how No Child Left Behind has been implemented at the local level. The District Questionnaire utilized by the Center helped to focus the researcher’s attention on areas that might be interesting to music education – staffing, student access, instructional time and course offerings – and eliminate those that lie beyond the scope of this inquiry, especially funding issues. The strongest influence of the Center’s questionnaire was the type of data to be sought. Much of the Center’s questionnaire collected nominal and ordinal data. This, by its own admission, prevented the Center from determining the precise impact that No Child Left Behind has had on our nation’s schools. Hoping to uncover a more detailed view of the Act’s impact in the State of Ohio, the researcher chose to create a measurement instrument that would collect data on all levels, including interval and ratio.

All construction issues related to the measurement instrument were purposeful. The researcher considered many of the suggestions outlined in “Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method” (Dillman, 2000) when creating the questionnaire. Specifically, the researcher attempted to make the task of responding appear brief, eliminate any monetary cost to respondents, show consideration and appreciation in all communication, and create a visually interesting questionnaire (Dillman, 2000). Furthermore, the researcher made deliberate use of postcard communication before,
during, and after data collection, and offered a monetary reward in advance of anticipated responses (Dillman, 2000).

Validity

Once the measurement instrument was completed, its content validity was established by a panel of experts. These experts were a small sampling of music specialists (n=30) from across the state (Appendix C). The researcher believed that currently employed music teachers, necessarily in tune with the attitudes of their principals toward their subject matter and always managing their programs in accordance with building policies, were best-suited to determine if the researcher was asking the right questions of Ohio principals. As such, panelists were asked to report on the clarity of each questionnaire item and its appropriateness in determining respondents’ attitudes and recording the status of their school music program (Appendix C). Suggestions to make the questionnaire a better measurement instrument were also solicited from the panel. Based on their expert responses, the researcher modified the instrument in the following ways:

- Minor changes to the wording of several items helped to increase clarity.
- One Likert-type item was deleted from the questionnaire. According to the panelists, “The music teachers in my school have their own room(s).” represented a non-issue for the profession.
• Items 21 through 26, numerically open-ended and included to detail the impact of 
No Child Left Behind on music instructional time in both general music and 
performance classes, were reduced to 3 items. Panelists believed separating time 
allotments for performance and general music classes was unnecessary.

Although all suggestions from the panel were considered by the researcher, only those 
echoed by a number of panelists brought about change to the measurement instrument. The choice of the researcher to exclude singular suggestions acknowledges that while 
many consequences of No Child Left Behind may be universally perceived, some 
consequences remain unique to specific schools.

Concurrent validity was established for the portion of the questionnaire designed 
to measure the relative status of music programs. This precautionary measure was 
deemed necessary because of the sensitive nature of some of the questionnaire items and 
the real possibility of principals providing socially acceptable, but inaccurate responses. Concurrent validity was achieved by comparing principals’ responses to alternate forms 
of similar items. As such, information regarding staffing, student access, instructional 
time, and course offerings was solicited from these principals in both Likert and open-
ended form. The correlational coefficients (Kendall’s tau b) depicted in Table 1 indicate 
very strong, positive relationships among the principals’ responses to these alternate-form 
items. Satisfied that the measurement instrument was indeed measuring what it professed 
to measure, the researcher then subjected the instrument to a pilot test.
Table 1

Matrix of Correlational Coefficients for Likert and Open-ended Responses Regarding Staffing, Instructional Time, Student Access, and Course Offerings (Kendall’s tau b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open-ended Staffing</th>
<th>Open-ended Time</th>
<th>Open-ended Access</th>
<th>Open-ended Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likert Staffing</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pilot Test

The instrument was pilot tested with a small group of Ohio principals (n=20) that were not selected as part of the main, randomized study sample. This assembly, also randomly selected, was asked to complete the questionnaire as well as comment on its readability. Although the questionnaire was easily understood, many of the principals offered suggestions to make it more concise. They identified redundant items and suggested that some be eliminated. As such, only ten of the sixteen Likert items used to ascertain principals’ attitudes toward music education were included in the final version of the questionnaire. In the absence of any other concerns among the principals, the researcher was satisfied that face validity for the questionnaire was confirmed.
Considering reliability, a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of $\alpha = .81$ was calculated for the Likert items appearing in the final version of the questionnaire. Nunnally suggests that acceptable reliability coefficients exceed a value of .60, but recommends values greater than .80 (1967). Since the calculated Alpha of $\alpha = .81$ surpassed both of these values, the researcher was confident that reliability was not compromised by omitting the six redundant items identified by the pilot test respondents. Ultimately, since the pilot test respondents are very similar to the true research subjects, these measures provide a stable indication of reliability for the measurement instrument and help to control measurement error.

*Conduct of the Study*

Following the mailing of a postcard to alert principals of their selection to participate in the study (Appendix A), data collection began on Friday, February 23, 2007, with the mailing of the first research packet. Each packet contained a cover letter explaining the intent of the study (Appendix B), a response questionnaire, and a stamped, addressed return envelope. Recognizing that principals are less frequently the subjects of a study in music and are seemingly notorious for low response rates, a $1.00 incentive was also included in each packet. Attached to each bill was a note from the researcher saying “Please use this dollar to enjoy a favorite drink while you complete this questionnaire!”

Within the response questionnaire, subjects were first asked to indicate their level of agreement with ten Likert-type items. This portion of the questionnaire was used to
ascertain the attitudes toward music education among Ohio principals. Responses for each item ranged from 1, “very strongly disagree,” to 6, “very strongly agree.” A “not applicable” response was also provided as an option for respondents. While very few principals utilized this option, this response did not retain a numerical value and was not considered in determining the attitudinal scores of the principals.

Next, items 11 through 22 collected detailed information about the status of the music program within the school. Specifically, four segments addressed issues related to staffing, student access, instructional time, and course offerings. This portion of the questionnaire remained numerically open-ended, allowing the researcher to collect data at the highest possible level.

Finally, two checklists collected demographic information so that the researcher might better understand the differences among the subjects, while question 25 allowed principals to articulate in their own words the impact that No Child Left Behind has had on their school and its music program. The time needed to complete the questionnaire was determined to be minimal, requiring twenty to twenty-five minutes to respond to all questionnaire items.

Within a two-week response period, a mailed postcard reminder was sent to each participant and a second complete research packet was placed in the mail on Monday, March 12, 2007, to those who had not yet responded. New to this packet was a revised cover letter that tactfully tried to encourage response (Appendix B). In addition to a second postcard cue, phone call reminders to participants were also employed. Calls began on Wednesday, March 21, 2007, and concluded on Friday, March 23, 2007. As such, the final cut off date for accepting data remained Wednesday, March 28, 2007.
Ultimately, data collection procedures generated a response rate of 72.8%. Response rate was determined by dividing the number of usable response questionnaires (n=179) by the number of subjects in the original sample (n=246). Only two questionnaires returned as undeliverable and one questionnaire containing an obvious response set were deemed unusable for the study. Item non-response was controlled using the mean substitution method (Dodeen, 2003). This procedure allowed the researcher to substitute the item mean when a respondent failed to provide a response. The item mean was the best estimate of the missing response and allowed the researcher to complete the data set without compromising its integrity. No more than two items were subject to this procedure. As a result, four questionnaires exceeding this limit were also excluded from analysis.

Demographic Characteristics of Schools

In an effort to facilitate greater insight and understanding of the data, as well as strengthen the case for generalizability, the demographic characteristics of respondents’ schools are provided. The primary characteristics on which comparisons were made remain academic rating, educational community, and school type with regard to educational level. Upon visual inspection, the researcher concluded that the percentages for each category appear to be similar to those found in the larger population.
As illustrated in Figure 1, a majority of schools occupied the two highest categories. During the 2005-2006 school year, 31% of schools were rated “effective” and 32% were rated “excellent.” The “continuous improvement” category accounted for 19% of the schools, and the two lowest ratings, “academic watch” and “academic emergency,” described only 8% and 4% of the schools, respectively. Six percent of the schools were unrated.
In comparison, participants’ schools were more evenly distributed among the three categories of educational community: urban, suburban, and rural. “Rural” schools accounted for 38% of the sample with “suburban” schools accounted for 36%. Slightly lower, 26% of the schools were identified as “urban.” Figure 2 graphs the frequencies for each category.

**Figure 2**  
*Frequency Graph for Educational Community*
The final characteristic considered by the researcher was the educational level of each school. For data analysis, “primary” schools generally included grades kindergarten through fifth, “middle-level” schools included grades six through eight, and “secondary” schools included grades nine through twelve. Not surprising, a majority of the schools were labeled as “primary,” accounting for 56% of the sample. Percentages for “middle-level” and “secondary” schools were 22% and 21%, respectively. Figure 3 outlines the frequencies of the categories for this final characteristic.

Figure 3

*Frequency Graph for School Type with Regard to Educational Level*
Controlling Non-Response Error

Non-response error was controlled by comparing early and late respondents, accepting that those who do not respond would have highly correlated responses to those who reply late (Miller & Smith, 1983). Those who responded to the first research packet were considered early, while late respondents required an additional solicitation. Table 2 reports the means of these two groups on the primary variable of interest, attitude toward music education, and the $t$-test in Table 3 confirms no significant difference ($\alpha = .05$) between the groups.

Table 2
Attitudinal Means for Early and Late Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.01</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
$T$-test for Significance of Mean Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>112.95</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* values indicate a two-tailed test
All of the assumptions for a $t$-test were met when conducting this analysis. Table 2 visually displays the independence of each group and Levene’s test in Table 3 confirms no significant difference in the variance of the attitudinal scores between groups. Visual inspection of histograms and the consideration of skewness and kurtosis values led the researcher to conclude that a generally normal distribution of attitudinal scores existed within each of the groups.

The efforts to control non-response, as well as all the practices employed to minimize error, allow the researcher to be 91% confident that the usable data obtained from the respondents (n=179) will accurately represent the originally chosen sample. Accordingly, results of this inquiry may be generalized to the larger population.

Chapter Summary

The research procedures outlined in this chapter were provided for two distinct purposes. First, the researcher wanted to detail the progressive actions taken in conducting the study. In doing so, the researcher hoped to provide a blueprint for replication and encourage future inquiries regarding the impact of *No Child Left Behind* on music and arts education as a whole.

The second, more important purpose of this chapter was to establish confidence in the study results. Knowing that officials in Ohio lack data to conclude whether or not *No Child Left Behind* is narrowing schools’ curricula in ways that marginalize the arts (Sebastian & Boss, 2007), the researcher took deliberate steps to ensure that the data uncovered in this study would be valid. To accomplish this goal, the researcher
thoughtfully attended to the five errors common in survey research. Frame error was minimized by using the most current directory of Ohio public schools and ensuring that all data contained in the directory, including principals’ names, were complete. Selection error was minimized by purging the complete frame of duplicate entries, assuring that all Ohio public school principals had equal chance to be chosen for participation. Sampling error was controlled by drawing a sufficiently-sized, random sample from the complete frame. Random sampling technique remains the most efficient and effective method to ensure a sample is representative of the larger population.

To minimize the possibility of measurement error, the researcher utilized a valid and reliable instrument for data collection. This questionnaire, created by the researcher, was grounded in recent literature, validated for content by a panel of experts, and pilot tested for reliability with other Ohio principals.

Non-response error was controlled by comparing the data supplied by early and late respondents. Recognizing the research that supports this procedure (Miller & Smith, 1983), the researcher is confident that the usable data obtained from the respondents (n=179) are representative of both the sample and the population. Ultimately, the researcher hopes that the sum of these efforts, along with a relatively high response rate, will bolster confidence for the study results revealed in Chapter Four.

Finally, all research procedures and materials were submitted to, and approved by the Internal Review Board for research conducted at The Ohio State University prior to beginning the study. Accordingly, this study has been assigned the protocol number 2007E0099 (Appendix F).
STUDY RESULTS

Data analysis revealed that a vast majority of Ohio’s public school principals hold favorable attitudes toward music education. In fact, only 7% of the respondents earned attitudinal scores that were classified less than favorable. The mean attitudinal score among the respondents was 25.1 with a standard deviation of 3.1. Accordingly, the researcher estimates, with 95% confidence, that the mean of the population will fall within the interval of 24.65 to 25.55 (25.1 ± .45). A breakdown of the various attitudinal classifications is presented in Table 4. The distribution of scores remains virtually normal, with skewness = .19 and kurtosis = -.04.
When considering the first questionnaire item, “Music is a vital part of every child’s education,” the researcher was not surprised by the overwhelmingly favorable attitudes recorded by the respondents. Scored on a six-point Likert scale, the median value for this statement was 5. The most frequent response to this item, however, was 6. Thirty-seven percent of the principals very strongly agreed that music was indeed a vital part of every child’s education. Question 1 stands out as the only item to record a mode of 6.

Since current educational reform is often data-driven, the sixth item appearing in the questionnaire asked principals to indicate their level of agreement with the statement “I regularly collect and/or review data that tracks students’ achievement in music.” A median and modal value of 3 suggested that most principals (79%) disagree with this statement. Likewise, 83% of principals disagreed with the statement “I am familiar with the Opportunity-to-Learn Standards for Music Instruction published by the National
Association for Music Education.” Principals’ responses to these statements remained the most disagreeable.

Relative to the issue of which principals are likely to have the most positive attitudes toward music education, no significant differences were revealed among principals of various school types or educational communities. The analysis of variance outlined in Table 5, however, confirms that the academic rating of a school may have some bearing on principals’ attitudes. An eta squared value of .25 indicates that 25% of the variance in principals’ attitudinal scores is explained by the academic rating of their school. The Scheffé post hoc test in Table 6 illustrates that Ohio principals serving in schools rated “excellent” or “effective” have significantly more positive attitudinal scores than principals serving in schools with ratings of “academic watch” or “academic emergency.” Principals of unrated schools also have significantly more positive attitudinal scores than principals of schools with the lowest ratings. An eta value of .50 serves as a measure of effect size.

Table 5

Summary Data (Academic Rating) and Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rating</th>
<th>Unrated</th>
<th>Emergency</th>
<th>Watch</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>26.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>436.689</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87.338</td>
<td>11.602*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1302.274</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>7.528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1738.962</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
### Table 6

*Post hoc Test for Analysis of Variance with Academic Rating as Factor (Scheffe)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (I)</th>
<th>Rating (J)</th>
<th>Mean Diff. (I-J)</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>A. Emergency</td>
<td><em>5.16</em></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Watch</td>
<td><em>3.92</em></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Improvement</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-3.63</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Emergency</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td><em>-5.16</em></td>
<td>-9.62</td>
<td>-.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Watch</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-5.47</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Improvement</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
<td>-7.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td><em>-4.38</em></td>
<td>-8.08</td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td><em>-5.76</em></td>
<td>-9.45</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Watch</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td><em>-3.92</em></td>
<td>-7.58</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Emergency</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-2.98</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Improvement</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>-4.84</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td><em>-3.13</em></td>
<td>-5.82</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td><em>-4.51</em></td>
<td>-7.19</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Improvement</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>-5.13</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Emergency</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Watch</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td><em>-2.53</em></td>
<td>-4.52</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>-3.83</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Emergency</td>
<td><em>4.38</em></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Watch</td>
<td><em>3.13</em></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Improvement</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td><em>-1.38</em></td>
<td>-3.12</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Emergency</td>
<td><em>5.76</em></td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Watch</td>
<td><em>4.51</em></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Improvement</td>
<td><em>2.53</em></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.
In conducting this analysis, all of the assumptions for ANOVA were met. While the independence of each group is visually displayed in Table 5, Levene’s test for homogeneity confirmed no significant differences in the variances of each academic rating. Visual inspection of histograms, as well as the consideration of skewness and kurtosis values, led the researcher to further conclude that a generally normal distribution of attitudinal scores existed within each of the groups.

Despite favorable attitudes, respondents consistently ranked music as the least important subject in the general education of students. When considered among the other core disciplines recognized by *No Child Left Behind*, mathematics, reading, science, social studies and writing (substituted for foreign language because achievement in foreign language is not tested on Ohio’s mandated proficiency tests), music and the other arts were assigned the lowest ranking by 71% of the respondents. Reading and mathematics, subjects with specific accountability standards set forth in *No Child Left Behind*, topped the list. The rankings for all subjects are illustrated in Table 7.

*Table 7*

*Subject Ranks (n=179)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When considering the number of certified music teachers employed by Ohio’s public schools since the beginning of the *No Child Left Behind* era, the researcher found that 11% of principals indicated a reduction in the number of music teachers working in their buildings, while 9% indicated an increase in music specialists. Only 3% of principals reported that access to music programs had been limited for specific populations of students so that they may focus more on academics. In each of these cases, the population that was denied access to music remained those who had failed, or were at risk for failing state proficiency tests. Six percent of principals reported a reduction in the number of music courses offered at their schools and 16% reported an increase. The course most often added to the curriculum was instrumental music (band), accounting for 33% of the course additions. General music courses were most often eliminated. They account for 38% of eliminated courses.

The amount of instructional time for music since the implementation of *No Child Left Behind* seemed to have changed only slightly. Seventy-six percent of principals indicated that the time allotted for music study was unchanged. Seventeen percent of the principals reported unspecified changes in the amount of instructional time devoted to music. The specific data provided by the remaining principals showed that the average change in time for music study was $M = -2.7$ minutes with a standard deviation of $s = 11.0$ minutes. Table 8 reveals the net change in minutes recorded by these principals. The extreme negative scores may be an indication of severe, localized reaction to the mandates of *No Child Left Behind*. 
Table 8

Frequency Table for the net gain/loss of Instructional Minutes for Music since the passage of No Child Left Behind in 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-20.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-15.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall status of Ohio’s public school music programs was determined by the researcher by considering the condition of staffing, student access, course offerings and instructional time in summation. The data obtained from the sample suggested that 62% of music programs have remained unchanged in the wake of *No Child Left Behind*. Furthermore, 21% of the music programs have gained strength since 2002 and 17% have become weaker.
For the sample of 179 principals, a low association (Cramer’s V = .20) between principals’ attitudinal classifications and the status of the music program surfaced (Table 9). While principals with unfavorable attitudes were evenly distributed across the various status designations, 94% of those with very favorable attitudes administered programs that have remained unchanged or become stronger since the passage of No Child Left Behind. Although principals with extremely favorable attitudinal classifications
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administered programs that remained unchanged or stronger as well, an overwhelming majority of these music programs, two-thirds, remained stronger.

**Table 9**

*Contingency Table for association between Program Status and Attitudinal Classification (Cramer’s V)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudinal Classification</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Very Favorable</th>
<th>Extremely Favorable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Attitudinal Classification</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Attitudinal Classification</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Attitudinal Classification</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Attitudinal Classification</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although no association was found between the status of the music program and educational community, a low association (Cramer’s V = .27) was revealed between the status of the music program and the type of school, with respect to general grade level (Table 10). While middle and secondary schools report relatively equal percentages
within each status designation, 77% of Ohio’s primary schools have been able to maintain the status quo of their music programs in spite of *No Child Left Behind*.

**Table 10**

*Contingency Table for association between Program Status and School Type (Cramer’s V)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within School Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unchanged</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School Type</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stronger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within School Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School Type</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within School Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School Type</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within School Type</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 also showed a low association between program status and schools’ academic ratings (Cramer’s V = .20). A majority of schools in the upper thee ratings have music programs that have remained unchanged or stronger since 2002. Specifically, 82% of “continuous improvement” schools, 85% of “effective” schools, and 84% of “excellent” schools report their music program to be unchanged or stronger. Conversely, 86% of “academic emergency” schools and 80% of “academic watch” schools report that
their music programs have remained unchanged or weaker since 2002. Unrated schools were not considered in this analysis.

**Table 11**

*Contingency Table for association between Program status and Schools’ Academic Ratings (Cramer’s V)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Within School Rating</th>
<th>Emergency</th>
<th>Watch</th>
<th>Continuous Improvement</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternate Study Results

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the impact that No Child Left Behind has had on music education in the State of Ohio. As such, it was necessary to determine the curricular stature of the state’s music programs since the passing of the legislation. While the net gain/loss of certified staff, student access, instructional time, and course offerings remain appropriate measures of program status, the procedures utilized throughout this inquiry allowed the researcher to uncover another measure of program status. Findings of this study suggest that 60% of principals expect their music teachers to devote a portion of their instructional time to other subjects, specifically reading and mathematics. This phenomenon was not revealed in the initial examination of instructional time. Yet, this expectation undoubtedly creates a de facto reduction of time spent on musical endeavors.
Figure 5 illustrates the alternate depiction of Ohio’s music programs that was created when these data were considered. When compared to the findings reported earlier in this chapter, the data now suggest that 43% of music programs have become weaker in the era of No Child Left Behind. This percentage surpasses both the number of “unchanged” programs (40%) and the number of “stronger” programs (17%).

While a low association (Cramer’s V = .20) continued to be observed between principals’ attitude classifications and the status of the music program, the description of
this association changed. Now, 92% of principals with “unfavorable” attitudes, 88% with “favorable” attitudes, and 74% with “very favorable” attitudes report that their music programs have remained unchanged or weaker since the passage of No Child Left Behind. Furthermore, at least one principal with an “extremely favorable” attitude now reports that the music program in his or her school has become weaker.

**Table 12**

*Contingency table for association between Alternate Program Status and Attitudinal Classification (Cramer’s V)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudinal Classification</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Very Favorable</th>
<th>Extremely Favorable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unchanged</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Attitudinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stronger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Attitudinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Attitudinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Attitudinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A low association (Cramer’s V = .20) also continued between the status of the music program and the type of school, with respect to general grade level. Although middle and
secondary schools still report relatively equal percentages within each status designation, larger percentages of these schools now have music programs with a “weaker” status. Forty-three percent of middle schools and 32% of secondary schools fall into this category. Among primary schools, 44% continue to maintain the status quo of their music program while 48% have seen their programs become “weaker” in the era of *No Child Left Behind*.

**Table 13**

*Contingency Table for association between Alternate Program Status and School Type (Cramer’s V)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within School Type</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, when considering this alternate view of the data, the association between program status and schools’ academic ratings ceased to exist. This indicates that music programs of every status designation exist unremarkably in schools of every academic rating.
Although survey research cannot by itself establish causal relationships, question twenty-five of the measurement instrument allowed principals to articulate in their own words how *No Child Left Behind* has affected the music programs of their schools. Analysis of this item revealed very specific responses among the principals. The first of these responses was the belief that because it is an untested subject, music has become less important. Furthermore, as *No Child Left Behind* absorbs more and more of a school’s resources, less monies are available for music and the other arts, resulting in cuts for arts education. Twenty-five percent of the principals participating in the study articulated these beliefs. The following quotations, which cite the direct influence of *No Child Left Behind*, are representative of this group.

“No Child Left Behind has caused our school to look at more academic classes and reduce staffing for elective classes such as music.”

~ subject 208

“The unfunded mandates related to *No Child Left Behind* have added to the financial burden of the school system. The reduction of music offerings is a direct result of the school system’s financial problems.”

~ subject 23135

“We have altered the times that specials have for instruction so that time may be spent in the ‘regular’ classroom to prepare for certain testing that *No Child Left Behind* requires.”

~ subject 28845
“We have eliminated 5th grade band, and sometimes at-risk students have missed 25% of their music instruction in order to receive intervention in reading and mathematics.”

~ subject 13698

Another area clearly delineated in principals’ responses remained the impact of No Child Left Behind on the curriculum of a school. The delivery of the curriculum was also identified as being influenced by the legislation. Evident in the following quotations is the expectation of music teachers to dedicate some of their instructional time to other, non-musical endeavors. Sixteen percent of the respondents shared similar observations.

“The No Child Left Behind Act has made us work to make music a more integrated part of the educational program for each child. The music teacher works more closely with classroom teachers.”

~ subject 8304

“Due to demands on scheduling and adding courses for intervention, it has been difficult to schedule the demands of students wanting music. [Now] we offer independent studies in music.”

~ subject 18184

“[No Child Left Behind’s] unreasonable expectations keep us from offering students a well-rounded and enriched curriculum. A few years ago we participated in SPECTRA and were able to offer dance and drama classes to all students. We can no longer give time for such opportunities.”

~ subject 15404

“There needs to be more staff development to incorporate [reading and mathematics] into music.”

~ subject 35105
Finally, many principals alluded to the fact that although *No Child Left Behind* has not currently affected their music programs, future cutbacks may be unpreventable. Statements like those that follow might indicate that negative affects of the legislation may continue into the future.

“At this point *No Child Left Behind* hasn’t had an impact. But as the pressure to achieve 100% achievement in reading and mathematics comes, there will be pressure to give more to those subjects and less to the arts.”

~ subject 26344

“Because of Adequate Yearly Progress goals, we will have to devote more time to reading and mathematics which will result in less time for music, art, and physical education.”

~ subject 38620

“We may be looking at making some changes/decreases to our music offerings in the 2007-2008 school year because of increased focus on Ohio Achievement Tests.”

~ subject 33498

**Chapter Summary**

The results of the study indicated that a vast majority of principals hold favorable attitudes toward music education. Music, however, was still viewed as less important than other subjects. Ohio’s principals consistently ranked music and the other arts last when considered among other core subjects. Significant differences in principals’ attitudinal scores were revealed when examining the academic ratings of their schools. Ohio principals serving in schools rated “excellent” or “effective” had significantly more
positive attitudinal scores than principals serving in schools with ratings of “academic watch” or “academic emergency.”

The most controversial finding of the study centered on the status of Ohio’s public school music programs. Initial determinations suggested that only 17% of the state’s music programs have become weaker in the era of *No Child Left Behind*. When a *de facto* reduction of instructional time was considered, however, 43% of Ohio’s music programs were classified as weaker. This dramatic change was attributed to the expectation of principals that the music teachers working in their buildings devote some of their instructional time to other subjects, specifically reading and mathematics.

Finally, the perspectives provided by several principals illustrated how *No Child Left Behind* has led principals to modify their policies regarding music education. While this research did not seek to establish causal relationships, these testimonials confirmed that *No Child Left Behind* was at least a contributing factor in principals’ policy decisions.
CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY RESULTS

When *No Child Left Behind* was signed into law by President George W. Bush in January of 2002, many educational stakeholders feared that the legislation would have a less-than-desirable effect on our nation’s students and schools. The barrage of anecdotal accounts detailing the mostly negative consequences of *No Child Left Behind* has validated and increased stakeholders’ concerns. However, research studies that might fortify the thrust of this evidence remain few. Furthermore, research studies that attempt to determine the impact of *No Child Left Behind* on a single discipline are seemingly non-existent. As such, this study remains part of a larger effort to fill this gap. Since many of the reported consequences of *No Child Left Behind* have an impact on music and the other arts, the researcher conceived this study to ascertain the impact that the legislation
has had on music education in the State of Ohio. While the status of Ohio’s public school music programs ultimately was explored, the investigation began by determining the overall attitude toward music education among Ohio’s public school principals.

The mean attitudinal score of 25.1 ($s = 3.1$) reported in Chapter Four shows that Ohio’s principals tend to hold favorable attitudes toward music education. This result echoes the findings of Radocy (1987) and Wise (1987) and suggests the attitudes of Ohio principals may be similar to the attitudes of other school administrators from various states and regions of the country. While much of the research reviewed in Chapter Two referred to Ohio, caution is advised in making direct comparisons of other attitudinal measures with the reported results. Categorical data related to administrators’ opinions about music were collected by Jones (1961), Clay (1972), and Monroe (1994) and analyzed at the item level. Measuring the attitudes of Ohio’s school administrators was not identified by these investigators as a research objective. As such, similar attitudinal measures on which to base a comparison do not exist. For this reason, a comparison of the number of principals that hold favorable attitudes toward music education is also impossible.

Despite Clay’s claim that 100% of Ohio administrators believed that music programs were an important component of American schools (1972), the researcher was surprised to find that 93% of the principals in the current study record no less than favorable attitudes toward music education. Considering that Ohio has experienced increased attrition among music specialists (ODE, 2005) and that these teachers often cite “lack of administrative support” as the reason for an early departure (Luekens, Lyter & Fox, 2004; Madsen & Hancock, 1995), a smaller percentage was expected. Thus, the
researcher can only speculate about possible reasons for the larger number of principals with favorable attitudes. One possible explanation is that recent advocacy campaigns, including a successful effort to require all Ohio high school students to earn one academic credit in the arts to be eligible for graduation, may have positively influenced principals’ attitudes. More likely, however, principals’ attitudinal scores reflect a philosophical position regarding the value of music that remains independent of principals’ support for music education.

Evidence for the claim that principals’ attitudes toward music education are philosophical in nature has been consistently recorded throughout history. Jones (1961), Clay (1972), Radocy (1987), and Monroe (1994) observed that the percentage of principals’ who initially believed music was important decreased when principals were asked to qualify their responses. In Chapter Two, the researcher reported that 78% of the principals participating in Jones study initially claimed that music was important, albeit an elective (1961). A deeper investigation, however, revealed that only 50% of principals believed music was equally important as other elective courses (Jones, 1961). Principals’ support for music decreased when music was compared to other subjects. This finding is upheld by Siskin, who claims that academic subjects lose worth when ranked relative to one another (2003).

The current study also uncovered data to support the claim that principals’ attitudes are philosophical in nature and remain independent of their operational support for music education. Although 93% of the principals participating in the study report at least favorable attitudes, 71% of principals assigned music the lowest ranking when compared to other, core subjects tested on Ohio achievement tests. These findings
suggest that a dichotomy exists between principals’ philosophical attitude toward music education and the relative importance principals assign to music study. This observation is probably best expressed in the remarks of Lehman, who noted that “No one is opposed to the arts. Support for music education permeates American society. It’s a mile wide, but it’s only an inch deep” (1992).

Political correctness may be the reason that explains the dichotomy between principals’ attitudes and the relative importance they assign to music study. Indeed, music is among the most visible academic programs within a school. Music programs typically enjoy widespread community support and often have their own parent support groups. Furthermore, music and the other arts are a source of great pride for many of our nation’s schools. As such, principals may find it “politically correct” to support music even if they do not truly believe in music’s benefit to students, schools, and communities. Regardless of their true beliefs, principals have found it increasingly difficult to offer anything more than verbal support for music. Money, additional staff, instructional time, and other tangible, program-sustaining resources that once might have gone to music programs, are now needed to successfully meet the accountability demands of No Child Left Behind.

Considering the findings of the Center on Educational Policy that suggest middle-level and urban-district schools are disproportionately identified for improvement (Rentner, et. al., 2005), the researcher expected the principals who lead these schools to exercise less favorable attitudes toward music education than the rest of their colleagues. This expectation was not realized. The results of this investigation indicate no significant differences between the attitudinal scores of principals of various school types and
educational communities, further strengthening the case that principals’ attitudes toward music education are philosophical measures that remain independent of other variables.

As noted in Chapter Four, principals serving in schools rated “excellent” or “effective” had significantly more positive attitudes toward music education than the principals serving in schools with ratings of “academic watch” or “academic emergency.” The \( \eta \) value of .50, which also serves as a measure of effect size, indicates that 25% of the variance in principals’ attitudinal scores was explained by the academic rating of their school. The conclusion that the researcher draws from this finding is that the principals of schools with relatively low academic ratings, although philosophically in favor of music, are forced to exercise less favorable views toward music education. These principals are in the unenviable position of having to worry most about test scores, accountability, and the demands of \textit{No Child Left Behind}. This conclusion is further supported by the obvious trend observed in the mean attitudinal scores of the principal subgroups: as academic rating increases, mean attitudinal scores also increase. Within this pattern of means, principals of unrated schools, unbound to the accountability measures of \textit{No Child Left Behind}, appropriately record a mean attitudinal score that is most similar to the principals of “excellent” schools. Indeed, principals of “excellent” schools, by virtue of their school’s success in meeting many of the law’s accountability standards, are more likely to exercise a favorable view toward music education.

This study also investigated the status of Ohio’s public school music programs. The individual components explored by the researcher – staffing, student access, instructional time, and course offerings – remain unremarkable when considered alone. Some findings, however, are noteworthy. Three percent of the principals surveyed report
that they limit access to music programs for students who have failed, or are at risk for failing, Ohio proficiency tests. The researcher believes that the emergence of this phenomenon establishes a dangerous precedent, especially in a time of educational reform.

This dissertation has provided numerous anecdotes detailing the drastic measures some administrators will entertain in an effort to meet the accountability standards of No Child Left Behind. Considering that a school’s academic rating, performance on state proficiency tests, and other measures of academic performance are annually published in state and local newspapers for the scrutiny of all, the researcher understands how principals might find themselves in a position where they must choose between what is best for students and what is best for the school. However, denying students access to music or other school programs so that they may focus more on academics is not supported by available research and should not be an option for administrators.

The research of Nichols, Glass and Berliner suggests that students who have failed or are at risk of failing proficiency tests would also be at greater risk to drop out of school (2005). Conversely, a recent Harris Poll conducted on behalf of the National Association for Music Education (MENC) and the International Music Products Association (NAMM), reports that 96% of our nation’s principals believe that participating in music education encourages and motivates students to stay in school (2006). The combination of these results suggests that limiting at-risk students’ access to music programs is more likely to produce negative results. Regrettably, if more schools and students continue to struggle with meeting the performance standards of No Child
*Left Behind*, as Wiley, Mathis and Garcia predict (2005), more principals may consider such action.

Another noteworthy finding regards course offerings. Although only 6% of the principals indicated they have eliminated music courses since the passage of *No Child Left Behind*, the nature of these reductions concern the researcher. Specifically, the music course most frequently eliminated from a school’s curriculum was general music. Such courses typically serve about 80% of the student population, especially in secondary schools. On the other hand, the music course most frequently added to a school’s curriculum was instrumental music (band). If principals continue to favor performance classes that serve only a small percentage of the student population, fewer students will have the opportunity to study music. Music will be at risk of becoming less democratic and more elitist, serving only those who elect it.

Music and arts education are not just for “the talented” or those who choose to perform in an ensemble (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988; Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994; Fowler, 1996). The broad base of music and the other arts was assumed by the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations when it stated that “No one can claim to be truly educated who lacks basic knowledge and skills in the arts” (1994). In the spirit of this sentiment, all students are entitled to, and require a quality arts education. Would our schools consider teaching reading and mathematics to only those students who show aptitude for, or elect to study these subjects? The music education profession, then, must reenergize its advocacy efforts to convince principals that music courses that serve the masses play a significant role in the education of our children.
An effort of this nature has increased meaning for the State of Ohio. Already, very few of the state’s high schools offer a generally focused music appreciation course. Therefore, it should be the goal of educators and advocates to bring music education to a larger number of our state’s high school students. The recent Ohio legislation that requires high school graduates to earn a full credit in the arts endeavored to meet this goal. Unfortunately, the legislation currently permits students to earn arts credit at any point between grades seven and twelve. Recognizing the timeliness of this issue, the researcher included the following question in the current study’s questionnaire: “In light of the recent passage of legislation that requires all Ohio students to have at least 1 full credit in the arts between grades 7 and 12 in order to graduate, at what level do you think would be most appropriate for students to meet this requirement?”

Data analysis revealed that 63% of principals believed that students should earn this credit while in middle-school. As a rationale for this belief, principals most frequently cited that early exposure to music can encourage students to pursue music throughout their schooling and perhaps beyond. Other principals, however, noted that if a majority of students meet their arts requirement prior to ninth grade, more Ohio high school principals, and perhaps music teachers, may think themselves absolved from having to offer a variety of music courses. The most radical interpretation of this legislation could even permit high school administrators to eliminate all music courses if students are given the opportunity to meet their graduation requirement at the middle level. While this option is unlikely to gain widespread acceptance, eliminating all high school music courses when or if graduation requirements are completed at the middle-level is an option nonetheless. Just as some Ohio principals chose to limit students’
access to music, testing pressures, budgetary constraints, or any number of circumstances may convince other administrators to choose to eliminate music programs altogether.

Ohio’s middle school music programs could also suffer as a result of this legislation. Already, middle schools in Hilliard, Ohio are preparing to lose one class period from next year’s schedule (Boss, 2007). This reduction is the result of increasing instructional time for courses that will fulfill high school graduation credit. An increase in time was deemed necessary to ensure these courses have a suitable amount of academic rigor. Under the proposed plan, students’ schedules will accommodate fewer elective courses. Students will no longer be able to participate in both instrumental and vocal ensembles, threatening the enrollment of performance classes. Furthermore, for students not electing performance classes, a suitable general music course will need to be developed. Ironically, since so few Ohio high schools have general music courses, no one really knows what such a course would entail. What does a “terminal,” eighth-grade music course look like? Can students successfully meet all of music’s relevant achievement standards by the completion of eighth grade? Only time will reveal the true impact of this legislation. Nonetheless, this legislation and No Child Left Behind will have lasting implications for music teacher education.

Current educational reform may force teacher preparation programs, including those in the arts, to address the teaching of reading and mathematics. If future teachers will be asked to integrate these subjects into their curricula, future teachers will need to acquire specific content knowledge and teaching strategies related to these disciplines. Additional coursework, curriculum development, and other requirements needed to address the teaching of reading and mathematics will supersaturate the already
demanding curricula typical of arts teacher preparation programs. Reductions to the core curricula of these programs will be necessary to accommodate the additional requirements. Thus, colleges and universities will experience a narrowing curriculum of their own.

Without being alarmist, the researcher can envision how diluting arts teacher preparation programs with non-artistic content might negatively affect teacher quality. Will the students who graduate from these programs truly be “highly qualified” within their content specialty? Since most arts courses are electives, especially at the secondary level, will a decrease in teacher quality catalyze a decrease in student interest and enrollment? Is the enactment of No Child Left Behind and other state and local reform the tipping point that will ultimately lead to the exclusion of arts programs from public school curricula? Results of this study suggest that such questions should be considered by arts educators and advocates.

The next item to explore is perhaps the most controversial finding of the study. In considering the relative status of Ohio’s public school music programs, the first discussion must be which results to consider: the original findings or the alternate findings. The difference in the two lies in the belief that requiring music teachers to devote some of their instructional time to other subjects is essentially equivalent to taking instructional minutes away from music and giving them to other disciplines. Indeed, the detrimental effects of No Child Left Behind have been accomplished in small, gradual steps such as this. No Child Left Behind has not, in one bold and dramatic stroke, devastated music programs beyond recognition.
Certainly, some music teachers already incorporate the teaching of reading and mathematics into their daily lessons to the benefit of students and without detriment to musical objectives. But these teachers are the exception. Most music educators do not feel prepared to teach mathematics or reading through musical content, and a majority of Ohio school districts do not offer relevant training or professional development (Gerber & Gerrity, in press). As Lehman observed, arts programs are “constantly being nibbled away” (1992), and arts professionals must now “draw the line.” Therefore, the researcher encourages readers to consider the alternate findings. The discussion that follows highlights those results.

In the wake of No Child Left Behind, 43% of Ohio’s public school music programs have weakened. This finding gives credence to the anecdotal accounts depicted throughout this document (Wood, 2004; Anonymous, 2005; Hommel, 2005; Conrad, 2006; Dillon, 2006; Allen, 2007; EveryHope, 2007; Lichtenberg, 2007) as well as those that were not cited. The researcher notes, however, that No Child Left Behind has not been determined to be the cause of this phenomenon. Rather, the educational atmosphere created by the Bush Administration makes it more difficult for music programs to thrive. This is not to say that the federal government aimed to stifle music programs, but all legislation has both winners and losers. In the case of No Child Left Behind, the arts undoubtedly are among the losers. As such, arts educators should not be surprised that only 17% of Ohio’s music programs were determined to have gained strength since the passage of No Child Left Behind while 83% of the state’s music programs have weakened or remained unchanged.
By making principals accountable for their students’ achievement in reading and mathematics, *No Child Left Behind* essentially has created a new core curriculum. All subjects, including music and the other arts, now serve these priority subjects. Thus, principals’ policies regarding staff, student access, instructional time, and course offerings, if enacted for the betterment of reading or mathematics, are now seemingly justified. With regard to music, Willie Hill warned that fallout from *No Child Left Behind*, including arts-discouraging policies, is likely to weaken a number of music programs across the country (2003). The results of this investigation confirm this reality in Ohio.

The low association (Cramer’s $V = .20$) observed between principals’ attitude classifications – unfavorable, favorable, very favorable, and extremely favorable – and the status of music programs was somewhat surprising. A majority of the findings support the belief that principal’s attitudes are independent of other variables. Upon further inspection, however, these findings seem only to extend the relationship between a school’s academic rating and principals’ attitudes. As previously illustrated, schools with better academic ratings afford principals the opportunity to exercise more favorable attitudes toward music education. In turn, principals with more favorable attitudes are less likely to enact policies that might weaken a school’s music program. As such, the results of this study suggest that improving principals’ attitudes toward music education remains a viable course of action in the effort to preserve music education in Ohio’s schools. This logical progression is supported by Fields (1982), Hill (2003), and Circle (2004), who believed that music education’s best chance for survival was through increased advocacy efforts.
Although the low association (Cramer’s V = .20) observed between the status of music programs and the type of school was unsurprising, the nature of this association was different from expected. To consider once again the findings of the Center on Educational Policy that showed middle-level schools are more frequently identified for improvement (Rentner et. al., 2005), the researcher expected the music programs in these schools to have experienced cuts, and in turn believed these programs would receive weaker status designations. This was not the case. Data analysis showed that the vast majority of weaker music programs (63%) were housed in primary schools rather than middle schools. A possible explanation for this finding is that in Ohio, a greater proportion of state rating criteria are met at the elementary level than within the middle school. By virtue of being accountable to more performance benchmarks, primary schools may need to make further reductions to their music programs to ensure these standards are met.

Finally, the segment dedicated to the principals’ perspective reveals the difficult position that many principals find themselves in when trying to maintain quality music programs in the current era of accountability. As Zastrow & Janc report, even under considerable pressure to raise student achievement in mathematics and reading, many principals are reluctant to take time and resources away from other areas, including the arts (2004). In recording their observations, the researcher sensed that principals found no delight in having to make cuts to their school’s music program. Unfortunately, the rigid and uncompromising nature of No Child Left Behind may ultimately prevent principals from avoiding “curricular erosion” (Zastrow & Janc, 2004).
Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the outcomes of this study, the investigator has identified additional areas of research that may be useful for the music education profession. The first of these includes an examination of Ohio schools that are currently rated “academic watch” or “academic emergency.” Knowing that the principals of these schools have the least favorable attitudes toward music education and are the most pressured by the testing mandates of No Child Left Behind, the researcher suggests that studying these schools will make it possible to identify the extreme consequences of the legislation. If Wiley, Mathis and Fox (2005) are correct in predicting that a devastating number of Ohio schools will fail to meet adequate yearly progress goals after the 2010-2011 school year, many schools and music programs will experience the legislation’s extreme consequences. Having access to information about these consequences prior to their manifestation may better prepare music specialists to address these unfortunate situations.

An investigation that tracks the progression of schools from “academic emergency” to “excellent” could provide important answers to how once ineffective schools might successfully meet the accountability mandates of No Child Left Behind. Determining the exact steps a school might take to pull itself out of “academic emergency,” with special attention given to the music program of the school, might help to identify what educators and advocates could expect to happen to music programs in schools of various academic designations. If we can predict potentially harmful outcomes, we can then determine a means to prevent them. As such, triangulating this line of research with qualitative accounts and case studies would be beneficial.
Curricular investigations will also be necessary. Educators and advocates must know which types of music curricula are preserved in our schools and which types of music curricula seem to be abandoned in a period of educational reform. With this information, music educators will be able to design curricula that can meet the needs of a school without compromising the integrity of our subject area. Furthermore, a Delphi research study that attempts to determine what a terminal music curriculum might look like at the middle-level would be extremely valuable for Ohio’s music educators.

Likewise, since a majority of Ohio’s public school principals expect music teachers to devote instructional time to the teaching of reading and mathematics, arts education researchers must determine the extent to which arts teacher preparation programs in Ohio must change to accommodate these expectations. Questions related to teacher education include the following: Will it remain possible to complete arts education programs in four years? Will arts teacher education programs need to be expanded to five or six years to accommodate additional reading and mathematics requirements? What instructional strategies and curriculum development initiatives would music education faculty need to add to existing methods courses? While *No Child Left Behind* has had significant implications for compulsory education, music education faculty will also need to explore curricular changes in music teacher preparation if these programs are to be successful in producing music educators who can successfully negotiate testing mandates and still provide students with the high quality music education they deserve.

Finally, continued and regular investigations of the condition of Ohio’s public school music programs are also warranted. Such studies will help to identify emerging
trends and keep the profession focused on the consequences of No Child Left Behind. For instance, if the base line data provided by this study indicates that 43% of Ohio’s public school music programs have become weaker since the passage of No Child Left Behind, it would be valuable for the profession to know if this percentage increases in future years. Likewise, will more than 60% of Ohio’s public school principals expect their music teachers to devote instructional time to mathematics and reading in the future? Will one out of four principals continue to view music as less important because it is an untested subject? While the Center on Educational Policy provides a significant amount of information from its longitudinal study, isolating the effects of No Child Left Behind on music will provide the music education profession with answers to these vital questions.

Conclusion

Even before the Center on Educational Policy began reporting that a narrowing of our nation’s public school curricula was a consequence of No Child Left Behind (Rentner, et. al., 2005), teachers across the nation had experienced this phenomenon first hand. Unfortunately, our data-driven society is often too skeptical to believe anecdotal evidence, waiting until something is “proven” before giving it the attention it deserves. As such, this study has given voice to at least a small segment of teachers who have warned us that portions of the No Child Left Behind Act are threatening to alter our educational system in ways that are not acceptable to students, parents, and society as a whole.
No Child Left Behind has indeed had negative consequences for music education in the State of Ohio. The demand to meet rigid and uncompromising performance benchmarks has pressured many of our state’s school administrators to narrow their schools’ curricula in subtle yet clear ways that marginalize music and the other arts. Such action has weakened 43% percent of Ohio’s public school music programs since No Child Left Behind was passed in 2002. Furthermore, another 40% of our state’s music programs, so far able to maintain the status quo, may be at future risk to suffer a similar fate. If the prediction that a vast majority of Ohio’s schools will be labeled “failing” by the year 2014 is realized (Wiley, Mathis & Garcia, 2005), music educators and advocates should expect more music programs to experience loss of certified staff, limited student access, decreased instructional time, and a trimming down of course offerings. Many principals participating in this study have already acknowledged that future consequences to their music programs are certain. The music education profession must now find ways to combat this trend if it is to preserve music education for future generations of school children. Advocacy initiatives focused on the importance of music and arts education must be rejuvenated. Relationships with parents and communities must be strengthened. Music curricula that can enhance academic goals without compromising musical objectives must be developed and shared with the profession. In this era of educational reform, it appears that testing, accountability, and No Child Left Behind are positioned to become more entrenched and institutionalized, placing additional pressure on arts education. Music education must find ways to work within such an environment to ensure that all students have access to a quality, complete, and arts-inclusive education.
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APPENDIX A

POSTCARD COMMUNICATION

I. Recruitment
II. First Confirmation
III. Second Confirmation
IV. Study Conclusion
Dear

I am sending you this postcard to inform you that you have been randomly selected to participate in a research study that will attempt to detail the status of Ohio’s music programs since the passage of the *No Child Left Behind Act*. In a few days, you will receive a short, simple questionnaire. I certainly hope you will reply. I thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire and look forward to learning about your thoughts for music education and status of the music program in your school.

Sincerely,

Kevin W. Gerrity
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
Dear

By now you should have received a packet of information regarding the research study entitled “NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education.” It included a cover letter explaining the study, a response questionnaire, and a stamped, addressed envelope for you to use to return your completed questionnaire. If you have not yet received your packet, or one or more of its contents is missing, please contact me via email and I will be sure to place the appropriate item(s) in the mail as soon as possible. My email addresses is listed below. Otherwise, I will look forward to receiving your response by **Saturday, March 10, 2007**. I thank you in advance for taking the time to participate in this study. I truly appreciate your time.

Yours professionally,

Kevin W. Gerrity
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
gerrity.4@osu.edu
Dear

I recently sent you a second packet of information regarding the research study titled “NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education.” I know that March brings many responsibilities, especially State-wide proficiency tests. However, I hope that you still might be able to take a few moments and complete this questionnaire. As a sample study, your responses represent 15 other public school principals from Ohio. The opinions you express are vital to the success of the study. Please consider participating. If you have already responded, please disregard this notice and accept my sincere thanks. Otherwise, I’ll look forward to receiving your responses by Saturday, March 24, 2007. Thank you again for your consideration of this matter.

Yours Professionally,

Kevin W. Gerrity
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
gerrity.4@osu.edu
Dear

Thank you for participating in the research study entitled “NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education.” Your responses have helped detail the status of Ohio’s public school music programs since the passage of No Child Left Behind. If you have any questions regarding the study, please feel free to contact me. Otherwise, please accept my sincere thanks for taking the time to participate in the study. Your responses were greatly appreciated and highly valued.

Yours Professionally,

Kevin W. Gerrity
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
gerrity.4@osu.edu
APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER COMMUNICATION

I. Content Validity
II. Pilot Test
III. First Research Packet
IV. Second Research Packet
Dear Colleague,

I am writing to request your help in establishing the content validity of a newly developed instrument that will attempt to quantify principal’s attitudes toward music and detail the status of music programs since the passing of the *No Child Left Behind Act* in 2002. Specifically, I am asking you to determine the clarity and appropriateness of each questionnaire item. It is my belief that teachers like you, necessarily aware of their principal’s attitude toward music and always managing their programs in accordance with local policies, are the best to make these determinations. As such, I invite you to rate each item and offer any thoughts or suggestions that might help to make the questionnaire a better measurement instrument. Each item is listed as they currently appear in the questionnaire.

I thank you in advance for your help. Your efforts may help to determine the impact that *No Child Left Behind* has had on the music programs in our schools. If you have any questions as you are completing the content validation form, please do not hesitate to contact me. I can be reached at (614) 491-8657 or (614) 354-6689. Again, your help is greatly appreciated and highly valued.

Sincerely,

Kevin W. Gerrity  
Ph.D. Candidate  
The Ohio State University  
gerrity.4@osu.edu
Dear Colleague,

You have been selected to participate in a pilot study that seeks to measure the attitudes of Ohio principals and detail the status of Ohio’s public school music programs. Your responses are important in establishing the reliability of a questionnaire that will be used in a future research study. I understand how busy you are and have tried to make the questionnaire as brief as possible. It will most likely take you about 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

In addition to helping establish the reliability of our questionnaire, your responses could help to provide a detailed picture of Ohio’s public school music programs since the passage of No Child Left Behind while illustrating the difficult position Ohio principals find themselves in when trying to maintain first-class music programs in spite of funding and accountability concerns.

Included in the packet you will find:

- A cover letter explaining the research study.
- A stamped, addressed envelop for you to use to return your completed questionnaire. (You may fold the questionnaire)

We thank you in advance for taking the time to complete our pilot study questionnaire and look forward to learning about thoughts for music education and the status of the music program in your school. You can be assured that your responses will remain confidential: I ask that you do not identify yourself anywhere on the questionnaire. If you have any questions about the questionnaire or confidentiality, I encourage you to contact us at the numbers listed below. Otherwise, we will look forward to receiving your response by Friday, February 9, 2007.

Thank you again for considering this request.

Yours professionally,

Kevin W. Gerrity
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University

Questions? Contact Kevin at gerrity.4@osu.edu or (614) 491-8657
Dear Colleague,

Here is the packet I promised to send you. You have been selected to participate in a research study that seeks to measure the attitudes of Ohio principals toward music education and detail the status of the music programs in Ohio public schools. You should have been notified of your selection via a postcard that expressed my sincere hope that you might decide to participate. Your responses will help to provide a detailed picture of Ohio’s public school music programs since the passage of No Child Left Behind while illustrating the difficult position Ohio principals find themselves in when trying to maintain first-class music programs in spite of funding and accountability concerns.

I understand how busy you are and have tried to make the questionnaire as brief as possible. It will most likely take you about 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

Included in the packet you will find:

- A cover letter explaining the research study.
- A stamped, addressed envelop for you to use to return your completed questionnaire. (You may fold the questionnaire)
- A one-dollar bill as thanks so that you might enjoy a favorite soft drink or hot beverage while you complete the questionnaire.

I thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire and look forward to learning about your thoughts for music education and the status of the music program in your school. I do want to inform you that participation in this study is strictly voluntary, but if you choose to participate, you can be assured that your responses will remain confidential. To that end, I ask that you do not identify yourself anywhere on the questionnaire. The subject number appearing on the return envelope is used only to verify who has responded. Once opened, the envelope is destroyed. If you have any questions about the questionnaire or confidentiality, I encourage you to contact me at the number listed below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact Ohio State’s Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251. Otherwise, I will look forward to receiving your response by Saturday, March 10, 2007. Thank you again for considering this request.

Yours professionally,

Kevin W. Gerrity
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
(614) 491-8657
gerrity.4@osu.edu
Dear Colleague,

I am sending you this second information packet regarding the research study titled “NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education” because I have not yet received your responses. I am sure that this was just an oversight, or perhaps your schedule just did not permit you the time to complete the questionnaire. With so much going on in our schools, especially state-wide proficiency testing, I can certainly appreciate how busy you must be. However, I am still hopeful that you might have the opportunity to complete the questionnaire. As a sample study, your responses represent 15 other public school principals and remain vital to the success of this project. Please consider participating in this study.

Included in the packet you will find:

- A cover letter explaining the research study.
- A stamped, addressed envelop for you to use to return your completed questionnaire. (You may fold the questionnaire)
- A one-dollar bill as thanks so that you might enjoy a favorite soft drink or hot beverage while you complete the questionnaire.

I thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire and look forward to learning about your thoughts for music education and the status of the music program in your school. I do want to inform you that participation in this study is strictly voluntary, but if you choose to participate, you can be assured that your responses will remain confidential. To that end, I ask that you do not identify yourself anywhere on the questionnaire. The subject number appearing on the return envelope is used only to verify who has responded. Once opened, the envelope is destroyed. If you have any questions about the questionnaire or confidentiality, I encourage you to contact me at the number listed below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact Ohio State’s Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251. Otherwise, I will look forward to receiving your response by Saturday, March 24, 2007. Thank you again for considering this request.

Yours professionally,

Kevin W. Gerrity
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University
(614) 491-8657
gerrity.4@osu.edu
APPENDIX C

CONTENT VALIDATION

I. Expert Panel
II. Content Validation Form
I

Expert Panel

Theresa Allen East Middle School Harrod, Ohio

Elizabeth Southeastern Middle School Chillicothe, Ohio

Candace St. Henry High School St. Henry, Ohio

Thomas Boardman High School Youngstown, Ohio

Philip Indian Hill High School Cincinnati, Ohio

Joyce Stewart Alternative School Columbus, Ohio

Mark Jefferson Elementary School Hamilton, Ohio

Donna Kemp Elementary School Dayton, Ohio

Kathleen Tiffin Elementary School Chillicothe, Ohio

Diana Lincoln Elementary School Wadsworth, Ohio

Sara Marietta Middle School Marietta, Ohio

Michael Whitehall-Yearling High School Whitehall, Ohio

Jean Marion Local Elementary School Maria Stein, Ohio

Royce McMullen Elementary School Loudenville, Ohio

Rosalie Wilson Hill Elementary School Worthington, Ohio

Leslie Mineral Ridge Middle School Mineral Ridge, Ohio

Patricia Noble Elementary School Defiance, Ohio

Lauren Marion-Sterling Elementary School Cleveland, Ohio

Denise Northmoor Elementary School Englewood, Ohio

Kenneth Northridge High School Dayton, Ohio

Joyce Westerville North High School Westerville, Ohio

Victoria Esther Dennis Middle School Dayton, Ohio

Michael Norwood High School Norwood, Ohio

David Jackson Memorial Middle School Massillon, Ohio

Christopher Perry Elementary School Nashport, Ohio

Cynthia Ridgemont Elementary School Mount Victory, Ohio

Larry Portsmouth West Middle School West Portsmouth, Ohio

Malinda Rosemore Middle School Whitehall, Ohio

Margaret Silver Lake Elementary School Silver Lake, Ohio

Anjanette Howland Springs Elementary School Warren, Ohio
Directions for Part I:

Please read each statement and indicate if the statement is clear and appropriate for determining Principals’ attitudes toward music education. A space is provided for suggestions that may help make the questionnaire a better measurement instrument. Principals’ responses to each item will range from 1 (very strongly disagree) to 6 (very strongly agree) on a typical Likert scale.

1. Music is a vital part of every child’s education.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. I am familiar with the Ohio Standards for music education.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

3. I expect the music teachers in my school to devote some of their instructional time to other subjects (e.g. reading or math).

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
4. Since 2002, the number of certified music teachers working in my school has been reduced.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

5. The music teachers in my school have their own room(s).

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

6. I encourage all teachers to weave music into their instruction.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

7. I regularly collect and/or review data that tracks students’ achievement in music.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
8. Since 2002, the time allotted for music instruction has been reduced.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

9. I am familiar with the music curriculum of my school district.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

10. All the students in my building have access to the music program.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

11. The daily schedule followed in my building makes the scheduling of music courses difficult.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
12. Since 2002, the music course offerings in my building have increased.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

13. All students should be required to study music.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

14. Music education is a luxury that is difficult to justify in my building and/or district.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

15. I have consulted with the music teachers in my building about the policies that govern music education in our school.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

______________________________________________________________________________
16. Policies that negatively affect music education are sometimes necessary to ensure students can achieve in other academic areas (e.g. reading and math).

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

17. I am familiar with the *Opportunity-to-Learn Standards for Music Instruction* published by the National Association for Music Education.

Is the statement clear? Yes or No (circle one)

Is the statement appropriate? Yes or No (circle one)

Suggestions?

continue on the next page.
Directions for Part II:

In each box, specific questions relating to staffing, student access, instructional time, and course offerings are listed exactly as they appear in the measure instrument. Please read over each group of questions and indicate whether or not you believe that the researcher is asking questions that are relevant to the concerns our profession holds for the future of music education. A space is provided for your response.

STAFFING

18. Since 2002, the number of certified music teachers working in my school has increased / decreased (circle one) by how many teachers? __________________

(0 indicates no change)

If a change in the number of certified music teachers working in your school has occurred, do you believe the change was catalyzed by NCLB? Please Explain. If no change has occurred, please leave this area blank.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

19. Please indicate how many music specialists are currently employed in your building.

_____ # of FULL-TIME, CERTIFIED MUSIC TEACHERS

_____ # of PART-TIME, CERTIFIED MUSIC TEACHERS

If your school does not currently employ a certified music teacher, please indicate who provides the music education for the students of your school.

_____ A NON-MUSIC CERTIFIED TEACHER

_____ CLASSROOM TEACHERS

_____ OTHER ____________________________________________
Suggestions for Staffing concerns?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

ACCESS

20. Since 2002, has the access to music programs been limited for any identified student populations in your building (e.g. English Language Learners or students failing or at risk of failing state proficiency tests) so that they may focus more on academics?

_____ YES If yes, which student populations? _______________________________

_____ NO

Suggestions for Student Access concerns?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

TIME

21. Since 2002, the time allotted for general music classes in the daily schedule has

increased / decreased (circle one) by how many minutes? _________________

(0 indicates no change)

22. Since 2002, the time allotted for performance music classes in the daily schedule

has increased / decreased (circle one) by how many minutes? _________________

(0 indicates no change)
23. Since 2002, the number of times general music classes meet per week has
   *increased / decreased* (circle one) by how many times? ______________________
   (0 indicates no change)

24. Since 2002, the number of times performance music classes meet per week has
   *increased / decreased* (circle one) by how many times? ______________________
   (0 indicates no change)

25. Since 2002, the number of quarters per year general music classes meet has
   *increased / decreased* (circle one) by how many quarters? ______________________
   (0 indicates no change)

26. Since 2002, the number of quarters per year performance music classes meet has
   *increased / decreased* (circle one) by how many quarters? ______________________
   (0 indicates no change)

If a change in the time allotted for music instruction, either in minutes, meetings per week, or
quarters per year has occurred, do you believe the change was catalyzed by NCLB? Please
explain. If no change has occurred, please leave this area blank.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Suggestions for Instructional Time concerns?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
27. Since 2002, the number of music course offerings provided in my school has

*increased / decreased* (circle one) by how many courses? __________________

(0 indicates no change)

Please list all the courses that have been *added* to the music curriculum since 2002.

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

Please list all the courses that have been *eliminated* from the music curriculum since 2002.

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

If a change in the number of music course offerings has occurred in your school, do you believe the change was catalyzed by NCLB? Please explain. If no change has occurred, please leave this area blank.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

28. In light of the recent passage of legislation that requires all Ohio students to have at least 1 full credit in the arts between grades 7 and 12 in order to graduate, at what level do you think would be most appropriate for students to meet this requirement?

_____ MIDDLE – LEVEL (in either the 7th or 8th grade)

_____ HIGH SCHOOL (at some point between 9th and 12th grade)

Please provide a brief rationale for your choice.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
29. Please let us know what music courses are currently offered at your school by checking all that apply.

_____ ELEMENTARY GENERAL MUSIC
_____ ELEMENTARY CHORAL MUSIC
_____ ELEMENTARY INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
_____ MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH GENERAL MUSIC
_____ MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH CHORAL MUSIC
_____ MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
_____ HIGH SCHOOL GENERAL MUSIC / APPRECIATION
_____ HIGH SCHOOL CHORAL MUSIC
_____ HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
_____ CLASSROOM PIANO AND / OR GUITAR
_____ OTHER ________________________________

Suggestions for Course Offering concerns?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

You’re Done. Thank you for your help.
APPENDIX D

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRES

I. NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education  
(Pilot test version)
II. NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education  
(Final version)
I

No Child Left Behind:
Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education
(Pilot test)
Thank you for participating in this research study. Your responses will help to determine the status of music education programs across Ohio since the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. We appreciate your time and look forward to learning about your thoughts toward music education and the status of the music program in your school. Be assured your responses will remain confidential.
To begin... Please respond to each of the following questions about music education. Circle the appropriate number from the following scale that accurately expresses your level of agreement.

1 = Very Strongly Disagree (VSD)
2 = Strongly Disagree (STD)
3 = Disagree (DIS)
4 = Agree (AGR)
5 = Strongly Agree (STA)
6 = Very Strongly Agree (VSA)
? = Not Applicable (NAP)

Example

A. The directions to this questionnaire are easy to follow.

   VSD  STD  DIS  AGR  STA  VSA  NAP
   1    2    3    4    5    6   ?

By circling the number 6, you are indicating that you very strongly agree with this statement, thus believing that the directions to this questionnaire are indeed easy to follow.

START HERE

Level of Agreement
(circle your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VSD</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>VSA</th>
<th>NAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Music is a vital part of every child’s education.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  ?

2. I am familiar with the Ohio Standards for music education.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  ?

3. I expect the music teachers in my school to devote some of their instructional time to other subjects (e.g. reading or math).

   1  2  3  4  5  6  ?
| 4. Since 2002, the number of certified music teachers working in my school has been reduced. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | ? |
| 5. I encourage all teachers to weave music into their instruction. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | ? |
| 6. I regularly collect and/or review data that tracks students’ achievement in music. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | ? |
| 7. Since 2002, the time allotted for music instruction has been reduced. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | ? |
| 8. I am familiar with the music curriculum of my school district. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | ? |
| 9. All the students in my building have access to the music program. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | ? |
| 10. The daily schedule followed in my building makes the effective scheduling of music courses difficult. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | ? |
11. Since 2002, the music course offerings in my building have increased.

12. All students should be required to study music.

13. Music education is a luxury that is difficult to justify in my building and/or district.

14. I have consulted with the music teachers in my building about the policies that govern music education in our school.

15. Policies that negatively affect music education are sometimes necessary to ensure students can achieve in other academic areas (e.g. reading and math).

16. I am familiar with the *Opportunity-to-Learn Standards for Music Instruction* published by the National Association for Music Education.

Continue. Thank you for your responses thus far! Please provide some more detailed information by answering the following items.
STAFFING

17. Since 2002, the number of certified music teachers working in my school has

*increased / decreased* (circle one) by how many teachers? __________________
(0 indicates no change)

If a change in the number of certified music teachers working in your school has occurred, do you believe the change was catalyzed by NCLB? Please Explain. If no change has occurred, please leave this area blank.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

18. Please indicate how many music specialists are currently employed in your building.

_____ # of FULL-TIME, CERTIFIED MUSIC TEACHERS

_____ # of PART-TIME, CERTIFIED MUSIC TEACHERS

If your school does not currently employ a certified music teacher, please indicate who provides the music education for the students of your school.

_____ A NON-MUSIC CERTIFIED TEACHER

_____ CLASSROOM TEACHERS

_____ OTHER __________________________

ACCESS

19. Since 2002, has the access to music programs been limited for any identified student populations in your building (e.g. English Language Learners or students failing or at risk of failing state proficiency tests) so that they may focus more on academics?

_____ YES  If yes, which student populations? ________________________________

_____ NO
20. Since 2002, the number of quarters per year music classes meet has
   \textit{increased / decreased} (circle one) by how many quarters? \underline{___________________} (0 indicates no change)

21. Since 2002, the number of times music classes meet per week has
   \textit{increased / decreased} (circle one) by how many times? \underline{___________________} (0 indicates no change)

22. Since 2002, the amount of time that music classes regularly meet has
   \textit{increased / decreased} (circle one) by how many minutes? \underline{___________________} (0 indicates no change)

If a change in the time allotted for music instruction, either in minutes, meetings per week, or quarters per year has occurred, do you believe the change was catalyzed by NCLB? Please explain. If no change has occurred, please leave this area blank.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
23. Since 2002, the number of music course offerings provided in my school has **increased** / **decreased** (circle one) by how many courses? __________________ (0 indicates no change)

Please list all the courses that have been **added** to the music curriculum since 2002.

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

Please list all the courses that have been **eliminated** from the music curriculum since 2002.

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

If a change in the number of music course offerings has occurred in your school, do you believe the change was catalyzed by NCLB? Please explain. If no change has occurred, please leave this area blank.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

24. In light of the recent passage of legislation that requires all Ohio students to have at least 1 full credit in the arts between grades 7 and 12 in order to graduate, at what level do you think would be most appropriate for students to meet this requirement?

_____ MIDDLE – LEVEL (in either the 7th or 8th grade)

_____ HIGH SCHOOL (at some point between 9th and 12th grade)
Please provide a brief rationale for your choice.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

25. Please let us know what music courses are currently offered at your school by checking all that apply.

_____ ELEMENTARY GENERAL MUSIC
_____ ELEMENTARY CHORAL MUSIC
_____ ELEMENTARY INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
_____ MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH GENERAL MUSIC
_____ MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH CHORAL MUSIC
_____ MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
_____ HIGH SCHOOL GENERAL MUSIC / APPRECIATION
_____ HIGH SCHOOL CHORAL MUSIC
_____ HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
_____ CLASSROOM PIANO AND / OR GUITAR
_____ OTHER _____________________________________________________________
And finally…. 

26. Please rank the following subjects from most important (1) to least important (6) in creating well-educated persons.

_____ MATH
_____ MUSIC
_____ READING
_____ SCIENCE
_____ SOCIAL STUDIES
_____ WRITING

27. Indicate the type of community your school is located in by placing an “X” by the appropriate choice.

_____ URBAN
_____ SUBURBAN
_____ RURAL

28. Indicate your school type by placing an “X” by the appropriate choice and let us know its grade configuration in the space provided.

_____ PRIMARY grade configuration (e.g. K-4) _________________
_____ MIDDLE – LEVEL grade configuration (e.g. 6-8) _________________
_____ SECONDARY grade configuration (e.g. 9-12) _________________

You’re Done!
Thank you so much for completing this questionnaire
If there are any further comments you would like to share, we invite you to express your thoughts in the Additional Comments section located below.

**Additional Comments**

Return completed questionnaires to:
Kevin W. Gerrity
1349 Halfhill Way
Columbus, Ohio 43207-4495
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Thank you for participating in this research study. Your responses will help to determine the status of music education programs across Ohio since the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. We appreciate your time and look forward to learning about your thoughts toward music education and the status of the music program in your school. Be assured your responses will remain confidential.
To begin... Please respond to each of the following questions about music education. Circle the appropriate number from the following scale that accurately expresses your level of agreement.

1 = Very Strongly Disagree (VSD)
2 = Strongly Disagree (STD)
3 = Disagree (DIS)
4 = Agree (AGR)
5 = Strongly Agree (STA)
6 = Very Strongly Agree (VSA)
? = Not Applicable (NAP)

### Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VSD</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>VSA</th>
<th>NAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. The directions to this questionnaire are easy to follow.

By circling the number 6, you are indicating that you very strongly agree with this statement, thus believing that the directions to this questionnaire are indeed easy to follow.

### START HERE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>VSD</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>VSA</th>
<th>NAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(circle your response)</td>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
<td>NAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Music is a vital part of every child’s education.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 ?

2. I am familiar with the Ohio Standards for music education.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 ?

3. I expect the music teachers in my school to devote some of their instructional time to other subjects (e.g. reading or math).  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 ?
4. I encourage all teachers to weave music into their instruction.

5. I am familiar with the music curriculum of my school district.

6. I regularly collect and/or review data that tracks students’ achievement in music.

7. I am familiar with the Opportunity-to-Learn Standards for Music Instruction published by the National Association for Music Education.

8. All students should be required to study music.

9. Music is a subject that is difficult to justify in my building and/or district.

10. Policies that negatively affect music education are sometimes necessary to ensure students can achieve in other academic areas (e.g. reading and math).
Continue. Thank you for your responses thus far! Please provide some more detailed information by answering the following items.

STAFFING

11. If the number of certified music teachers working in your school has changed since 2002, please indicate the net gain/loss of teachers in the space provided (e.g. +2 or -1). Zero (0) indicates not change.

_________ net gain/loss of certified music teachers.

12. Next, please indicate how many music specialists are currently employed in your building.

_____ # of FULL-TIME, CERTIFIED MUSIC TEACHERS

_____ # of PART-TIME, CERTIFIED MUSIC TEACHERS

13. If your school does not currently employ a certified music teacher, please indicate who provides the music education for the students of your school.

_____ A NON-MUSIC CERTIFIED TEACHER

_____ CLASSROOM TEACHERS

_____ OTHER __________________________________________________________

_____ OUR SCHOOL DOES NOT PROVIDE MUSIC EDUCATION (N/A)
ACCESS

14. Since 2002, has the access to music programs been limited for any identified student populations in your building (e.g. English Language Learners or students failing or at risk of failing state proficiency tests) so that they may focus more on academics?

_____ YES If yes, which student populations? _______________________________

_____ NO

TIME

15. Since 2002, the number of quarters per year music classes meet has

Increased / Decreased (circle one) by how many quarters? ___________________ 
(0 indicates no change)

16. Since 2002, the number of times music classes meet per week has

Increased / Decreased (circle one) by how many times? ____________________ 
(0 indicates no change)

17. Since 2002, the amount of time that music classes regularly meet has

Increased / Decreased (circle one) by how many minutes? __________________ 
(0 indicates no change)

18. Do you expect the music teachers in your school to devote some of their instructional time to other subjects (e.g. reading or math)?

_____ YES If yes, approximately how many minutes per class? ________________

_____ NO
COURSE OFFERINGS

19. If the number of music course offerings provided in your school has changed since 2002, please indicate which courses have been added or eliminated from the curriculum in the space provided.

Please list all the courses that have been added to the music curriculum since 2002.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please list all the courses that have been eliminated from the music curriculum since 2002.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

20. In light of the recent passage of legislation that requires all Ohio students to have at least 1 full credit in the arts between grades 7 and 12 in order to graduate, at what level do you think would be most appropriate for students to meet this requirement?

_____ MIDDLE – LEVEL (in either the 7th or 8th grade)

_____ HIGH SCHOOL (at some point between 9th and 12th grade)

Please provide a brief rationale for your choice.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
21. Please let us know what music courses are currently offered at your school by checking all that apply.

_____ ELEMENTARY GENERAL MUSIC
_____ ELEMENTARY CHORAL MUSIC
_____ ELEMENTARY INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
_____ MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH GENERAL MUSIC
_____ MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH CHORAL MUSIC
_____ MIDDLE OR JUNIOR HIGH INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
_____ HIGH SCHOOL GENERAL MUSIC / APPRECIATION
_____ HIGH SCHOOL CHORAL MUSIC
_____ HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
_____ CLASSROOM PIANO AND / OR GUITAR
_____ OTHER ____________________________________________

And finally…. 

22. Please rank the following subjects from most important (1) to least important (6) in the general education of students.

_____ MATH
_____ MUSIC
_____ READING
_____ SCIENCE
_____ SOCIAL STUDIES
_____ WRITING
23. Indicate the type of community your school is located in by placing an “X” by the appropriate choice.

_____ URBAN

_____ SUBURBAN

_____ RURAL

24. Indicate your school type by placing an “X” by the appropriate choice and let us know its grade configuration in the space provided.

_____ PRIMARY grade configuration (e.g. K-4) _________________

_____ MIDDLE – LEVEL grade configuration (e.g. 6-8) _________________

_____ SECONDARY grade configuration (e.g. 9-12) _________________

25. In your own words, please describe the impact that the No Child Left Behind Act has had on your school. Information regarding the Act’s impact on the music program of your school (either direct or residual) is especially appreciated.

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

You’re Done!
Thank you for completing this questionnaire
If there are any further comments you would like to share, we invite you to express your thoughts in the Additional Comments section located below.

**Additional Comments**

*Return completed questionnaires to:*

Kevin W. Gerrity  
1349 Halfhill Way  
Columbus, Ohio 43207-4495
APPENDIX E

SCRIPTS

I. Phone Call Reminders
Phone Call Reminders

1. Hello. May I please speak with (Participant)?

2. Hi (Participant).

3. My name is Kevin Gerrity and I am calling to find out if you have received information regarding the research study entitled “NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education.”

If the participant provides an affirmative response to Line 3:

A. Terrific. Have you had the opportunity to complete the response questionnaire?

If YES:

a) Great. I would really like to thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire.
b) When do you think we might expect to receive your completed questionnaire in the mail?
c) Wonderful. We’ll look for your response then. However, just in case something unexpected should come up, remember that our response deadline is Wednesday, March 28, 2007.
d) Thank you again (Participant). Take care and enjoy the rest of the school year. Goodbye.

If NO:

a) Well, I completely understand how busy you must be.
b) However, I am really hoping that you will be able to participate in the study. Do you think you might be able to find some time to complete and return the response questionnaire?

(assuming a positive response)

- Great. I really appreciate it.
- When do you think we might expect to receive your completed questionnaire in the mail?
- Wonderful. We’ll look for your response then. However, just in case something unexpected should come up, remember that our response deadline is Wednesday, March 28, 2007.
- Thank you again (Participant). Take care and enjoy the rest of the school year. Goodbye.
(assuming a negative response)

- Well, as I said, I completely understand that your schedule may not allow any time for completing questionnaires. But, I would still like to thank you for at least considering the request.
- Thank you for your time (Participant). Take care and enjoy the rest of the school year. Goodbye.

If the participant provides a negative response to Line 3:

B. Well, let me start by confirming the business mailing address that we have listed for you.

C. Thank you for the updated information. However, despite our mix-up with your mailing address, I am still hoping that you might be able to participate in the study. Its title is “NCLB: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education,” and its main focus is to determine the attitudes of Ohio principals toward music education and the status of Ohio’s music programs since the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act. Do you think you might be able to find some time to complete and return the response questionnaire?

If YES:

a) Great. I really appreciate it. I’ll send a complete packet of information to the new address you have provided for us.

b) Once you receive the packet, please complete the response questionnaire and return it to us as soon as possible. Remember, our response deadline is Wednesday, March 28, 2007.

c) Thank you again (Participant). Take care and enjoy the rest of the school year. Goodbye.

If NO:

a) Well, I completely understand that your schedule may not allow any time for completing questionnaires.

b) However, I would still like to thank you for considering the request.

c) Thank you for your time (Participant). Take care and enjoy the rest of the school year. Goodbye.
APPENDIX F

INTERNAL REVIEW

I. Internal Review Board Approval Form
# Internal Review Board Approval Form

**TITLE PAGE - APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION**

**FROM REVIEW BY THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**
The Ohio State University, Columbus OH 43210

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
<th>Name: Timothy A. Gerber</th>
<th>Phone: 292-5985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Title:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other. Please specify.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May require prior approval.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department or College:</td>
<td>Music/ARTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Address (room, building, street address):</td>
<td>106B Hughes Hall</td>
<td>1899 College Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Timothy A. Gerber</td>
<td>2/1/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>292-1102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Investigator</th>
<th>Name: Kevin Gerrity</th>
<th>Phone: 354-0689</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Graduate Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Undergraduate Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other. Please specify.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Address (room, building, street address) or Mailing Address:</td>
<td>106C Hughes Hall</td>
<td>1899 College Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Kevin Gerrity</td>
<td>3/8/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Investigator</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Graduate Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Undergraduate Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other. Please specify.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Address (room, building, street address) or Mailing Address:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol Title</th>
<th>No Child Left Behind: Determining the Impact of Policy on Music Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>None Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For Office Use Only

☑ Approved. Research has been determined to be exempt under these categories: 2. Research may begin as of the date of determination listed below.

☐ Disapproved. The proposed research does not fall within the categories of exemption. Submit an application to the appropriate Institutional Review Board for review.

Date of determination: 2/2/07  Signature: [Signature]

Office of Responsible Research Practices
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