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ABSTRACT

Traditional music education students are often required to choose a specific curricular emphasis or track of study within their degree program. These specializations, based upon the student’s major instrument, include choral, general, and instrumental music. Although there is general training and coursework beyond a student’s area of specialty in the undergraduate music education curriculum, the majority of music performance and music education experiences are within the student’s track. Upon graduating from an accredited college or university, however, music education graduates who earn a Florida teaching certificate are endorsed to teach all areas of music from kindergarten to twelfth grade. It is possible secondary music teachers may be assigned to teach choral, general, and instrumental music classes. As a result, these individuals could conceivably be teaching classes in areas outside of their elected expertise. The lack of quantitative data concerning the status of music educators’ preservice training relative to their current teaching assignments in the state of Florida facilitated the need for an investigation. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate Florida high school music teachers’ preservice training and determine the percentage of these educators who were currently teaching outside of “track” or area of specialization. Further, differences between the numbers of high school music teachers teaching inside and outside of their track(s) and their school’s size, students’ socioeconomic status, and geographic location were explored.

Participants (N = 232) completed a survey instrument consisting of four sections: (1) Demographic Data, (2) Professional Responsibilities, (3) Undergraduate/Graduate Coursework, and (4) Additional Information. Analyses of responses found that most (83.1%) of the participants indicated a performance-oriented music education track of study in choral and/or instrumental music and a majority (64.6%) of the participants were teaching at least one class outside of their track on a weekly basis. A majority (85.7%) of beginning teachers were teaching at least one class outside of track while a minority (35.5%) of veteran teachers taught out of track classes. Results also indicated that general track participants reported fewer methods classes and relevant curricular offerings in their area than their choral and instrumental counterparts. Significant differences were found between inside and outside track teachers in 3A and 6A
school size categories, suburban and urban geographic locations, and socioeconomic status
schools with 0-20%, 41-60%, and 81-100% of students receiving free and reduced meals. The
other comparisons between inside and outside track teachers and the schools at which they were
teaching revealed no significant differences. Consequently, teacher experience levels and track(s)
of expertise were more likely to indicate inside or outside of track teaching status than individual
school characteristics.
Undergraduate music education students enter the college or university setting with a major performance instrument. These students learn how to refine and finesse technique on their major instrument by participating in ensembles, taking applied lessons, and performing in master classes, juries, and recitals. Additionally, specialization in general, instrumental, or choral music education is often contingent upon the student’s major instrument resulting in specific curriculums for each music education “track.” Music education teaching observations, field experiences, and internship placements are oftentimes based upon the student’s area of specialization. Although there is general training and coursework beyond a student’s area of specialty in the undergraduate music education curriculum, the majority of music performance and music education experiences are within the student’s track. This design leads to questions of whether the K-12 licensure currently endorsed by the state of Florida is being met with the existing university music education curricular system.

Passage of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (United States Department of Education, 1993) and development of the National Standards for Arts Education (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994) have emphasized a comprehensive approach to music education. Among the skills to be taught are listening, analyzing, composition, improvisation, and performance. A variety of proposed music course offerings beyond the band/chorus/orchestra model in the high school curricula now include Salsa band, guitar, musical theater, keyboard, Afro-Cuban drumming, music theory, world voices, and music technology (Balistreri & Minear, 2008). As a result, there are increasing demands for teachers to expand their knowledge base beyond the Western music tradition and to teach classes outside of the performance-oriented environment (Madsen, 2000; Reimer, 2008; Teachout, 2005). Despite the growth of the K-12 music curricula and the new competencies teachers must possess to accommodate this growth, a majority of undergraduate preservice music teacher education programs remain focused on “tracking” individual preservice teachers in a general, choral, or
instrumental area of expertise (Burnsed & Jenson, 1994; Conway, Hourigan, & Stanley, 2007; Hickey & Rees, 2002; Rohwer & Henry, 2004).

The state of Florida licenses music educators with a K-12 teaching certificate, which theoretically assumes that all music educators are qualified to teach orchestra, steel drum band, show choir, marching band, concert choir, and elementary music with the same degree of expertise and effectiveness. The incongruity between undergraduate specialization and broad certification may lead to “out of expertise area” teaching responsibilities for music educators. Additionally, research (Ball, Thames, & Phelps, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2006) has found the more specialized and complex the discipline (e.g., chamber orchestra vs. beginning strings), the stronger the correlation is between student achievement and teacher expertise. High school musicians are usually the most advanced and experienced performers in the K-12 school setting and the course offerings are oftentimes the most diverse (e.g., class piano, class guitar, music technology, music appreciation, music theory, and multicultural performance ensembles). These factors make high school music teachers highly susceptible to teaching classes that were not the focus of their undergraduate curriculum. Therefore, it is important to assess the number of high school teachers who are currently teaching outside of their specialty area.

**Teacher Certification**

Teacher certification in the United States encompasses a variety of endorsements and requirements. Pathways to licensure vary from the traditional four-year degree program to the alternative certification route. Despite the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession’s (1986) declaration that uniform certification procedures be established, the disparity from state to state in who can be certified and what they can be certified to teach has resulted in a confusing and non-standardized practice of professional licensure (Henry, 2005; Feistritzer, 1984). This practice includes a series of over 600 tests designed to measure a teacher candidate’s basic skills or content knowledge (Selwyn, 2007). The reciprocity of teaching licenses between states ranges from a nonrestrictive status to no reciprocity at all. This variation also contributes to the lack of clarity and uniformity in certifying teachers (Henry, 2005).

Differences in standards for certifying teachers also appear to be varied within a single certification area, such as music. While the state of Florida endorses music educators to teach at all age-levels and in all tracks, there has been an overall decrease in the number of states offering
K-12 certification in music since 1972 (Erbes, 1987). These states limit endorsements to specific grades (K-8, 5-12, 1-9, etc.) and/or specific areas (general, chorus, band, composite, etc.) of instruction. States such as Vermont separate music teaching licensure into specific age levels (PK-6 or 7-12) and require teachers to “demonstrate knowledge of music and music education concepts and skills including the processes and stages of children’s and/or adolescents’ musical and aesthetic development” (Vermont Department of Education, 2009). Other states such as Wisconsin divide music teaching certificates into specific areas of expertise to “model academic standards of performance, creativity, literacy, response, and connections” within the choral, general, or instrumental context (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2009).

Advantages of the K-12 music teaching certificate may be superficial and short-sighted. Hoag’s (1983) rationale that “the ability to teach both vocal and instrumental music is becoming more important as economic cutbacks and declining enrollments cause reductions in teaching staff and redistribution of teaching assignments” may undermine the need for high quality instruction (p. 5). The K-12 certification allows for flexibility in the job market by enabling one to accept a teaching position at any level, but some claim this endorsement is inappropriate for beginning teachers (Conway, 2001). Others believe the K-12 certificate does not align with the traditional undergraduate tracking system of band, choral, and general music specializations (Cutietta, 2007; Hickey & Rees, 2002; Rohwer & Henry, 2004). Richard Colwell (2006) writes:

> Although states, at the request of school administrators, certify music teachers for all grades and all sub disciplines, there is no cogent reason for teacher education programs to accept this blanket approach. With the resources (four years) available, music teacher education programs should prepare students well in the focus they elect (p. 27).

Greher and Tobin (2006) further state, “Teachers who obtained either an elementary or secondary music education degree in instrumental or vocal music who get certified in a state that only offers broad certification may be thrust into teaching a different age-group in an area for which they received little or no training during their undergraduate years” (p. 53).

**Music Teacher Competencies**

Teachers must know the subject matter they teach. In fact there may be nothing more foundational to teacher competency. “The teacher has special responsibilities in relation to content knowledge, serving as the primary source of student understanding of subject matter”
The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), an association of approximately 615 schools of music primarily at the collegiate level, is the national accrediting agency for music and music-related disciplines in the United States. The Baccalaureate Degree in Music Education as described by NASM includes the following structural guidelines: basic musicianship and performance comprise at least 50% of the total program; general studies, 30-35%; and professional education 15-20%. Specialization competencies are outlined in the NASM handbook as follows:

Institutions and other educational authorities make decisions about the extent to which music teachers will be prepared in one or more specializations. The following competencies apply singly or in combination consistent with the specialization objectives of each teacher preparation program in music.

(1) **General Music.** Listed below are essential competencies and experiences for the general music teaching specialization:

(a) Musicianship, vocal, and pedagogical skills sufficient to teach general music.

(b) Knowledge of content, methodologies, philosophies, materials, technologies, and curriculum development for general music.

(c) The ability to lead performance-based instruction.

(d) Laboratory and field experiences in teaching general music.

(2) **Vocal/Choral Music.** Listed below are essential competencies and experiences for the vocal/choral teaching specialization:

(a) Vocal and pedagogical skill sufficient to teach effective use of the voice.

(b) Knowledge of content, methodologies, philosophies, materials, technologies, and curriculum development for vocal/choral music.

(c) Experiences in solo vocal performance, as well as in both large and small choral ensembles.

(d) Performance ability sufficient to use at least one instrument as a teaching tool and to provide, to transpose, and improvise accompaniments.

(e) Laboratory experience in teaching beginning vocal techniques individually, in small groups and in larger classes.

(3) **Instrumental Music.** Listed below are essential competencies and experiences for the instrumental music teaching specialization:
(a) Knowledge of and performance ability on wind, string, and percussion instruments sufficient to teach beginning students effectively in groups.
(b) Knowledge of content, methodologies, philosophies, materials, technologies, and curriculum development for instrumental music.
(c) Experiences in solo instrumental performance, as well as in both small and large instrumental ensembles.
(d) Laboratory experience in teaching beginning instrumental students individually, in small groups, and in larger classes (National Association of Schools of Music, 2008).

The voluntary standards of NASM are widely accepted and considered the industry standard by member institutions (Jones, 2009). Hope (2007) commends NASM for its adoption of a new category in the undergraduate music education standards, which include opportunities for teacher education programs in such areas as composition, electronic music, guitar, ethnic music, jazz, and keyboard. He states “NASM is ahead of most institutions and states” as it acknowledges new ideas and new emphases in music teacher preparation (p. 7). Further criticism of academia is launched by Martin (1995): “the paradigm blindness of the many preservice programs mimics the process of the 50’s and 60’s, rather than acknowledging, changing, and addressing the challenges of the next century” (p. 19).

Fowler (1996) identifies political and economic factors as the most dominating curricular influences in higher education:

The turf wars at institutions of higher education are fierce. Schools or departments of education guard their area with the tenacity of a lioness guarding her cubs. The funding of departments, based upon the numbers of students enrolled in the department’s courses, tends to reduce curricular discussions to economic issues. Change does not come easily to departments vying for the credits that will sustain them. These vested interests do not operate on the basis of what courses make good sense for the prospective teacher. Rather, they operate protectively and politically to preserve the department (p. 171).

Music faculty members are also protective of their areas and “routinely agree on very little, except for their love of music” when faced with curricular cutbacks (Kennedy, 2005, p. 195). Benefits of the NASM standards and the breadth of course offerings are often ignored or
overlooked when university music departments fail to broaden their curriculum due to such factors (Bok, 2006; Jones, 2009).

Critics of NASM standards, however, claim the framework is outdated and insufficient in preparing teachers for the classroom (Colwell, 2006; Deal, 2002; Fowler, 1996; Gordon, 2001; Jorgenson, 2008; Kimpton, 2005; Leonhard, 1985). In a speech to the National Association of Schools of Music conference attendees, Deal (2002) outlined the perceived problems of a disconnected and compartmentalized undergraduate music curriculum, which has experienced “minimal change” over the course of five decades (p. 104). Little regard for “the big picture” has resulted in an outdated paradigm and lack of direction for the future in curricular relevancy. Kimpton (2005) attributed the rising costs of higher education in the early 1990’s to the compressed 120-credit bachelor’s degree. He further states: “the strict adherence of schools to the 75-year old NASM policy of 65% music content, 35% methods/other courses, and an increase in state-mandated courses and exit requirements forced many music education programs to disproportionally reduce the number of music education courses” (p. 13). An increase in mandated non-music preparation coursework for teacher licenses has also marginalized and forced cuts in music courses (Jorgenson, 2008). Colwell (2006) elaborates:

- The lack of concern about a public school music teacher’s subject matter competence is understandable as music teacher education is heavily weighted with musical [and non-musical] competencies, the public and school administrators have no clue, and there is presently an expectation of considerable musical skill at the time of entry into the music teacher education program. The subject-matter emphasis, however, does not prevent students who are not musically adequate from being admitted and graduating (p. 21).

Colwell’s statement is supported by Gordon’s (2001) finding that on average, one third of the students in a music classroom or performance group possess higher overall music aptitude than the music teacher. The perceived mediocrity of music education graduates has been described by Leonard (1985) as a “long series of compromises” in which:

- The present music teacher education program results in a human product whom applied music specialists consider less than adequate as a performer, whom musicologists consider deficient as a musical scholar, whom theorists view as lacking basic musicianship, and whom school administrators consider unprepared to relate music to the total school program (p. 11).
The possession of a music education college degree alone does not guarantee new teachers will understand their art or how to teach it effectively (Fowler, 1996).

Teachers in the field have expressed concern about the lack of training in areas outside of their specialty track (Belz, 2006; Nicholson, 2002). In a survey of Arizona music teachers, Shires (1990) found “band teachers who also taught choir did not consider themselves adequately prepared to do so” (p. 121). A lack of preparation in lower grades was noted by one of the participants in Simon’s (2009) examination of Tennessee teachers:

The reality of Instrumental Music Education majors is that they will, more likely, teach general music in their first job. I wish my program had offered more courses in elementary music pedagogy. It would’ve made my first year of teaching more successful (p. 52).

Preservice music teachers have also indicated a feeling of inadequacy in teaching outside of their chosen area of expertise. Among their concerns are inappropriate modeling, lack of pedagogical understanding, and inability to meet parent expectations or state standards (Hamman & Ebie, 2009).

In response to the development of the National Standards for Arts Education (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994), a review board of teachers and other education leaders declared the following:

New teachers graduating from teacher preparation programs should present, as a part of the requirements for licensure, evidence that they have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that at least equal those demanded of their students. They should present evidence that they are disposed to continually develop their skills and expertise, both in content areas and in pedagogy (Kapinus, Morgan, Philip, Quam, & Selden, 1994, p. 93).

The Florida Curriculum Framework (1996) has also questioned the teaching effectiveness of music educators who are teaching outside of their tracks:

Arts teachers, in particular, should be certified in their particular area of expertise. Currently, certification covers broad areas such as art or music, kindergarten through grade 12; however, this does not mean that the teacher so certified is truly capable of teaching all areas of dance, music, theatre, or the visual arts. For example, a music teacher whose area of emphasis is voice and choral music is rarely able to teach band or orchestral instruments with the same degree of expertise (p. 280).
This concern may be more applicable to specific geographic locations (Costa-Giomi, 2008; Isbell, 2005; Kruez, 2005), socioeconomic factors (Abril & Gault, 2008; Zuelke, 2008), school sizes (Bergee & Westfall, 2005; Walberg & Walberg, 1994; Warner-King & Price, 2003), or teacher experience levels (Ferguson, 2005; Richardson, 2008). Nevertheless, the state of Florida continues to endorse its music educators with a music teaching certificate at all age levels and in all areas of expertise.

Need

As demonstrated in the literature, teachers who are certified to teach music in the state of Florida must exhibit a wide variety of competencies in many areas of musical study. However, the current tracking system of most undergraduate music programs requires preservice teachers to specialize on one instrument and its corresponding area within the music education curriculum. It is possible secondary music teachers could be assigned to teach choral, general, and instrumental music classes. As a result, these individuals could conceivably be teaching classes in areas outside of their elected expertise. There may also be a disproportionate number of students from specific geographical locations or socioeconomic backgrounds who are receiving instruction from these teachers.

Currently, there is no existing comprehensive database of music educators in the state of Florida, which includes teaching assignments as well as teachers’ tracks of specialization or areas of expertise. There is also limited research in teacher training and certification procedures as they relate to teaching responsibilities or assignments. The lack of quantitative data concerning the status of music educators’ preservice training relative to their current teaching assignments in the state of Florida facilitates the need for an investigation (Giles, 1995).

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate Florida high school music teachers’ preservice training and determine the percentage of these educators who were currently teaching outside of their “track” or area of specialization. Further, differences between the numbers of high school music teachers teaching outside of their tracks with their school’s size, students’ socioeconomic status, and geographic location were explored. This investigation was not philosophical or theoretical in nature and did not investigate the perceived importance of one
curricular design or teaching certificate over another. Such matters were beyond the scope of this examination. This study was limited specifically to the collection and analysis of data from high school teachers in the state of Florida. The research questions which were addressed in this study included:

**Research Questions**

1. What were the music education tracks of the high school music teachers within the study?
2. Were there differences between the numbers of undergraduate and graduate coursework classes by curricular area and the participants’ music education tracks?
3. If yes, what were the differences between the numbers of undergraduate and graduate coursework classes by curricular area and the participants’ music education tracks?
4. How many high school music teachers were currently teaching inside and outside of their track?
5. Were there differences between the number of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks and their current teaching assignments?
6. How many teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track or tracks were within the different sizes of schools?
7. Were there differences between the numbers of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks by the school size in which they taught?
8. How many teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track or tracks were within the different geographic location of the school (rural, suburban, urban)?
9. Were there differences between the numbers of teachers who were teaching inside and outside of their tracks by the geographical location in which they taught?
10. How many teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track or tracks were within the different schools’ socioeconomic status of the students?
11. Were there differences between the number of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks and the schools’ socioeconomic status at which they taught?
12. Were beginning music teachers more likely to be teaching outside of their tracks than their more experienced counterparts?

**Operational Definitions**

Beginning teacher: An educator with less than three complete years of full-time teaching experience (U.S. Department of Education, 2004)

Choral track: Specialization within the music education curriculum which includes traditional chorus, private voice, musical theatre, and other choral ensembles

Curriculum: The subjects taught at an educational institution, or the elements taught in a particular subject area

General track: Specialization within the music education curriculum which includes music technology, class guitar, class piano, and music theory (Thompson & Kiester, 1987)

Geographic location: Rural, suburban, or urban community surrounding an existing school

Instrumental track: Specialization within the music education curriculum which includes band, orchestra, private instrument instruction, and other instrumental ensembles

Multi-track: Various combinations of choral, general, and instrumental tracks

Non-music class: Subject not listed as a course in the Florida Department of Education High School Courses for Music (Florida Department of Education, 2005)

Other track: Specialization outside of the music education curriculum (e.g. performance, music therapy, music theory)

Reciprocity: The transfer of a teaching certificate from one state to another

School: If teachers work in more than one school, the school at which they are teaching is defined as the location where the majority of their instructional duty time is spent

School size: Student enrollment classification of 1B, 1A, 2B, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, or 6A (Florida High School Athletic Association, 2009)

Socioeconomic status: Percentage of students receiving free and reduced meals (United States Department of Education, 1996)
Teacher: Anyone serving in the capacity of a facilitator of instruction who has been certified by some state or accrediting agency

Track: An instrument/area of expertise or specialization within the music education university curriculum that includes a specific program of study for that concentration
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Music teachers who are certified in the state of Florida are endorsed to teach at all age levels, in all areas of music performance, and in various classroom settings, thus creating the need for teachers to exhibit a wide range of competencies in many areas of musical study. The current tracking system of most undergraduate music programs within the state, however, requires preservice teachers to specialize on one instrument and its corresponding area within the music education curriculum. This specialization creates the possibility of music teachers being assigned to teach classes in areas outside of their elected expertise. To date there are no studies which link Florida music educators’ preservice experiences to specific teaching assignments, yet there are a few that examine these issues as they apply to other states (Fischer, 1999; Keeler, 2008; Marks, 1994; Simon, 2009). The present study will follow an earlier model developed for teachers in the state of South Carolina (Franklin, 1968). Other studies related to comprehensive musicianship, preservice teacher preparation, the undergraduate music curriculum, individual school characteristics, and teacher certification practices will also serve as a foundation for the present study. Additionally, the results and findings of these studies will reveal the perceived strengths and weaknesses of current undergraduate music education curricula, the certification process, and the placement of qualified teachers within the state of Florida.

Comprehensive Musicianship

The comprehensive musicianship approach to learning is a student-centered methodology in which musical development is nurtured by performance, perceptive listening, analysis, and evaluation, as well as compositional/improvisational techniques and processes. The origin of this approach has been traced to the Young Composers Project under the sponsorship of the Ford Foundation (1957) and the leadership of composer, Norman Dello Joio (Abramson, Choksy, Gillespie, Woods, & York, 2001). A shift from the short-range performance goals of traditional rehearsal procedures to broadly based educational objectives was one of the core principles of
the Young Composers Project (Garofalo & Whaley, 1979). Although the project concluded in 1973, some have attributed comprehensive musicianship to more recent trends in music standards-based instruction (Austin, 1998; Buchanan & Mehaffey, 2005; Fritts, 1991) while others have identified this concept as an historical artifact, particularly in the higher education setting where music theory, history, literature, and performance are commonly isolated and departmentalized (Deal, 2002; Hickey & Rees, 2002; Thomson, 1990). Campbell (1991) stated, “if comprehensive musicianship and thorough music literacy are to occur in formal educational settings, the effort will require the combination of aural, kinesthetic, and notational skills along with provisions for creative expression” (p. 21). Tracking systems of choral, general, and instrumental specializations may encourage further compartmentalization within the music department and place more emphasis on an applied instrument or area. However, comprehensive musicianship skills may also be taught within performance ensembles and music theory or history classes.

**Performance Ensembles**

Comprehensive musicianship activities in the ensemble setting include listening, performing, composing, and improvising. Research has found that comprehensive musicianship can be taught through performance literature (Burris, 1988; Carlson, 1992; Sindberg, 2006) and those who are taught with this method demonstrate higher levels of achievement in aural discrimination (Whitener, 1983) and composition (Garofalo & Whaley, 1979). Dammers (2007) examined the abilities of eighth grade band students ($n = 24$) to transfer craftsmanship, creativity, and concepts from existing performance literature to a composition activity through the use of laptop computers. Using Finale Notepad (2006) software, students were instructed to compose an original melody/piece which resembled the formal aspects (as identified in the class) of a model piece (*The Cowboys*) currently being rehearsed. In order to “balance providing enough structure for students to compose successfully yet leave enough openness for the students to be creative,” the assignment was tiered to two levels of difficulty: (1) Compose a single line melody using the major tonalities of the model piece; (2) Compose a small ensemble piece adding harmonic considerations to the assignment (p. 59). Students were given 14 weeks to complete their compositions with varying increments of time according to individual attendance records. Compositions were rated by three experienced middle school band directors and results indicated
a moderate level of craftsmanship and creativity. However, the level of conceptual understanding of form, tonal structure, and dotted eighth-sixteenth rhythms reflected by the compositions was low. Dammers (2007) concluded “unless broader musical concepts are regularly emphasized in rehearsal, students will not transfer these understandings to their compositions from their experience of simply performing in the ensemble” (p. 94) Comprehensive musicianship skills must be taught and reinforced in the performance ensemble setting in order for students to retain such information and apply it to other musical activities.

Other research has focused less on the students and more on the directors in performance ensembles settings. Cargill (1996) explored the correlations between band directors’ ($n = 25$) educational backgrounds and their acceptance of comprehensive musicianship procedures as well as their attitudes towards employing such procedures in the rehearsal setting. Videotaped rehearsals were examined by a panel of three music majors, private interviews of each teacher were conducted by the researcher, and data was collected and recorded on three researcher-designed instruments. A series of multiple regression analyses was conducted to determine to what extent acceptance of comprehensive musicianship concepts could predict the role of such instruction in selected undergraduate courses and the number of hours beyond the bachelor’s degree. Results indicated that music education methods courses or number of hours beyond bachelor’s degree were not significant predictors of comprehensive musicianship acceptance. However, there was a significant correlation between band directors’ attitudes towards comprehensive musicianship and its use in the classroom. The researcher concluded the band director’s primary concern was for successful contest performance upon which job competency was based. Student musicianship and understanding were secondary due to performance pressures and lack of time for instruction.

The Wisconsin Comprehensive Musicianship through Performance curriculum (WCMP) is a conceptually based rehearsal guide derived from three sources: (1) selected principles of the Music Educator’s National Conference’s Comprehensive Musicianship Project; (2) Comprehensive Musicianship Project adaptations such as the Hawaii Music Curriculum Program and *Blueprint for Band* (Garofalo, 1976); and (3) recognized strengths of selected outstanding secondary level performance teachers in the state of Wisconsin. Johnson (1992) employed a qualitative approach to examine the actions of two teachers using the WCMP curriculum and two teachers who were not using the WCMP model. This study occurred over the course of 20
consecutive days and data collection sources included observations, interview and classroom lesson transcripts, informal discussions with teachers, students, and school personnel, formal interviews with teachers and students, and analyses of school documents, lesson plans, and teaching materials. Analysis and coding of transcripts was based upon the WCMP Teacher Attribute list. A case by case analysis of each teacher was provided for each attribute with specific examples of qualitative data and summarized by the researcher. Synthesis of the data analysis revealed that non-WCMP teachers focused upon traditional drill/performance techniques while WCMP teachers focused upon concept based instruction. Although the WCMP teachers shared the same philosophy, differences were observed in their goals, instructional methodologies, and assessment procedures.

Curricula and Coursework

Comprehensive musicianship studies in the higher education setting examine specific course offerings as well as overall programs of study. Implementation of the comprehensive musicianship curricula in higher education settings was initiated by the Institutes for Music in Contemporary Education (IMCE) project. Willoughby (1970) examined these 36 institutes to determine their implications for the improvement of undergraduate music curricula. Qualitative research techniques included examination of all reports from all 36 participating schools, as well as additional materials, on-campus visitations, and personal interviews for an in-depth analysis of 11 selected schools. Results indicated that a wide variety of instructional strategies were employed, yet lecture presentations were minimal. Student involvement in original or stylistic compositions, performance of these works, and aural/visual analysis were at the core of most courses in the IMCE project. Historical content was increased and the range of subject matter extended from the Renaissance (or earlier) to the 20th century. Students of the IMCE project were reported as being more verbal, analytical, and possessing a wider perspective of music earlier in their training than those who were taught in a compartmentalized program. Despite the subjective nature of this particular study, the number of participants and the precedent of such an undertaking is worthy of acknowledgement in the research literature.

The comprehensive musicianship approach is based upon music theory, literature, and history aspects of music instruction (Bland, 1977). Many undergraduate music education programs continue to require a core of music theory and history classes. Several researchers have
investigated the application of comprehensive musicianship skills within the context of music theory and history curricula. During a 15-week undergraduate music theory course, Dodson (1980) found that students who were directly involved in the process of composing original music exhibited more self-confidence in dealing with basic music concepts and skills than their control group counterparts. A horizontal, cross-cultural approach to music history is representative of the comprehensive musicianship philosophy. This approach is promoted by the NASM standards for all baccalaureate programs to provide students with “many repertories, multiple connections with cultures, and numerous successful methodologies” (National Association of Schools of Music, 2009, p. 72). DuPree (1990) conducted a survey of 500 NASM-accredited college and university music programs across the United States to measure the impact of a more comprehensive approach to the undergraduate music history curriculum. Responses were received from 266 of the schools and findings were reported in percentages. Results indicated there was a gradual modification of the traditional curriculum to include new concepts and information with over 75% of the programs covering music written post-1970 and more than 50% covering pre-Medieval music. However, less than 30% of the respondents reported covering jazz, ethnic, or non-western music and women composers. Despite the chronological expansion of music history curricula, continued emphasis of traditional Western European art music and the lack of attention to other cultures and genres seems antithetical to the comprehensive musicianship approach.

In a more narrow and focused case study, Kim (1997) examined the comprehensive musicianship curricula at San Diego State University. The purpose of this study was to describe, document, and analyze the comprehensive musicianship program at this institution. Qualitative data was collected in the form of interview transcripts, student surveys, historical documentation, comprehensive musicianship programs, and observations of comprehensive musicianship and non-comprehensive musicianship classes and recitals. Results indicated that most faculty members appreciated the philosophy of comprehensive musicianship and acknowledged the sacrifice of depth for breadth in material due to time constraints. Most students seemed to like their comprehensive experiences through composition activities, world music, lab exercises, and core courses. However, a substantial number of performance students expressed a desire to have a more traditional curriculum of study. Additionally, many professors expressed that students tended to appreciate their comprehensive musicianship studies more after they had completed
their degree program. The researcher concluded that students’ dissatisfaction with class time and scheduling, professors’ concern about units of credit and class hours, and the administrators’ difficulty in planning, staffing, and coordinating classes may have contributed to the more recent national decline of comprehensive musicianship course programs.

**Preservice Teacher Preparation**

Preservice teacher preparation programs are responsible for articulating degree requirements and providing students with courses that combine various skills. Additionally, these programs must integrate social efficiency (teacher professionalism), academia (content knowledge), developmental psychology (pedagogical knowledge) and ethics into each course offering to provide preservice teachers with a balanced and non-compartmentalized approach to education (Ballantyne, 2007). The undergraduate music education program must synthesize various aspects of performance practice, teaching pedagogy, and skill sets for a variety of musical instruments and materials within the time constraints of a four-year degree program. Several researchers have investigated the perceptions of music teachers, music education faculty, and preservice teachers regarding the breadth and effectiveness of professional preparation programs (Marks, 1994; Mishra, 2008; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Shires, 1990).

The preservice instrumental track of study typically includes woodwinds, brass, percussion, and orchestral strings. Preservice teachers whose primary instrument is woodwind, brass, or percussion are also expected to acquire proficiency on an orchestral instrument (National Association of Schools of Music, 2008). Mishra (2008) investigated the attitudes of preservice woodwind (n = 24), brass (n = 18), and percussion (n = 4) specialists toward teaching areas outside of their specialty. All of the participants had completed one string techniques course while only three participants had played a string instrument prior to college. Likert-scale indications of comfort levels in teaching specific subjects revealed that participants were least comfortable about accepting a choral position with a string component. Moderate correlations were found between attitude toward taking a primarily string position and the ability to choose age-appropriate repertoire as well as teaching middle school orchestra and the ability to teach basic left and right hand technique. Mishra (1987) concluded, “The choral-instrumental divide appears wider than the wind-string divide” and the attitudes of preservice teachers will impact
their career decisions and direct their attention and learning during their undergraduate training (p. 27).

In a study of California’s college and university music teacher preservice training programs as they relate to professional preparation and teacher retention, Marks (1994) concluded the following content areas should be a part of the basic requirements for those who wish to pursue a degree in music education: survey/introduction to music education, jazz methods/improvisation, general music, music technology, and the inclusion of various technologies in the instruction of traditional music education courses. A similar survey of music education graduates from Northern Arizona University revealed 90% of the band directors perceived a need for marching band methods coursework, 94% of the orchestra directors perceived a need for string pedagogy courses, and 97% of the band directors accompanied by 22% of the choir directors expressed interest in the need for a jazz band pedagogy course. The need for choir pedagogy classes was perceived by 95% of the choir directors and 85% of the band directors, respectively (Shires, 1990).

Rohwer and Henry (2004) found significant differences between choral, instrumental, and general music education faculty perceptions of requisite skills for effective music teachers. The purposes of this particular study were: (1) to describe collegiate music educators’ perceptions concerning the skills and characteristics necessary to be an effective music teacher, (2) to describe their perceptions concerning the need for assessment of skills and characteristics needed to be an effective music teacher, (3) to describe the most common types of assessment for skills and characteristics, and (4) to compare their perceptions concerning the aforementioned skills and characteristics. Survey results from 416 music professors listed in the College Music Society Directory indicated that teaching skills were rated the highest, or most important, followed by personality characteristics, and lastly musical skills. Needs for assessment of skills were rated from highest to lowest with music, teaching, and personality, respectively. A significant difference between the means of choral, instrumental, and general music teachers in the musical skills category revealed that choral teachers cited skill importance the highest ($M = 4.44$), followed by instrumental teachers ($M = 4.33$), and then general music teachers ($M = 4.15$). Item-specific discrepancies included transposition as being rated the lowest for choral teachers, piano being rated lowest for instrumental teachers, and conducting as the lowest for general music teachers. This data may support the case for specific tracking within music education
programs according to student interest. Rohwer and Henry speculated about the reality of having qualified music educators in every area:

Most music education programs provide all-levels certification, meaning that students graduate certified to teach in any area at any level. To suggest that music education programs are actually able to achieve this goal effectively may be unrealistic. Many music programs do offer tracked curricula, but only to the degree of offering separate instrumental, choral, and general music methods classes. Extended tracking may need to be considered, as the results of this survey suggest that the perceived degree of musical skills needed in each area of expertise is different (p. 25).

They further cited error diagnosis as being ranked second by choral and instrumental areas and sixth by general music teachers. Piano skills were ranked seventh in choral, ninth in instrumental, and third in the general areas while conducting was ranked fifth by choral directors, fourth by instrumentalists, and ninth by general music teachers. The researchers concluded, “If music teacher education programs are to produce the most effective teachers, consideration may need to be given to more discrete curricular tracking for all areas of expertise, or at the very least between instrumental and vocal tracks” (p. 25). Such curricular tracking exists in most Florida colleges and universities. However, the state-issued K-12 music teaching certificate does not reflect this specialization.

**The Undergraduate Music Education Curriculum**

The National Standards in Music Education (1994) have been identified as a driving force for change in the undergraduate music education curriculum (Lehman, 2008; Reimer, 2008; Teachout, 2005; Tutt, 2007). The Goals 2000: Educate America Act (United States Department of Education, 1993) established the National Education Standards Improvement Council to endorse the following content standards for music education:

1. Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music.
2. Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music.
3. Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments.
4. Composing and arranging music within specific guidelines.
5. Reading and notating music.
6. Listening to, analyzing, and describing music.
7. Evaluating music and music performances.
8. Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts.

Several studies have investigated the development of the National Standards and their influence on the undergraduate music education curriculum (Adderley, 1996; Fonder, 1999; Kruse, Oare, & Norman, 2008; Sims, Bergee, & Kantner, 2001). Fonder (1999) and Keeler (2008) concluded the largest music schools (number of music education majors exceeded 200 students) were more influenced by the National Standards than smaller institutions in adjusting their curricula. Generalizations from the collected data suggest there is less attention devoted to improvisation, composition, and world music in smaller schools. These standards are also neglected in the music education research community (Kruse, et al. 2008).

**National Standards in Music Education**

Adderley (1996) surveyed 245 music educators and 39 college/university faculty members in the state of South Carolina to measure the perceived adequacy of teacher education programs in relating to the National Standards in Music Education – Goals 2000. Using a five-point Likert scale, music teachers were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt prepared to teach each of the nine content standards for music education. College/university faculty members were asked to indicate the perceived quality of education provided to their music students in addressing the nine content standards by means of a five-point Likert scale. Results indicated that college/university faculty members generally felt more confident than music educators in teacher preparation programs for effective instruction with the content standards. Significant differences between the two subject groups were evident in Content Standard 3, improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments; Content Standard 4, composing and arranging music within specific guidelines; and Content Standard 8, understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts.

Sims, Bergee, and Kantner (2001) further investigated the effectiveness of a collaborative project in addressing Content Standard 8. This experimental study involved 35 art and 49 music
undergraduates enrolled in freshmen orientation courses and in junior or senior level art and music teaching methods classes at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Participants attended three large group seminars, an art exhibit, a professional musical theater production, and a university-sponsored recital or concert of their choice. They were divided into groups of 4 and provided with an opportunity to discuss the relationships between the arts with elementary school students. Each group interviewed a small group of elementary students, discussed the procedure, and wrote a reflection of the experience. Data was analyzed in a pretest/posttest format and responses were anonymous. Results of both tests indicated that students expressed a moderate interest in teaching an interdisciplinary arts course. Music students “seldom” visited art museums and “occasionally” attended theater performances, while art students “seldom” attended classical or jazz concerts or theater. Interactions with elementary students had the greatest impact on the college students when comparing pre and posttest results. Interpreting these results, Sims et al. (2001) suggested that providing these experiences seemed to be a “valuable way for arts teacher educators to assist students in learning how children think about the arts and what vocabulary children draw upon to discuss art forms” (p. 30). The less formal and structured atmosphere of exchanging ideas with children enabled the college students to experience learning from a different perspective as well.

The Sunshine State Standards of Florida (1996) are aligned with the National Standards in Music Education (1994). According to these standards, students who perform music should also develop skills in creating, listening to, analyzing, and interpreting music. The historical, cultural, and social impacts of music making and listening are also identified as key components to the learning process. Kendal-Reed (2001) investigated the implementation of and impediments to teaching the Sunshine State Standards. A survey was distributed to all middle and high school band directors (N=690) teaching in Florida public schools and an overall return rate of 39% (N=269) was achieved. Directors’ indication of “totally comfortable” in teaching ranked below the 50th percentile in the following five categories: multi-cultural music (29.7%), music history (49.1%), improvisation (23.4%), composition/arranging (22.1%), and cross-curricular activities (27.1%). By linking these areas with the directors’ ratings of the quality of instruction at their undergraduate institutions, Kendal-Reed concluded that undergraduate institutions needed to adjust their curricula to reflect the changes of broader goals and objectives for K-12 students according to the Sunshine State Standards.
National Association of Schools of Music Guidelines

The comprehensive approach of the National Standards combined with the broad nature of NASM’s professional education requirements have provided a variety of undergraduate music education curricula among institutes of higher learning (Cutietta, 2007; Keeler, 2008; Kennedy, 2005; Meaux, 2004). Keeler (2008) examined music teacher programs in selected Iowa colleges and universities. The purpose of this study was to identify the differences in credit requirements among the 25 Iowa colleges and universities offering undergraduate music education degrees. These requirements were also compared to the NASM recommended guidelines. Analysis of the credit hour requirements for certification in music education degrees at each institute revealed the widest variation in general education courses, which ranged from 19 to 90 hours. Results also indicated there was an incongruity between the NASM guidelines and the Iowa music education programs of study regarding the distribution of coursework for the music education degree. Collegiate music programs in Iowa required fewer hours in music courses and more professional education hours than the recommended NASM percentages of 50% and 15-20%, respectively. However, the general education credit requirement of each college and university was consistently in line with the NASM recommendation of 30-35%. Based on the data analysis, Keeler recommended that music programs should revise curricula to reflect NASM guidelines more closely.

In an attempt to establish a baseline indicator of core music curriculum and curriculum specializations, Kennedy (2005) surveyed administrators and analyzed publications from 17 exemplary conservatories and schools of music in the United States offering baccalaureate degrees in music. The 17 subject groups included private music institutions, schools of music at public institutions, and schools of music at private institutions. Results indicated great variation existed among the individual core music curricular offerings with 491 different course titles across the curricula. In a similar study, Meaux (2004) conducted a descriptive analysis of undergraduate music education programs at 26 NASM accredited institutions in the state of Texas. Data was collected from official undergraduate catalogs and programs were classified according to degree requirements, course content, and the number of hours in each curriculum area. Further categorization of coursework included one of the following areas: General Studies, Studies in Music, or Professional Education. Results from this research indicated there was a wide variety of structure within each of the curriculum areas with Professional Education
demonstrating the least consistency among institutions. Not every school addressed all NASM standards and none of the schools were following the NASM recommendations for course credit in ensemble participation. “Hidden credits” were revealed by the researcher and labeled as “technically illegal and morally unethical” (Meaux, 2004, p. 79).

*Music Education Undergraduate Coursework*

Researchers have also investigated specific coursework within the music education curriculum and its relevance to the teaching profession. Cooper (1994) surveyed three groups of instrumental music educators to identify the most important or necessary areas, topics, or emphases in the core-curriculum of instrumental music courses. Among the groups were 25 teachers of college method courses, 125 high school band directors from exemplary programs, and 125 randomly selected high school band directors. One hundred forty-two surveys were returned with a 52% response rate. Results indicated that 65% of high school band directors rated their college band methods course as no better than “adequate.” They were also concerned about the lack of recent successful public school teaching experience by those who taught such courses. Most of the respondents (66%) favored marching band techniques as a separate and required course. An interesting finding was that only 51% of the subjects had taken such coursework with a majority (59%) of them rating it as no better than “adequate.” An overwhelming 74% of the subjects indicated they believed the primary focus of instrument methods courses should be a combination of performance and teaching skills. The expressed need for earlier and more frequent field experiences concurred with previous studies. Respondents also indicated there should be higher standards for prospective instrumental music educators and more rigorous expectations of undergraduate instrumental music majors.

Conway, Hourigan, and Stanley (2007) conducted a case sampling of four beginning teachers to examine their perceptions regarding the importance, effectiveness, and relevance of their secondary instrument methods classes at the University of Michigan. Methods of data collection included individual interviews, classroom observations, focus group interviews, and researchers’ self-study journals. Data sets were coded for common themes and compared to reach the final categories of findings. Participants and teacher-researchers shared the opinion that the amount of content covered in brass and woodwind courses was simply too much to retain. In reflecting upon the finding related to the need for different knowledge in high school versus
beginning band, Conway et al. (2007) concluded it was too difficult to prepare students for multiple contexts: “All of the participants in this study were instrumentalists teaching instrumental music. Many graduates leave preservice programs to teach out of their area of experience. Teacher education must continue to grapple with preparation for multiple contexts.” (p. 52). Although this study was limited to four participants, the researchers asserted that logical situational generalizability was apropos in transferring these findings to other populations.

Several studies have investigated specific skills or areas of expertise within the undergraduate music education curriculum (McCormick, 2008; Simon, 2009). Simon (2009) conducted an online survey of Tennessee teachers, administrators, and teacher educators to measure their perceptions of preservice music teacher preparation programs. Although this study was limited to general categories of such programs (e.g., organizing and managing students, teaching strategies specific to the music discipline, addressing the needs of English language learners), music administrators identified piano proficiency as a weakness among beginning music teachers. This finding is congruent with the results of previous studies related to piano proficiency among music educators and student teaching interns (Christensen, 2000; March, 1988; McWhirter, 2005). McCormick (2008) found that one-third of strings/orchestra teachers in the states of Iowa and Nebraska thought their undergraduate string methods/pedagogy class was of little or no value. Furthermore, a majority of the non-string trained respondents indicated little to no confidence in playing the violin, viola, cello, or bass.

**Individual School Characteristics**

Public high schools within the United States range from small community-based neighborhood learning centers to large magnet schools with thousands of students. Geographic regions encompass rural, suburban, and urban environments while a majority of the funding within each school is determined by its surrounding community tax base. Student populations range from poor domiciles with lower levels of education to more affluent family backgrounds with advanced degrees. Researchers have explored and investigated variations in geographic location (Abril & Gault, 2008; Costa-Giomi, 2008; Eros, 2009; Isbell, 2005; Kruez, 2005; Otte, 2008), socioeconomic status (Ingersoll, 2003; Zuelke, 2008), school size (Bergee & Westfall, 2005), and teacher experiences (Catena, 2009; National Center for Education Statistics, 2004) to evaluate differences that exist between various types of schools.


**Geographic Regions**

Although they account for 49% of all schools nationwide, individual rural schools are usually smaller than their urban and suburban counterparts (National Education Association, 2009). Thus, in order to accommodate government-mandated curricula requirements, teachers in rural schools are often expected to teach in multiple areas and subjects (Tonn, 2007). Otte (2008) conducted a survey of rural choral high school music educators (\(N = 122\)) in the state of Kansas to determine teachers’ undergraduate tracks of specialization and current teaching assignments. Results indicated that 116 respondents held bachelor’s degrees in music education while six participants (4.92%) earned bachelor’s degrees in other fields. Of the 122 music educators, 58 teachers (47.54%) selected voice as an applied music concentration, 45 teachers (36.89%) specialized in band or band and piano/organ, 18 teachers (14.75%) reported piano/organ concentrations, and one teacher (0.82%) did not identify an area of expertise within the music education degree program. Teaching assignments were distributed across the following areas according to percentage of teachers within the study: (a) choral music exclusively at high school (28.7%), (b) chorus and band (77%). Additionally, twenty-six music teachers (21.31%) who were teaching chorus and band also reported teaching other courses: music appreciation (12.29%), piano (4.10%), guitar (3.28%), music technology (2.46%), strings (0.82%), percussion class (0.82%), and independent study (0.82%). Non-music course assignments were reported by thirteen teachers (10.65%) in the following areas: study hall, seminar, or library (\(n = 5, 5.73\%\)), English (\(n = 2, 1.63\%\)), Title I (\(n = 2, 1.63\%\)), theater technology (\(n = 2, 1.63\%\)), and social studies (\(n = 2, 1.63\%\)). Although most of the music educators were teaching classes within their certification area (K-12 music), a slight majority (52.46%) of the choral directors were not applied voice students during their undergraduate studies.

Urban schools share some of the same plights as their rural counterparts, yet differ in governance and administrative structures. Both school types lack adequate resources to meet federal and state standards and enroll large numbers of students from high-poverty neighborhoods (Schneider & Jones, 2009). Mandated pressures by the No Child Left Behind Act (2002) to make adequate yearly progress in reading and mathematics has resulted in the erosion of the arts, particularly in the urban public school curricula: “Efforts to strengthen foundational skills in urban schools may contribute to the inequities in the breadth of education available to students of different racial and economic backgrounds” (Council for Basic Education, 2004, p.
Despite the similarities in student population and funding, the structure of the larger and more politically isolated bureaucracies of urban school districts differs from the smaller and more localized school board offices of rural school districts:

In rural, small town, and suburban districts, classroom teachers comprise 80% or more of the school district’s employees. In the 120 largest urban districts, the number of employees other than teachers is approaching a ratio of 2 to 1; that is, for every classroom teacher there are almost two others employed in the district ostensibly to perform services that would help these teachers (Urban education, 2009).

Eros (2009), in a case study of three urban music teachers, found that major challenges for inner city music programs included the unequal distribution of resources, the impact of large bureaucracies, and stigmas that affected urban students from personal and performance standpoints. Data collection procedures included surveys, email journals, interviews, and a focus group discussion. Findings revealed several inequities that existed within urban school districts. For example, one subject indicated that a small number of schools harbored a majority of the resources while the remaining schools were deprived of access to instruments and other instructional materials: “this district could provide for a harp ensemble at one magnet school but didn’t have money to give me a single instrument in my elementary school on the northwest side” (Eros, 2009, p. 229). Another finding corroborates with the notion that large, centralized administrations of urban districts are far removed from the realities of a classroom setting. Two of the three subjects indicated that district-wide lay-offs were implemented with little consideration to how specific school situations were affected. Others have researched and identified discourse between teachers and administrators in urban public school settings due to the multiple layers of bureaucratic networks (Stone, Henig, Jones, & Pierannunzi, 2001).

**Socioeconomic Status**

Student socioeconomic status is often measured by variables including parental education levels, occupations, family income, or free and reduced meal percentages. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 2005, 13.2% of high school students from low socioeconomic status schools took a music, art, or language class while 22.3% of high school students from high socioeconomic status schools took the same course (National Center of Education Statistics, 2005). The costs associated with renting an instrument, purchasing concert
attire, or taking performance field trips may be obstacles that students of lower socioeconomic backgrounds cannot overcome (Albert D. J., 2006).

Phillips (2003) investigated the music attitudes of sixth through eighth grade students ($N = 2,180$) in relation to home musical environment and socioeconomic status. Federal free and reduced lunch percentages were used to determine socioeconomic status and the Music Background Inventory (Svengalis, 1978) was used to quantify the richness of a student’s family musical environment. Music attitude was measured by 32 Likert-scale responses to an adaptation of the Music Attitude Scale (Shaw & Tomcala, 1976) and the degree to which students felt capable in music activities was measured by 36 items of the Self-Concept in Music scale (Svengalis, 1978). Results of correlation data indicated that students from high socioeconomic status families were more influenced by home musical backgrounds than middle and low socioeconomic status students. Additionally, the relationships between music attitude and music background decreased as socioeconomic status decreased. Philips commented, “It is likely that more affluent families can better afford musical activities such as private music lessons, musical events, and musical instruments in the home” (p. 77). These items were more prevalent in the music attitude responses of higher socioeconomic status students. He further stated, “Lower socioeconomic students may not be able to afford registration fees, instrument rentals, private lessons, and other costs associated with participation in a school music ensemble” (p. 115).

Hickok (2009) examined the differences in parental involvement, motivational factors, and socioeconomic status between all-state high school band and chorus participants ($N = 403$) in the states of Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee. Participants completed a survey instrument designed by the researcher. Attributions of success and failure in music as well as family background and parental involvement were measured with Likert-scale rankings from 1 (“not important at all”) to 5 (“extremely important”). Socioeconomic status of each participant was measured by the Hollingshead Index of Social Position (1958) with the average score ($M = 59.40, SD = 17.027$) of all participants ranking within the second highest of the five classes of social position. Further analysis revealed the mean socioeconomic status of chorus students ($M = 62.39, SD = 15.44$) was higher than the mean of the all state band participants ($M = 54.87, SD = 17.91$). Although this study included schools from three different states and a large subject pool from “strong band and chorus programs,” it is most likely that these results did not account for the lowest socioeconomic status students within each state (p. 87).
Abril and Gault (2008) investigated the perceptions of secondary principals regarding the music curricula in their respective schools and attempted to profile secondary music school programs in the United States. A stratified random sample of 1,000 active secondary principals was surveyed from a list of 19,510 of the largest national association of secondary school principals yielding a response rate of 54% (N = 541). Results indicated a majority (98%) of the schools offered at least one music course taught by a music specialist and there were no significant differences between rural, urban, and suburban principals’ perceptions of the variables (budgeting, scheduling, No Child Left Behind legislation, and standardized tests) that affected music programs negatively. However, while a majority of the schools included band (93%), chorus (88%), and jazz/rock ensemble (55%) in their course offerings, significant differences (p < .001) were found in the diversity of music course offerings between school socioeconomic status (SES) categories with the following mean scores: low SES (more than 50% free and reduced meals), 3.29 (SD = 1.72); middle SES (26% to 50% free and reduced meals), 3.97 (SD = 1.86); high SES (0% to 25% free and reduced meals), 4.733 (SD = 1.86). Less common courses appeared in fewer than 50% of the schools with general music (45%), orchestra (42%), theory (40%), guitar (19%), piano/keyboard (13%), music technology (10%), composition (7%), and mariachi ensemble (5%), respectively.

Albert (2005) explored recruitment and retention strategies of low socioeconomic instrumental middle and high school music programs within the state of Michigan. Participants in the study included three urban middle school instrumental music teachers, two administrators, and four parents. Qualitative analysis of interview transcripts, field notes, and free and reduced lunch program records from the United States Department of Agriculture resulted in emergent themes and categories. A synthesis of the findings revealed the most effective strategies for recruiting students of low socioeconomic status were exposure techniques (CD recordings, band apparel, concerts), creating culturally relevant ensembles, and providing school-owned instruments for families who cannot afford to rent or buy them. The most effective retention strategies included establishing a positive rapport and fostering positive relationships with students, exhibiting dedication to the program, and empowering students to take ownership of the music making process. In comparing music teachers of low socioeconomic students to those of high socioeconomic students, Albert concluded the teachers in this study experienced “more
difficult issues to deal with, such as transient student population, funding issues, and attitudes created by difficult domestic situations” (p. 129).

School Size

The average public high school enrollment is 722 students, however, school sizes vary by location with 44.2% of all urban schools enrolling 900 or more students and 50.8% of all rural schools with less than 300 students. Student enrollment in suburban high schools is distributed more evenly with less than 300 students in 25% of the schools, 300-599 students in 19.5% of the schools, 600-899 students in 18.3% of the schools, and 900 or more students in 37.2% of all suburban high schools, respectively (National Center for Education Statistics, 2003). Some studies have identified positive academic achievement in all students as a result of downsizing school enrollment (Lee & Smith, 1995; Fowler & Walberg, 1991) while others have identified large achievement gains limited to students of lower socioeconomic status backgrounds (Lee & Smith, 1997). In her 2008 State of the State address, Michigan Governor Jennifer M. Granholm proposed for the establishment of 100 small high schools (average of 400 students) to replace the “large impersonal high schools that have low academic achievement and high dropout rates” (Shakrani, 2008, p. 4). More recently, critics have deemed such efforts to be unsuccessful and ineffective (Gates, 2009; Towson Families United, 2008). Previous research on school size effects has been based upon correlation methods utilizing cross-sectional data, but the literature is “far from providing clear findings on the critical casual relationship between school size and student outcomes” (Ahn & Brewer, 2009, p. 435).

Using data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (National Center for Education Statistics, 1988), Lee and Smith (1997) attempted to identify an ideal high school size, defined in terms of student learning, and whether the ideal size was constant across different types of high schools (social backgrounds of the students they serve). Results indicated that students who attended high schools with a 600-900 student enrollment had “optimal learning” (i.e. how organizational size affects group members and the best school size for optimum economic efficiency, p. 206). Further analyses revealed that school size was very important for the most disadvantaged students:

Although learning differences are notable for low and high socioeconomic status schools of 600-900 students (about 2 points of gain on a 40-point test), in schools with less than
300 students, the difference is larger (about 3.5 points). In the largest schools, the differences in learning are striking (about 5 points) (p. 214).

Lee and Smith found that many students of lower socioeconomic statuses were attending the nation’s smallest (-0.32 SD) and largest (-0.21 SD) high schools and were therefore exposed to less than conducive learning environments.

In response to Lee and Smith (1997), Howley and Howley (2004) state: “the applicability of this prominent national study [National Educational Longitudinal Study] to particular states, to rural schools, and certainly to the nation at whole is problematic” (p. 11). They further challenge the optimal school size concept based upon national data sets of students and note that such data sets are representative of schools and districts, not individual students. By isolating and comparing the means of specific groups of students defined by school size and socioeconomic status, Howley and Howley conclude that small school size and achievement are significantly related in every socioeconomic status category except for the high socioeconomic student group. This finding aligns with the research of Lee and Smith (1997), however, “contrary to the assertion of Lee and Smith (1997), these results do not disclose any lower limits for school size” (p. 26).

Several researchers have explored administrator responsibilities in hiring teachers, designing a schedule, and creating a variety of course offerings. Woody (1993) surveyed 87 Florida principals in three areas of investigation for hiring first-time music teachers: (1) the initial screening process, (2) the interview process, and (3) most valued attributes in music teachers. “Commitment to comprehensive teaching of music” was ranked most often in first or second place by a total of 31 respondents. Approximately 65% of the principals of medium (1999 > n >999) and large (n > 2000) schools included this attribute among their top five rankings. However, a considerable majority (73.6%) of the small school (n < 1000) principals did not mention comprehensive music teaching at all. This difference was found to be statistically significant. Woody concluded the disagreement among principals indicated that some valued the comprehensive teaching of music as an academic subject while others were more concerned with their music programs’ performance achievements and involvement in school and community events.

Although some studies have found no correlations between school size and curricular diversity (Monk, 1987; Shakrani, 2008; Slate & Jones, 2005), others have identified limitations
within the small school course offerings (Barker, 1985; Gillespie & Hamann, 1998). In a national survey of 669 high schools, Barker (1985) found that 37 courses were offered at significantly higher frequencies in larger schools while only two classes (vocational agriculture and animal husbandry) appeared more frequently in smaller schools. Gillespie and Hamman (1998) conducted a national survey of schools \((N = 1,345)\) with orchestra programs to establish descriptive baseline data for string instruction. A return rate of 51\% \((N = 652)\) included completed surveys from 44 of the 50 states (88\%) representative of all Music Educators National Conference divisions: Eastern, North Central, Northwest, Southern, Southwestern, and Western. Results indicated that a majority (63\%) of the high schools with orchestra programs enrolled more than 1,000 students and most of them (56\%) were located in suburban communities. The researchers concluded that the “availability of orchestra instruction is tied to school size: the larger the school population, the more likely orchestra instruction is offered” (p. 84).

Teacher Experience

Research has shown that students from lower income families are more likely to be taught by inexperienced teachers who are not certified and do not possess a degree in the area which they are teaching (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). Furthermore, teachers who work in schools where a majority of the student population lives in poverty are also more likely to leave their positions than teachers in schools with students from middle or upper class families (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2005). Catena (2009) conducted a mixed method study of graduates from education programs at “five highly selective private liberal arts institutions of higher education” belonging to the Consortium for Excellence in Teacher Education (CETE) between 1970 and 2008 (p. 1). The purpose of this study was to learn how many alumni were working in the classroom and in what types of schools and locations were they teaching. Survey responses from alumni \((n = 924)\), interviews transcripts from a select group of alumni \((n = 9)\) and teacher preparation program faculty \((n = 5)\) were analyzed and reported as percentages. A total of 80\% of the alumni reported teaching in a K-12 classroom during their career. Results also revealed that a majority of CETE certified teachers (53\%) chose a traditional public school in a suburban location for their first teaching position. Although a slight majority of respondents sought employment in the public schools, they were 123\% more likely than the national teaching population to be working in private schools. Such results concur
with Kelly’s (2003) previous findings that most undergraduate education students seek teaching positions based upon their own personal cultural backgrounds and experiences.

**Teacher Certification Practices**

The United States is a mobile society as its citizens may become members of communities other than the ones in which they were born, raised, and educated as children. Yet educational curricula are developed at local levels thus resulting in a variety of instructional priorities from one school district to another. Recent calls for a mandated national curriculum and appropriate tests of that curriculum have been made as attempts to streamline the educational process for children of transient families (Sadovnik, Dworkin, Gamoran, Hallinan, & Scott, 2008). Because each state determines its own standards for teacher certification or licensure, the same proposal has been applied to the teaching profession (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986; National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 2008). Trends in alternative pathways to professional licensure and teacher certification testing have been topics of research over the last two decades. A lack of uniformity in teacher certification among states and individual institutions has also been investigated.

**Alternative Pathways to Certification**

The Holmes Group (1983) and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) advocated for the elimination of undergraduate teacher education degrees and proposed a post-baccalaureate program in which teachers become certified. Although the tradition of most colleges and universities has been to offer a variety of undergraduate teacher certification programs in combination with the bachelor’s degree (Cochran-Smith, Feiman-Nemser, McIntyre, & Demers, 2008), many institutes have implemented a post-baccalaureate program for teacher certification. Several researchers have investigated the merits and effectiveness of such programs. Fontanini (2007) utilized three clusters of the Wisconsin State Teacher Standards in evaluating the effectiveness of the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) initial certification program for teacher licensure at a private Wisconsin college. Results from an outcome-based program evaluation model revealed that prior to student teaching, secondary teacher candidates reported feeling well prepared ($M = 2.91$) in cluster 1 (*Classroom Culture and Communication*),
better than well prepared ($M = 3.30$) in cluster 2 (*Instruction and Assessment*), and well prepared ($M = 3.12$) in cluster 3 (*Planning and Preparation for Teaching*). Subjects reported feeling adequately prepared to well prepared ($M = 2.54$) in cluster 1, better than well prepared ($M = 3.23$) in cluster 2, and slightly less prepared ($M = 2.90$) in cluster 3 after student teaching.

During the first year of teaching, subjects felt well prepared ($M = 2.86$) in cluster 1, better than well prepared ($M = 3.36$) in cluster 2, and well prepared to very well prepared in cluster 3 ($M = 3.03$). Specific areas of needed improvement within clusters included using technology for record keeping as well as instruction and managing behavior. Fontanini concluded that further investigations of individual MAT programs may lead to more empirical evidence that such programs are effective in preparing future teachers.

Helfrich (2007) compared the differences in knowledge base and perceived readiness to teach literacy between teacher candidates in two different graduate education programs at the University of Pittsburgh. Her hypothesis was that teacher candidates in the MAT program would obtain higher scores on a knowledge inventory assessment and perceive themselves as more prepared to teach reading than their Professional Year (PY) program counterparts. She suggested these differences would be attributed to more field work experiences among MAT candidates. Results of this mixed-methods research study indicated there were no significant differences in knowledge of literacy between the two subject groups. Furthermore, MAT teacher candidates felt more prepared to teach reading across all areas than PY candidates. Follow-up surveys were administered after at least three months of full-time teaching. Respondents from both programs perceived themselves as being less prepared to teach reading after gaining experience as full-time teachers. Results from this study indicate more internships and interactive opportunities with students may assist preservice teachers in preparing for the “real world” classroom.

Field work experience and the interactive nature of the “real world” may seem to be undermined by an online music education degree. However, most colleges and universities currently offering online initial certification programs in music education require students to complete a face-to-face internship or student teaching experience (Greher & Tobin, 2006). According to the National Center for Education Information (Feistritzer, 2009), 23% of alternative route programs also currently award a master’s degree upon program completion. A study conducted by Groulx and Henry (2010) reported that in 2008, nine institutions offered NASM accredited online graduate degree programs in music with 80% or more coursework via
internet. Distance learning courses in conjunction with post-baccalaureate degrees are touted as opportunities for working professionals to further their education:

ECU master’s program offered via distance learning courses literally changed my life. Being a single parent holding down two jobs, I never would have been able to earn my MS without the program. Since graduating from the program, I’ve begun teaching at a local community college where I’ve been able to use everything I learned including how to utilize online course materials (Anonymous, 2007).

Developments in technology and subsequent changes in the delivery of instruction are becoming more prevalent. Music educators have been encouraged to accept these changes and “develop the best instructional products available and engage in our highest levels of creativity in order to take advantage of that which is inevitable” (Madsen, 2000, p. 88). Critics of online degrees claim these programs are based on the notion that content is the only focus of college coursework and some students are ill-equipped with the necessary skills for successful completion of such courses (Hukle, 2009; Simon, 2009), while others have found no differences in achievement between online and traditional class students (Kirtman, 2009; Sawchuk, 2009). Kirtman (2009) compared three online courses to three traditional face-to-face courses in elementary education over a two-year period. Data sources included identical midterm and final exams, literature reviews, and anonymous end-of-course surveys of course satisfaction. Results indicated no significant differences between subject groups (online vs. traditional) in literature review grades, final exams, and survey responses. However, t-test results indicated there was a significant difference between midterm exams with traditional students’ mean scores ($M = 26.4, SD = 2.4, p = .03$) averaging two points higher than the online students’ scores ($M = 24.8, SD = 2.6, p = .03$). This difference was attributed to students’ adjusting to the online learning process.

Darling-Hammond, Chung, and Frelow (2002) collected data from approximately 3,000 beginning teachers in New York City to assess their perceptions of teacher preparation, sense of self-efficacy, and plans to remain in the field. Researchers deemed New York City as an ideal pool of candidates for this survey because of its diversity and size including thousands of teachers from a wide variety of pathways and programs. Surveys were distributed to all teachers on the district personnel list with four or less years of experience and collected at a return rate of 98.5% ($N = 2,956$). A factor analysis of demographic items resulted in five categories, which described teachers’ sense of preparedness to (a) promote student learning, (b) teach critical
thinking and social development, (c) use technology, (d) understand learners, and (e) develop instructional leadership. Findings indicated beginning teachers who were prepared in a single formal program of preparation felt more prepared than those who took a series of courses from different institutions. Alternatively certified teachers reported feeling poorly prepared for many tasks of teaching and less than adequately prepared overall. Efficacy and retention in the field results concurred with previous research, which has found relationships between teachers’ preparation and their effectiveness with students. Additional findings were that those who enter teaching with little professional preparation experience more challenges in the classroom and tended to leave the profession at higher rates than those with more extensive preservice training. Nevertheless, the number of teachers certified through non-traditional programs has increased from 275 educators in 1985 to 62,000 in 2007 with all 50 states providing at least one alternate route to teacher certification (Feistritzer, 2009).

The Boston University School of Music, the oldest-degree granting music education institution of the United States, currently offers an online teacher certification sequence that is approved for professional licensure in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. However, the university states:

This program is designed for students who already possess a teaching license or simply want to learn more about music education but don’t desire licensure to teach in American primary and secondary schools. . . . Students from other states will need to check with their state education departments regarding requirements for licensure in their state.

(Boston University College of Fine Arts, 2009, Professional Licensure Sequence Section, para. 1)

Although the degree program offers certification within Massachusetts, it does not guarantee reciprocity to other states. This contradiction reflects the lack of uniformity in teacher certification practices from state to state.

State-by-State Certification Practices

Descriptive research focusing on teacher certification variation between states was initiated by Wolfe’s (1937) seminal compilation of state certification procedures for music educators. This study included a state-by-state listing of the requirements for certification on all public school levels of music teaching. The types of credentials or certificates available, terms of
duration, general requirements, preservice education, degrees of state control, and the
distribution of academic requirements were outlined in various tables. Additionally, Wolfe
provided twelve guiding principles to assist in the training and hiring of music educators.

In a replication of Wolfe’s (1937) study, Erbes (1984) noted there were no major changes
in state and national certification procedures. However, results indicated significant declines in
the number of states offering K-12 and lifetime certificates to music teachers. Recertification
practices continued to grow and expand as accountability and professional development
pressures were placed upon teachers (Rowls & Hanes, 1982). For example, in the year 2000, a
majority of states ($N = 45$) had teacher recertification requirements (Boser, 2000). Standardized
testing for certification was evident in 18 states while 24 states forecasted future implementation
of mandated tests. Only 8 states were not considering certification tests – Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho,
Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Vermont, and Wyoming (Erbes, 1984). In, a follow-up study
(1992), Erbes revealed continued emphases in teacher testing with 40 states requiring initial
certification tests and 2 more states (Michigan, Missouri) proposing tests for the following year.
Additionally, 21 states required a subject specific test in music education. A more recent state-
by-state analysis of certification practices for music educators documented 43 states with
required testing of basic skills, professional knowledge, or content knowledge (Henry, 2005).
Researchers have also noted idiosyncrasies within specific states including South Dakota Indian
Studies, a New Jersey exam in physiology and hygiene, and Texas/United States Constitution
coursework (Colwell, 2006; Erbes R. L., 1992).

Henry’s (2005) findings confirm the continued expansion of such practices recorded by
Erbes (1992). Commonalities and differences among states’ policies were investigated with the
following research questions: (1) What content areas were included under certification in music
teaching? (2) What were the age-level designations for certification in music teaching? (3) How
recent were the certification practices in the state? (4) What tests, if any, were required for
certification in music teaching? (5) Did the state have reciprocity for certification with any other
states? (6) What were the types of certificates available and length of validity for the various
certificates? (7) Was there an alternative certification program available for those without
education degrees? (8) What fees, if any, were required for certification in the state? (9) Were
application forms and instructions available online? Additional research included projected
trends in alternative certification, reciprocity policies, and accessibility to information
concerning certification. Data collection procedures were via web sites and phone interviews. State-by-state information was outlined in a table format for clarity and conciseness. Results indicated “specificity of age level and content area was dependent upon individual states’ needs for flexibility or ‘matching’ desirability between teacher and classroom” (Henry, 2005, p. 52). State certificate age levels and subject areas included the following endorsement types: K-6, 1-9 General, K-12 Chorus or Band, PreK-8 and 7-12 Vocal or Instrumental, K-12 Piano, K-12 Violin, and K-12 Composite. Most states ($N = 45$) offered some level of reciprocity for teachers who held certificates from other states while California, Indiana, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Washington did not acknowledge teaching credentials from other states than their own. Thirty-nine states provided alternative routes to certification for individuals with non-education baccalaureate degrees. Initial and renewal teaching certificate fees varied greatly from zero dollars in states such as Hawaii and Tennessee, to $300.00 for a professional endorsement in the state of Connecticut. Henry (2005) concluded that continued revision of certification policies by individual states would quickly make her study outdated. She further suggested future research in state certification practices and efforts to detect state and national policy trends in certification.

**Summary**

The Florida K-12 music teaching certificate encompasses a variety of ages and areas of music instruction. This endorsement provides music educators with the opportunity to teach in an elementary, middle, or high school setting in the band, orchestra, choral, or general music specialty area. Despite this broad certification, most undergraduate music education curricula require preservice teachers to specialize in one area of study. As a result of this specialization, there is limited coursework and exposure to other areas within the field of music education. This incongruity may lead to music teachers who are teaching “out of track” or area of expertise. Currently, there is no existing comprehensive database or record of music teachers within the state of Florida who are teaching “out of track.”

Proponents of an inclusive and comprehensive training program for music teachers suggest that “rigid vocal or instrumental track systems must be dropped, and the system of hoops that music education students must jump through should be reconsidered” (Burnsed & Jenson, 1994, p. 7). This proposal is reminiscent of the comprehensive musicianship movement during the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. Evidence suggests that while some embrace the comprehensive
musicianship approach and note its “repackaging” in the form of National Standards (Austin, 1998, p. 25), others are critical of this philosophy and its early attempts at synthesis:

The notion that a music educator could be adequately trained as a generalist in music education is illusory. The current practice leads to the general certification of music educators that lack minimal competencies in areas within the field of certification. In an attempt to prepare prospective music educators who are qualified for general certification, institutions offering teacher education programs have sacrificed depth of knowledge in a principal area for a superficial breadth of knowledge (Boswell, McCloud, & Harbinson, 1991, p. 29).

Criticisms of the comprehensive musicianship approach to higher education have been supported by tracking systems that prepare beginning music teachers in a single area of specialization. Is the current tracking system adequate in preparing future music educators? If not, how is the compromise between the depth of specialization and the breadth of the NASM standards to be achieved? Such questions cannot be addressed without descriptive information regarding preservice training experiences and current teaching assignments. This study will provide baseline data of Florida music teachers’ undergraduate coursework as it relates to their current teaching responsibilities.

Preservice teacher preparation and undergraduate music education curriculum research has found a variety of program designs and preservice teacher training experiences within colleges and universities. Researchers have also investigated the perceptions of teachers, administrators, and music education faculty regarding such programs of study. Establishment of the National Standards in Music Education (1994) and advocacy for a more comprehensive approach to music learning has been more influential in larger conservatories and music colleges than their smaller counterparts. However, the lack of specificity in the NASM standards has resulted in an array of program offerings and requirements among all institutes of higher learning. Furthermore, the lack of a standardized curriculum in specific courses has resulted in a wide variety of experiences for preservice teachers from one school to another (Hope, 2007). Are teachers taking the same number of courses across various institutions of higher learning collectively or are there inconsistencies among teacher preparation programs? Is there variation between tracking systems of different colleges and universities? Is this variation in coursework reflective of the expanding diversity in elementary and secondary schools or is it based upon the
missions and preferences of individual institutions? There is minimal research in the
development of music education curricula within the college or university setting and a lack of
research which addresses the flexibility of the NASM standards. This study will provide
quantitative norms for music education curricula as they apply to music teachers within the state
of Florida.

A number of studies have examined the demographics of various schools to identify how
the characteristics of location, student socioeconomic status, school size, and teacher experience
levels distinguish one school from another. Although a majority of America’s schools are
considered to be rural, enrollment numbers are generally higher in suburban and urban locations.
Funding for school size reduction projects has waned since recent studies have deemed such
efforts to be ineffective (Gates, 2009). Positive correlations between student socioeconomic
status, parental involvement, and teacher experience levels have also been identified and
explored in a variety of studies (Hickock, 2009; National Center for Education Statistics, 2004;
Phillips, 2003). How do these national statistics relate to the state of Florida? Are there similar
correlations within the state?

Research has also demonstrated that teacher certification practices within the United
States are as varied as the preservice teacher training programs and undergraduate curricula.
Previous studies in teacher certification have included alternative routes to certification as well
as state-by-state analyses of licensing procedures. Mixed results of less traditional certification
program studies have facilitated the need for more empirical investigations in this area. State
certification studies have revealed various levels of assessment, reciprocity, and teaching area
endorsements. However, there is a general increase in the number of states requiring
standardized testing and recertification procedures. Further studies have also reported an increase
in the number of states replacing the K-12 music teaching certificate with an area of expertise
(choral, instrumental, general) and age (K-5 or 6-12) specific level of endorsement. These
changes reflect the more specialized undergraduate training procedures of most music education
programs. Are there implications for the state of Florida to consider these certificate
endorsements for its music teachers? Would this certificate align with the professional training
experiences and current assignments of music teachers within the state? The current study will
analyze preservice teacher training experiences as well as the status of music educator
responsibilities within the state of Florida as an attempt to address these questions.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Subject Description

Participants ($N = 247$) in this study consisted of music teachers currently employed by public school districts within the state of Florida. Contact information for the teachers, in the form of email addresses, was obtained by the researcher through the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) website directory of public schools: (http://www.fldoe.org/Schools/schoolmap/flash/revisedreport.asp?search=HS&id). This website provided direct links to each of Florida’s 75 public school districts as well as individual high schools. Individual school district websites were accessed and an additional 34 high schools were identified by the researcher and included as an update to the FLDOE listing. All public high school website faculty listings were reviewed to determine if music educators were employed within each school. A total of 349 high schools included at least one music educator with email contact information. Music faculty email addresses and school names from those schools were recorded in a spreadsheet and sorted alphabetically by district location.

Description of Survey

The survey instrument consisted of four sections: (1) Demographic Data, (2) Professional Responsibilities, (3) Undergraduate/Graduate Coursework, and (4) Additional Information. The first section of the survey requested information regarding gender, highest academic degree of attainment, musical track of study, and the total number of years each participant had taught. Additional questions related to the participant’s school size, school socioeconomic status, and school geographic location. The second section of the survey asked participants to indicate the average number of specific classes they taught on a weekly basis. These classes included band, chorus, orchestra, private instrumental and/or voice, music technology, class guitar, class piano, music theory, special musical productions, other instrumental and/or voice instruction, and non-music subjects. The third section of the survey consisted of questions related to the participants’
recollections of their undergraduate and graduate coursework in specific areas of study. Among these areas were private or applied lessons, class instruction or methods courses, conducting, performance ensemble participation, and instructional training in teaching pedagogy. Subcategories within each of these areas included voice, winds and/or percussion, keyboard, orchestral strings, guitar, music technology, world music, and general music. The fourth and final portion of the survey addressed the non-collegiate background training related to and rationale for acceptance of the subject’s current teaching position. Electronic copies of the survey were created and distributed to participants via the internet during the months of October and December of 2009. Hard copies were created and distributed to participants at the Florida Music Educators Association convention in Tampa during the month of January, 2010. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix A.

**Procedures**

Upon approval by the Human Subjects Committee at Florida State University (see Appendix B), participants were contacted twice via e-mail to take part in the study. Each email contained an opening letter of consent with a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) link that allowed them to enter a secure website hosted by an internet-based survey company (SurveyMonkey.com). A copy of the opening letter is located in Appendix C. A total of 798 e-mails were sent to teachers matching the chosen demographic for participants. A return of 126 undeliverable e-mails resulted in a total of 672 recipients. Anonymous electronic responses from 183 teachers represented a 27% return rate. To achieve the desired response rate, paper copies of the questionnaire were distributed during the 2010 Florida Music Educators Association convention and completed by an additional 64 teachers. The total collection of e-mail and hard copy surveys resulted in a 37% response rate with 247 participants. Data were entered into Microsoft Excel spreadsheets and downloaded into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software for analysis.

**Research Design**

Case analyses, frequencies, and cross tabulations were conducted for research questions 1-12. Chi square analyses were completed for research questions 7, 9, and 11. Odds ratio was
calculated for question 12. Mean response by track groups were calculated for the variables music education coursework and current teaching assignments.
The state of Florida provides music educators with a K-12 teaching certificate. This certificate includes many age levels and areas of musical study. Therefore, preservice teacher training programs must prepare music educators for effective instruction in a variety of settings. The purpose of this study was to investigate Florida high school music teachers’ preservice training and to determine how this training relates to their current teaching assignments. Differences between the numbers of high school music teachers teaching outside of their area of expertise or track with school size, student socioeconomic status, and geographic location were also explored utilizing a questionnaire for data collection.

Analysis of the 247 responses yielded 15 incomplete surveys resulting in a 34.5% response rate ($N = 232$). Each participant completed a survey comprised of 16 questions, eight pertaining to demographics, six involving undergraduate and graduate coursework, one relating to professional responsibilities and one referring to non-collegiate training. In the demographic section of the survey, participants were asked to indicate gender, highest earned degree, track or tracks of study in their music education training, and total number of years teaching. Participants provided additional demographic information by indicating their school size as classified by the Florida High School Athletic Association (2009), school socioeconomic status as determined by the percentage of students receiving free and reduced meals (United States Department of Education, 1996), and the geographic location of their school (i.e., rural, suburban, urban). Participants were asked to recall undergraduate and graduate coursework in specific areas of study including private or applied lessons, class instruction or methods courses, conducting, performance ensemble participation, and instructional training in teaching pedagogy. In the professional responsibilities section of the survey, participants indicated the weekly average number of classes they taught the following subjects: band, chorus, orchestra, private instrumental lessons, private voice lessons, music technology, class guitar, class piano, music theory, special musical productions, other instrumental group instruction, other choral group
instruction, and non-music subjects. The final question of the survey included open-ended responses regarding participants’ non-collegiate training as it related to their current position. Tabulations of participant responses and differences between specific variables are reported in this chapter to address each research question of the present study.

Tabulation of the Music Education Track Variables

Demographic data related to each participant’s track or tracks of study addresses research question number one:

1. What were the music education tracks of the high school music teachers within the study?

Participants were asked to indicate their perceived track or tracks of study from the following categories: (1) Choral, (2) General, (3) Instrumental, and/or (4) Other. The option to select more than one track was made available to accommodate individuals who may have pursued multiple specializations during their music education training. The category of “other” was given as an option for those teachers who may have been alternatively certified and therefore, would not have been “tracked” within a collegiate music education curriculum. Sums and percentages of individual responses regarding track or track combinations were calculated for each variable. Results revealed the majority of participants indicated the instrumental track of study (n = 123) followed by the choral track (n = 59). Additionally, 37 participants indicated they pursued multiple tracks, of various combinations, within their collegiate curriculum. The general music track was the least indicated track within this study with only six participants. A complete list of results by track category is listed in Table 1.
Table 1: Sums and Percentages of Participant Track Indications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; General</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral, General, &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Music Education Track by Collegiate Curriculum

Research questions number two and three involved the number and types of undergraduate and graduate classes taken by the participants. In order to address these questions, the classes within the music education curricula were assigned to the following areas in accordance with the National Association of Schools of Music guidelines (2009) and criteria of the Music Educators National Conference (Thompson & Kiester, 1987):

a. Choral: Private voice, voice class, choral conducting, chorus (men’s, women’s, or mixed), other chorus (e.g., vocal jazz, show choir, gospel), and choral methods or techniques

b. General: Private keyboard, private guitar, keyboard class, guitar class, music technology class, choral/instrumental conducting combination course, world music ensemble (e.g., Irish fiddling, Mariachi, African drumming), and general methods or techniques

c. Instrumental: Private winds and/or percussion, private orchestral strings, winds and/or percussion class, orchestral strings class, instrumental conducting, band (symphonic or concert), other band (e.g., jazz, marching, pep), orchestra (symphony, chamber), and instrumental methods or techniques
Participants selected the total number of courses they took as music education students in each of these areas. Sums and percentages of each area were calculated for each participant. Participants were then grouped according to their track of expertise. Data from Table 1 was compared to area coursework and an average was obtained for each track. This data was then examined to answer the following research questions:

2. Were there differences between the numbers of undergraduate and graduate coursework classes by curricular area and the participants’ music education tracks?

3. If yes, what were the differences between the numbers of undergraduate and graduate coursework classes by curricular area and the participants’ music education tracks?

Results revealed there were differences between the numbers of classes taken within the different curricular areas when examined by the participants’ music education track or tracks. Participants within the choral or instrumental tracks received the majority of their music education coursework within their respective tracks (choral = 63%; instrumental = 75%). Additionally, most participants who were multi-tracked also took more courses within those corresponding track areas. Results also revealed, however, that participants within the general music track received the least amount of coursework in their area (18%) as compared to the amount of classes these same participants took in the choral (29%) and instrumental (53%) areas. Average percentages for each track by curricular area are presented in Table 2.
Table 2: Coursework Mean Percentages by Track Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track Grouping</th>
<th>Choral</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; General</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral, General, &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 208 participants (88.5%) indicated their music education training was based upon the semester schedule while 27 participants (11.5%) selected a schedule based upon the academic quarter system. In order to further analyze the number of specific classes within each coursework area, quarters were converted to semesters for the latter 27 participants. Each quarter of coursework was determined to represent one half semester of the same course. Means of specific class totals for each track grouping were then calculated. Results are presented in Table 3.
Table 3: Means of Classes Taken in Collegiate Curricula by Track Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track Grouping</th>
<th>Private Lessons/ Applied Study</th>
<th>Class or Group Instruction</th>
<th>Conducting</th>
<th>Ensembles</th>
<th>Teaching Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; General</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral, General, &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classes with the highest frequency averages for each track were: traditional choral ensembles (9.0) for the choral track, private voice (5.8) for the general track, and private winds/percussion (8.0) and traditional band ensembles (8.0) for the instrumental track. For the multi-track groups, the classes most taken were: private voice (10.1) for the choral/general track, traditional band ensembles (5.9) for the choral/instrumental track, private winds/percussion (9.6) for the general/instrumental track, private keyboard (5.9) for the choral/general/instrumental track, and private keyboard (5.4) for the other track. Conversely, the classes with the lowest frequency averages for each track were: private orchestral strings (0.1) for the choral track and private guitar (0.1) and music technology (0.1) for the instrumental track. The general track participants indicated no instruction in private orchestral strings, private guitar, class guitar, and world music courses. For the multi-track groups, the classes least taken were: world music (0.1) for the choral/general track, other choral ensembles (0.2) for the general/instrumental track, other choral ensembles (0.1) for the choral/general/instrumental track, and private guitar (0.1), class guitar (0.1) and other bands (0.1) for the other track participants. The choral/instrumental track participants indicated no instruction in private guitar. A listing of all results is in Table 3.

**Music Education Track by Class Assignments**

Research question numbers four and five involved the number of participants who are currently teaching at least one class outside of their track or tracks. In order to address these questions, the classes taught were assigned to one of three tracks; choral, general or instrumental. The specific classes for each track included:

a. Choral track: Chorus, private voice lessons, special musical productions, and other choral group instruction

b. General track: Music technology, class guitar, class piano, and music theory

c. Instrumental track: Band, orchestra, private instrumental lessons, and other instrumental group instruction

Class assignments to the aforementioned tracks were based upon information provided by the Music Educators National Conference (Thompson & Kiester, 1987). Additionally, while the participants were asked to indicate the number of classes taught within each specific course listed on the survey, the data was tabulated by course taught; not the number of times the class was
taught per week. Non-music classes were unrelated to this particular research question and not considered in the analysis.

Data from Table 1 was compared to participant responses regarding their class assignments within the overall track categories. Participants who indicated they were teaching at least one class outside of their track or tracks were identified and separated from those who indicated they were teaching classes inside of their track exclusively. This data was then examined to answer research question number four:

4. How many high school music teachers were currently teaching inside and outside of their track?

Sums and percentages of participants teaching classes inside and outside of their indicated track were calculated for each variable. Results revealed the majority of participants who chose a single track within their collegiate curriculum taught one or more classes outside their track within an average week. Specifically, roughly two-thirds of the choral \( n = 39 \) and instrumental \( n = 86 \) participants indicated teaching outside their track while all the general music participants \( n = 6 \) taught outside their track. Additionally, the total number of participants who were teaching outside of their track \( n = 150 \) represented 64.6% of the subjects participating in the study. Participants who indicated more than one track, with the exception of those who indicated a combination of choral and instrumental tracks, had class assignments more indicative of their collegiate curriculum. Results by track category and course assignment are listed in Table 4.
Table 4: Sums and Percentages of Participants Teaching Inside and Outside of Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Inside Track</th>
<th></th>
<th>Outside Track</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; General</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral, General, &amp; Instrumental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Table 4 was further examined to determine if there were differences between inside and outside of track teachers and the classes they were currently teaching. Means of specific class totals for each track grouping were then calculated to address research question number five:

5. Were there differences between the number of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks and their current teaching assignments?

Results of specific class averages for inside and outside track groupings are listed in Table 5 and Table 6.
### Table 5: Means of Weekly Classes Taught in High Schools by Track Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Chorus</th>
<th>Orchestra</th>
<th>Private Instrument</th>
<th>Private Voice</th>
<th>Tech</th>
<th>Class Guitar</th>
<th>Class Piano</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Musical</th>
<th>Other Instrument</th>
<th>Other Choral</th>
<th>Nonmusic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choral Inside</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral Outside</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Inside</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Outside</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Inside</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Outside</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; General Inside</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; General Outside</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; Instrumental Inside</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral &amp; Instrumental Outside</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General &amp; Instrumental Inside</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General &amp; Instrumental Outside</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral, General, &amp; Instrumental Inside</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral, General, &amp; Instrumental Outside</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Inside</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Outside</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outside track teachers averaged 3.2 more class categories taught than their inside track counterparts. Specifically, the number of different classes taught between inside and outside track teachers for each track category were: choral (inside = 5, outside = 10), general (inside = 0, outside = 10), instrumental (inside = 5, outside = 12), choral/general (inside = 7, outside = 3), choral/instrumental (inside = 7, outside = 7), general/instrumental (inside = 9, outside = 0), choral/general/instrumental (inside = 5, outside = 10). Means for traditional performance ensembles (i.e. Band, Chorus, and Orchestra) were higher than any other class for all inside and outside track groupings. The highest performance ensemble average (14.9) was traditional chorus for the choral/general track while the lowest performance ensemble average (0.3) was traditional orchestra for choral/instrumental track. The highest non-performance ensemble average (8.3) was musical productions for outside general/instrumental, followed by class guitar (5.2) in the same track grouping. A majority (61.5%) of track groupings reported teaching an average of 1.5 non-music classes on a weekly basis at their schools.

**Music Education Track by School Size**

Research question numbers six and seven involved the number of teachers who were teaching outside of their track or tracks by the school size in which they taught. Participants were asked to indicate the size of the school at which they were teaching by selecting one of the following options: (1) Class 1B/258 or fewer students, (2) Class 1A/259 to 521 students, (3) Class 2B/522 to 1014 students, (4) Class 2A/1,015 to 1,390 students, (5) Class 3A/1,391 to 1,739 students, (6) Class 4A/1,740 to 2,014 students, (7) Class 5A/2,015 to 2,362 students, (8) Class 6A/2,363 or more students. Data from Table 4 was compared to school size and sums and percentages were calculated for each size classification. This data was then examined to answer the following research question:

6. How many teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track or tracks were within the different sizes of schools?

Results revealed there were teachers who were teaching outside their track or tracks within all the different school sizes. The data also revealed that as schools became larger the number of teachers who taught outside their tracks also became more prevalent; 1B (n = 1), 1A (n = 6), 2B (n = 10), 2A (n = 22), 3A (n = 31), 4A (n = 31), 6A (n = 30). The only exception to
this trend was for 5A schools, which did have a higher percentage of teachers outside of their tracks, but not to the degree as the other sized schools. Additionally, only the 1B sized school had more teachers teaching within their track than outside; inside \((n = 2)\) versus outside \((n = 1)\). A complete list of all sums and percentages by track and school size is listed in Table 6.

Table 6: Sums and Percentages of Teaching Responsibilities by Participants Teaching Inside and Outside of Track and School Size Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size Classification</th>
<th>Inside Track Teachers</th>
<th>Outside Track Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Were there differences between the numbers of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks by the school size in which they taught?

To determine if there were differences between the numbers of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks by school size, individual chi squares for each school size classification were calculated. Results revealed significant differences between teaching
inside and outside track for the school sizes of 3A ($\chi^2 = 8.6, p = .003$) and 6A ($\chi^2 = 6.88, p = .008$). For all other school sizes no significant differences were found between the number of teachers teaching inside their tracks and those teaching outside their tracks.

**Music Education Track by School Geographical Location**

Research question numbers eight and nine involved the number of teachers who were teaching outside of their tracks by their schools’ geographical location in which they taught. Participants were asked to identify the geographic location and surrounding community of their school as rural, suburban, or urban. Data from Table 4 was compared to the schools’ geographical location and sums and percentages were calculated for each school. This data was then examined to answer the following research question:

8. How many teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track or tracks were within the different geographic location of the school (rural, suburban, urban)?

Results revealed all schools, regardless of location, had more teachers who taught one or more courses outside their track than teachers who taught exclusively within their track. Specifically, suburban schools had the largest number of teachers teaching outside their track ($n = 85$) followed by urban schools ($n = 38$) then rural schools ($n = 27$). A complete list of all sums and percentages by track and geographic location is listed in Table 7.
Table 7: Sums and Percentages of Teaching Responsibilities by Participants Teaching Inside and Outside of Track and School Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Location</th>
<th>Inside Track Teachers</th>
<th>Outside Track Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Were there differences between the numbers of teachers who were teaching inside and outside of their tracks by the geographical location in which they taught?

To determine if there were differences between the numbers of teachers who were teaching inside and outside their tracks by geographical location, individual chi squares for each location were calculated. Results revealed significant differences between teaching inside and outside track for the geographical locations of suburban ($\chi^2 = 9.74, p = .001$) and urban ($\chi^2 = 10.18, p = .001$). There were no significant differences found for rural schools between the number of teachers teaching inside their tracks and those teaching outside their tracks.

**Music Education Track by School Socioeconomic Status**

Research question numbers ten and eleven involved the number of teachers who were teaching outside of their tracks by their schools’ socioeconomic status of the students. Participants were asked to identify the socioeconomic status of their school by identifying the percentage of students they perceived were receiving free or reduced lunch. The free and reduced lunch categories, which are used by the United States Department of Education (1996), included: 0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, and 81-100%. Data from Table 4 was compared to the
schools’ socioeconomic status and sums and percentages were calculated for each. This data was then examined to answer the following research question:

10. How many teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track or tracks were within the different schools’ socioeconomic status of the students?

Results revealed all schools, regardless of socioeconomic status, had more teachers who taught one or more courses outside their track than teachers who taught exclusively within their track. Specifically, teachers who perceived 81-100% of their students receiving free and reduced lunch had the largest percentage of teachers teaching outside their track (82%) followed by schools which had 61-80% and 0-20%, which both had 69% teaching outside their track respectively. A complete list of all sums and percentages by track and school socioeconomic status is listed in Table 8.

Table 8: Sums and Percentages of Teaching Responsibilities by Participants Teaching Inside and Outside of Track and School Socioeconomic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Free &amp; Reduced Meals</th>
<th>Inside Track Teachers</th>
<th>Outside Track Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Were there differences between the number of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks and the schools’ socioeconomic status of the students at which they taught?

To determine if there were differences between the number of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks by the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch, individual chi squares for each socioeconomic status group were calculated. Results revealed significant differences between teaching inside and outside track teachers for the school socioeconomic statuses of 0-20% ($\chi^2 = 7.6, p = .005$), 41-60% ($\chi^2 = 8.6, p = .003$), and 81-100% ($\chi^2 = 8.6, p = .003$). No significant differences were found between the number of teachers teaching inside and outside of their tracks for the other schools’ socioeconomic statuses.

**Music Education Track by Years of Teaching Experience**

Research question number twelve involved the number of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track by years of teaching experience. Participants were asked to indicate the total number of years they had been teaching inclusive of the current year. This open-ended question yielded responses ranging from one to thirty-nine years of teaching experience ($M = 13.7$) for the total subject population. Section two of the U.S. Department of Education Title IX General Provisions identifies a beginning teacher as one who has been teaching "less than a total of three complete school years" (2004, p. 107). This information was used to answer the final research question:

12. Were beginning music teachers more likely to be teaching outside of their tracks than their more experienced counterparts?

Twenty-one participants (9%) had less than three complete school years of teaching experience while the remaining two hundred and eleven participants (89%) had an average of 14.9 years of teaching experience. To determine if a higher percentage of beginning teachers were teaching outside of their tracks, data from Table 4 was compared to participant years of experience. Results indicated that eighteen (85.7%) of the beginning teachers in this study were teaching at least one class outside of their tracks while seventy-five (35.5%) of their more experienced counterparts were teaching outside of their tracks. Results of an odds ratio test
indicated beginning teachers were nearly eleven times more likely ($OR = 10.88$) to be teaching outside of their tracks than mid- to late-career participants.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Traditional music education students are often required to choose a specific curricular emphasis or track of study within their degree program. These specializations, based upon the student’s major instrument, include choral, general, and instrumental music. Upon graduating from an accredited college or university, however, music education graduates who earn a Florida teaching certificate are endorsed to teach all areas of music from kindergarten to twelfth grade. Although a few studies have examined relationships between the academic preparation and professional responsibilities of music teachers in the states of California (Fischer, 1999; Marks, 1994), Iowa (Keeler, 2008), South Carolina (Franklin, 1968), and Tennessee (Simon, 2009), there is no existing research which examines this relationship within the state of Florida. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate Florida high school music teachers’ preservice training, determine the percentage of teachers who were currently teaching inside and outside of their track(s), and identify differences between inside or outside track teachers and the schools at which they were teaching. Specifically, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What were the music education tracks of the high school music teachers within the study?
2. Were there differences between the numbers of undergraduate and graduate coursework classes by curricular area and the participants’ music education tracks?
3. If yes, what were the differences between the numbers of undergraduate and graduate coursework classes by curricular area and the participants’ music education tracks?
4. How many high school music teachers were currently teaching inside and outside of their track?
5. Were there differences between the number of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks and their current teaching assignments?
6. How many teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track or tracks were within the different sizes of schools?
7. Were there differences between the numbers of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks by the school size in which they taught?
8. How many teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track or tracks were within the different geographic location of the school (rural, suburban, urban)?
9. Were there differences between the numbers of teachers who were teaching inside and outside of their tracks by the geographical location in which they taught?
10. How many teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their track or tracks were within the different schools’ socioeconomic status of the students?
11. Were there differences between the number of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks and the schools’ socioeconomic status at which they taught?
12. Were beginning music teachers more likely to be teaching outside of their tracks than their more experienced counterparts?

Discussion of Results

Research Question 1

Of the 232 participants, slightly over four-fifths (83.1%) of the high school teachers indicated a performance-oriented music education track of study, instrumental (53%), choral (25.4%) or choral & instrumental (4.7%). Conversely, the smallest percentage of participants selected a general track (2.6%). The disproportionate number of instrumental participants may be attributed to the combined band and orchestra specializations as the “instrumental” track. A possible reason for the higher percentage of instrumental and choral respondents may be that many high school music programs remain performance-oriented and are often based upon the traditional band/chorus/orchestra model. Therefore, if music educators want to work in this setting they specialize in a performance-type curricular track. Another reason may be that, while general music classes are offered at the high school level, this study was limited in the number of general music participants who completed the survey, and thus may not have been a
representative sample. Future surveys of individual high school general music teachers, specifically those teaching guitar, piano, music theory, music technology, and music appreciation, may provide more evidence to support the findings of this study.

Interesting, 16% of the study’s population were multi-track participants, which included combinations of choral, general, and instrumental curricular areas. The inherent flexibility of the specialization competencies of the NASM guidelines allows for individual institution faculty and administrators to decide if music teachers may be prepared in one or more tracks (National Association of Schools of Music, 2009). Although this study did not include teachers’ degree granting institutions, it is possible that graduates from specific schools pursued multi-track options. Variations in school size, course offerings, faculty expertise, or enrollment numbers may determine if such institutions offer multi-track specializations. Further research in this area may reveal differences between preservice music education tracking options at various colleges and universities.

Seven participants who selected “other” were asked to specify their degree program of study. Open-ended responses included performance, music therapy, music theory, and sound engineering or electronic music. Perhaps these individuals pursued alternative routes to certification in acquiring their current teaching positions and therefore did not have a track of study. An interesting result was that none of the “other” track participants specified a non-music degree program. This finding may be due to the highly qualified teacher mandate of the No Child Left Behind Act for all teachers to be trained and certified within their content area (2001). However, it was indeterminable if the “other” participants were teaching within their musical instrument or area of expertise. Therefore, further research could examine alternatively certified teachers to discover if and how they achieved certification as well as whether they are teaching within their specialty area.

Research Questions 2 & 3

The music education curriculum within colleges and universities includes a variety of courses ranging from performance ensembles to teaching pedagogy classes. Among these courses are private musical instruction, traditional band, chorus, and orchestra performance ensembles, class guitar, music technology, world music, and choral, general, or instrumental methods. Participants were asked to indicate the number of classes they had taken within specific
track categories. Results indicated choral and instrumental track students seem to be provided with a thorough education in their respective content areas. Choral track grouping participants, on average, received three or more semesters of instruction in private voice, voice class, choral conducting, choral performance ensembles, and choral methods while their instrumental track counterparts averaged three or more semesters of private winds/percussion, winds/percussion class, instrumental conducting, traditional bands, other bands (i.e. jazz, marching, pep), and instrumental methods. This data supports previous research which concluded that traditional choral and band teachers were generally satisfied with their preservice training in their own areas (Adderley, 1996; Ballantyne & Packer, 2004). However, other studies have suggested that quality may not be equated with quantity regarding the effectiveness and relevance of methods coursework within the band and choral tracks (Conway, Hourigan, & Stanley, 2007; Cooper, 1994; McCormick, 2008). Further research is needed to determine how an appropriate balance between breadth and depth as well as a set of successful standardized objectives and outcomes for classes within the band and choral tracks may be established.

Ensembles, private lessons, and conducting class averages were higher than group instruction and methods class averages for all track groupings. These findings relate to other studies which have identified more emphasis on performance skills than on teaching strategies in the music education curricula (Bell, 1976; Rohwer & Henry, 2004). The lack of teaching pedagogy classes has also been attributed to legislation, government policies, and mandated certification tests that emphasize subject matter over pedagogical issues (Cochran-Smith, 2005). Perhaps the number of music theory, music history and non-music courses such as psychology, educational foundations, and other liberal studies also limit the number of methods classes for preservice music educators (Kimpton, 2005). Unfortunately, the current study did not ask teachers to indicate the number of credits they earned in such courses. Therefore, further examinations of music teachers’ transcripts and preservice experiences may provide more comprehensive baseline data for curricular evaluation.

General music participants received less instruction in their content area than their choral and instrumental colleagues. Specifically, general music track participants took more classes in the choral (29%) and instrumental (53%) areas than their own (18%). Teaching pedagogy coursework averages were also considerably higher for choral and instrumental track specialists than the averages of general track participants. Additionally, general track participants received
minimal coursework in music technology and no instruction in world music or class guitar, curricular areas classified by the Music Educator’s National Conference as secondary general music (Thompson & Kiester, 1987). Such results may indicate that music education programs should address the practical curricular needs of general track specialists who plan to work at the secondary level so to provide more relevant coursework in their area of study. Further investigation into the preservice training experiences of a larger sample of secondary general music teachers is needed.

Multi-track participants appeared to have a relatively even distribution of course offerings throughout their music education training. This data is reflective of their self-identification as multi-track teachers and comprehensive training. The only missing class was private guitar from the choral/instrumental track grouping. This result is perhaps not surprising since guitar is more often referred to as a general music instrument, particularly at the secondary level (Thompson & Kiester, 1987). However, since many high schools do offer class guitar as a course offering, the collegiate curriculum may need to include training in this area to prepare preservice teachers for any type of secondary position.

Higher education teachers must be concerned with the development of student competencies to teach in all areas of music. Low averages for all track groupings in world music may be indicative of Kendal-Reed’s finding that only 29.7% of Florida’s secondary music teachers were “totally comfortable” in teaching multi-cultural music (Kendal-Reed, 2001). Likert-scale measurements of comfort levels in Kendal-Reed’s study may have also indicated a sense of resistance or a lack of willingness to teach multi-cultural music: “Due to the projected growth of cultural diversity and the resulting challenges, the willingness and ability of teachers to work with unfamiliar cultures may greatly influence their effectiveness” (Kelly & VanWeelden, 2004, p. 37). This finding may be of particular concern in a state as culturally diverse as Florida. Standard 10 of the Florida Curriculum Framework: the Arts states:

Florida students appreciate their own culture and the cultures of others, understand the concerns and perspectives of members of other ethnic and gender groups, reject the stereotyping of themselves and others, and seek out and utilize the views of persons from diverse ethnic, social, and educational backgrounds while completing individual and group projects (State of Florida, 1996, p. 27).
It is the responsibility of the music educator to broaden students’ knowledge and understanding of musical practices among many cultures. Perhaps in addition to providing multi-cultural performance ensemble opportunities, music education programs may consider adopting a more comprehensive approach to teaching multi-cultural music methods. This approach would enfold non-Western music topics into existing music theory, music history, conducting, private instruction, and methods classes. Multi-cultural field work experiences in the schools and intercultural exchange opportunities with musicians from various backgrounds may also foster a willingness to teach music beyond what is most familiar (Richardson, 2004). Although this study did not include analyses of courses beyond a general world music offering, future research may consider the percentage of time studying and using multi-cultural music within the context of non-performance classes and internship experiences to determine if multi-cultural music opportunities exist beyond the performance ensemble setting.

Results of this study found half of the track groupings average less than one class of music technology during their collegiate training. The lack of music technology instruction in higher education is incongruent with the advances in classroom composition, arranging, and performance software as well as the growing presence of Musical Instrument Digital Interface (MIDI) practice programs, personal mp3 players, internet usage, and electronic instruments in the public schools. “As technology advances and innovative tools become mainstream, the arts and arts education have the opportunity to play an important role in student access to these technological advances” (State of Florida, 1996, p. 270). It is conceivable that recent developments in and accessibility to MIDI technology, recording equipment, and music labs were not available to late-career teachers during their preservice training experiences. MIDI technology and synthesizers did not appear in mainstream society and higher education until the late 1980’s (Gilbert, 1997). Teachers with 20 or more years of experience (n =70) may not have had the opportunity to take courses that included such technologies. Additionally, the current study assumed all courses were offered to all participants. Perhaps rather than adopting a compartmentalized approach to music technology in an isolated course, colleges and universities employ technology throughout their curriculum, within the context of multiple courses. For example, performance technique or assessment software may be introduced in methods courses while composition and sequencing software may be included as a component of a music theory lab or an orchestration class. Future quantitative studies examining the implementation of
technology in all college and university music classes may reveal a more prevalent use of personal listening devices, MIDI software programs, the world-wide web, and other music technology innovations.

Research Question 4

Nearly half (48%) of the traditional performance ensembles were, on average, taught five or more times a week. Conversely, group guitar was the only general music class to average five or more classes per week. This data confirms that “while the number of high schools offering music courses for students not electing to participate in performance ensembles has increased significantly, general music courses are still a rarity in many high schools in this country” (Thompson & Kiester, 1987, p. 2). Because administrators often establish curricular offerings, this finding also supports Woody’s (1993) conclusion that many principals value the performance achievements and public relations aspects of traditional ensembles more than the comprehensive teaching of music as an academic subject.

Regrettably, previous research has indicated that approximately 85% of all high school students are not involved in music due to the lack of general music class offerings (Lentsch, 2000; Lindeman, 1995). “Students in our contemporary society fail to understand the connection of the music they experience in school to the music they participate in outside of school.” (Kelly, 2009, p. 143). Diversification of the high school music curricula may attract more students to music programs and offer more opportunities for them to transfer their school-based musical activities to their own personal musical lives. Future studies involving the creation, implementation, and sustainment of successful, existing secondary general music classes may provide more insight and justification for the expansion of traditional high school music curricula.

A majority (64.6%) of the participants were teaching at least one class outside of their track on a weekly basis. All of the general and other area participants were teaching outside of track while most of the choral (66.1%) and instrumental (69.9%) participants were teaching outside of their respective tracks. Multi-track participants teaching outside of track ranged from zero in the choral, general, instrumental category to eight or 72.7% within the choral and instrumental combination. This finding indicates an increasing trend in the number of music teachers who are teaching outside of their track during the past few decades. For example, while
Franklin (1968) found that 34% of secondary music teachers were teaching at least one class outside of track, Rosenthal (2005) later reported that over half of all high school music teachers were teaching in a secondary area. One of the implications of these results is that most preservice music education students will eventually be teaching at least one class outside of their elected area of expertise. This finding is a cause of concern as previous research has indicated that preservice teachers feel strongly committed to a chosen specialty in music education and express little desire to teach outside of that area of familiarity (Conway, 2001; Cooper, 1994; Hamman & Ebie, 2009; Mishra, 2008). It also may indicate that a more comprehensive or integrated track of study is needed in order to develop a broader perspective of music in education. Results of previous case studies involving more inclusive tracks of study beyond the choral, general, and instrumental models have indicated higher student retention rates (Kimpton, 2005) and stronger leadership skills (Burnsed & Jenson, 1994). However, too few research studies have been conducted to make generalizations regarding a more comprehensive track of study.

Research Question 5

Differences were found between the number of teachers who were teaching inside or outside of their tracks and the average number of specific classes taught per week. Results indicated a higher average number of classes for most of the corresponding inside track teachers. The largest discrepancy was between traditional chorus classes taught by inside choral/general participants (14.9) and outside choral/general participants (8.0) with the latter group teaching 6.9 fewer traditional choruses on a weekly basis.

Several outside track participants averaged more specific classes than their corresponding inside track counterparts. For example, outside track instrumental participants taught 1.1 more classes of “other instrumental group instruction” than their inside track participant colleagues. Perhaps steel drums, mariachi, and other specialized instrumental ensembles appeal to those with less traditional instrumental backgrounds and experiences (Cooper, 1994). Other findings which included higher averages for outside track participants included private voice for choral/general, traditional band and chorus for choral/instrumental, and orchestra, musical, and other instrumental group instruction for general/instrumental. Despite the differences in averages between inside and outside track groups, most means were within two or less classes per week.
Although none of the choral/general and choral/general/instrumental multi-track participant groups reported teaching classes outside of music, the remaining six groupings indicated they were teaching non-music classes. Perhaps these teachers were certified to teach other subject areas such as math, physical education, or other fine arts. It was beyond the scope of this study to assess if these teachers were certified in areas other than music. However, in light of the current financial constraints on public education, cuts in curricular offerings, and workforce reductions within the state of Florida, it is possible that music educators are teaching classes outside of area in order to maintain full-time status and avoid impending layoffs. Such findings have been documented in other states including Illinois (Rosenthal, 2005) and California (Sperling & Hollinger, 2009). Future research could investigate what non-music courses music educators are teaching, whether they have received additional training in these non-music areas, and if they are teaching these courses due to necessity or personal preference.

Research Questions 6 & 7

Only the smallest school size category (1B, 258 or fewer students) contained more inside than outside track participants. This finding contradicts previous research that concluded smaller schools tended to have more outside area teachers than larger schools: “Small schools are likely to have fewer teachers, and, hence fewer specialists; frequently, small schools require that their teachers take on broader teaching responsibilities than the traditional high school teacher” (Warner-King & Price, 2003, p. 36). However, due to the small sample size of inside \( n = 2 \) and outside \( n = 1 \) track participants within the 1B school size category of this study, a larger sample is needed to determine whether these results are truly representative of all 1B schools within the state of Florida.

Inside and outside track teacher percentages within other small school categories (1A and 2B) were relatively equal to one another. This data implies the probability of a choral music specialist teaching class guitar and music theory \( p = .55 \) in a school enrolling 500 students is nearly the same as a choral music specialist teaching traditional chorus and other choral ensembles \( p = .45 \) in another school of comparable size. However, such assumptions should be considered with caution as other variables (e.g. socioeconomic status, location, and curricula) may influence the placement of inside and outside track teachers.
The disparity between inside and outside track teacher totals within larger schools became more pronounced as school sizes increased. Several studies have identified larger schools with more varied curricula and a wider range of course offerings (Barker, 1985; Howley, 1997; Walberg & Walberg, 1994). Perhaps the diversity of classes offered at larger schools result in higher percentages of music educators who are teaching at least one course outside of their track of expertise than in smaller schools. The only exception to this trend was found in 5A schools with 42% inside track teachers and 58% outside track teachers. This drop in percentages may be attributed to the drop of total participants within the 5A school category.

Results for research question number six should be interpreted with caution due to the unequal samples of school size category participants. For example, only three participants identified their schools as 1B (258 or fewer students) while fifty-one participants selected 4A (1,740 to 2,014 students) and forty-two participants selected 3A (1,391 to 1,739 students) and 6A (2,363 or more students) school size categories, respectively. The average student enrollment in Florida's high schools (1,716.6) is nearly twice the national average high school enrollment (875.5), thus the disproportionate number of responses from participants in larger schools (Florida Department of Education, 2009). The mixed results of this study mirror the conflicting and inconclusive results of previous studies related to school size (Slate & Jones, 2005; Ahn & Brewer, 2009). Consequently, further investigations of teacher specializations and school size characteristics may provide more empirical evidence to support or refute findings of the current study.

Research Questions 8 & 9

Over half of the participants in each geographic location (i.e. rural, suburban, and urban) were teaching at least one class outside of track. This finding is not surprising given that a majority (64.6%) of the total sample was teaching at least one class outside of track on a weekly basis. Significant differences between inside and outside track teachers were found in suburban and urban schools. Conversely, there were no significant differences between inside and outside track teachers in rural schools. These findings are contrary to previous studies which have identified a disproportionate number of rural music educators teaching outside of track (Otte, 2008; Tonn, 2007). Perhaps this discrepancy is due to the limited number (n = 47) of participants who indicated they were teaching in a rural setting. Future analyses of rural music educators
within the state may include a larger sample of teachers from Florida’s 756 rural/town elementary, middle, and high schools to determine if there is a disproportionate number of inside or outside track music educators in rural locations (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008).

Results also indicated there were more participants teaching outside of track in suburban schools than in rural and urban schools combined with the total number of suburban teachers exceeding the combined rural and urban total by 34 participants. According to the United States Department of Education, during the 2006-2007 school year, Florida’s suburban schools contained a higher number of students (53.0%) than urban (24.3%) and rural/town (22.7%) locations combined (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). More recent data has reported a vast majority (76%) of Florida’s students attended suburban schools while the remaining percentages attended urban (12%) and rural/town (12%) schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). Previous research has also found that while rural and urban high school music curricula are usually limited to traditional band and choral performance ensembles, suburban high schools often provide more musically diverse course offerings (Abril & Gault, 2008; Gillespie & Hamann, 1998; Illinois Arts Education Initiative, 2008). Perhaps courses including Advanced Placement music theory, class guitar, and music technology are taught by choral or instrumental track teachers in suburban high schools.

Although a majority of the outside track participants were teaching in suburban schools, the highest percentage of outside track teachers was in the urban school geographic location. These findings differ from those of the National Education Association (2009) citing the highest percentage of out of track teachers in rural schools. A possible reason for this contradiction may be that national statistics do not correspond with the state of Florida. Another reason for these results may be that while there are 818 urban elementary, middle, and high schools within the state of Florida, this particular study only accounted for 52 of the state’s urban high schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). The limited number of urban high schools in this study may not represent the total sample of such schools within the state of Florida. It was beyond the scope of this study to determine why nearly three-fourths of all urban music educators were teaching outside of track. However, previous research has concluded that inner city and urban area “individuals who are responsible for hiring teachers may consider developing and promoting opportunities for professional growth and the quality of life in the surrounding
community if they wish to attract the best and brightest of our new teachers” (Kelly, 2005, p. 15). Perhaps urban administrators are experiencing difficulty in hiring inside track teachers. Due to the anonymity of participant responses, it may also be possible that a higher proportion of urban teachers were from a single district or region of the state containing higher concentrations of outside track teachers. Future studies may consider tracking participant responses by district or region in order to collect a representative sample from the entire state.

Research Questions 10 & 11

Over half of the participants in each school socioeconomic category (student percentages of free and reduced meals) were teaching at least one class outside of track. The highest percentage of outside track participants perceived themselves to be teaching in schools with the highest percentage of students (81-100%) receiving free and reduced meals. However, caution should be used while interpreting these results due to the low number of teachers representing this particular category of schools. Despite the highest percentage of outside track participants in the poorest of schools, the overall uneven distribution of percentages between free and reduced meal groupings seems to indicate that inside and outside teacher track assignments are unrelated to school socioeconomic status. For example, the most affluent schools (0-20%) contained the same percentage of outside track teachers as the second poorest school grouping (61-80%). Although previous studies have determined that a disproportionate number of out-of-field English, Math, Science, and Social Studies teachers are employed in low socioeconomic status schools, results from the current study seem to indicate there is no transfer to out-of-track teachers within the field of music education (Cochran-Smith, Feiman-Nemser, McIntyre, & Demers, 2008; Ingersoll, 2003). Perhaps other variables may be correlated with socioeconomic status and teacher track specializations. Further investigations may consider such relationships to determine if school socioeconomic status is related to inside or outside track teaching assignments.

Question 12

Beginning teachers are defined by the U.S. Department of Education (2004) as teachers who have less than three complete years of teaching experience. Results indicated that beginning high school music teachers were nearly eleven times more likely to be teaching outside of track
than mid- to late-career teachers. These findings are incongruent with the results of a national study which found that “those teaching out of field are typically fully certified veterans with an average of 14 years teaching experience” (Ingersoll, 2002, p. 22). However, this study did not include the arts in analyzing out-of-field teacher assignments. Furthermore, a recent national report has indicated while there was a drop in out-of-field English, math, and social science teachers from the 1987-1988 school year to the 1999-2000 school year, there was a 3% increase in out-of-field art and music teachers at the high school level (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). Although this report did not distinguish the differences between beginning and veteran educators’ responsibilities, an increase in the number of out-of-field arts teachers may be attributed to an influx of beginning arts teachers. Future investigations may reveal if the numbers of out-of-field music teachers are increasing due to a less experienced workforce or other variables.

Eighteen of the twenty-one beginning teachers were teaching at least one class outside of their track. However, in a previous study, Conway (2002) found that only four of fourteen beginning teachers in a Midwestern state were teaching at least one class outside of their musical track. Perhaps these differing results were due to regional differences as the current study was conducted in a Southeastern state. It is also possible that out-of-track music teaching assignments have become more prevalent since 2002. Further research is needed in this area as Conway states, “Although the profession has begun to focus on beginning music teachers, we do not have a strong research base from which to make decisions about beginning music teachers” (2003, p. 7).

Conclusion

Despite the existence of college and university specialized choral, general, and instrumental music education tracking systems as well as the inclusive K-12 music teaching certificate, there is a paucity of related research. Therefore, this study attempted to analyze the current music education tracking systems and the teaching assignments of Florida’s high school music teachers. Further, differences between inside and outside track teachers and the schools at which they were teaching were explored.

It was found that a majority of Florida’s high school music teachers were teaching at least one class outside of their track(s) of specialization. Because participants may have been teaching
more than one class outside of track, the total magnitude of mismatches between inside and outside track teachers may be conservative. Results also indicated discrepancies between the perceived training experiences of participant groups and an uneven distribution of coursework. General track participants reported fewer methods classes and relevant curricular offerings than their choral and instrumental counterparts.

Differences between the number of inside and outside track participants’ years of experience and the schools at which they were teaching relative to school size, geographic location, and socioeconomic status were also investigated. A majority (85.7%) of beginning teachers were teaching at least one class outside of track while a minority (35.5%) of veteran teachers taught out of track classes. Significant differences were found between inside and outside track teachers in 3A and 6A school size categories, suburban and urban geographic locations, and socioeconomic status schools with 0-20%, 41-60%, and 81-100% of students receiving free and reduced meals. However, most comparisons between inside and outside track teachers and the schools at which they were teaching revealed no significant differences. Consequently, teacher experience levels and track(s) of expertise are more likely to indicate inside or outside of track teaching status than individual school characteristics.

**Closing**

To date, there has been little research investigating the perceptions, relevance, and effectiveness of preservice teacher training as it relates to specific music teaching assignments within the state of Florida. This study attempted to investigate whether preservice tracking systems of music education programs were aligned with current high school music teaching assignments within the public schools. Further, differences between inside and outside track teacher experience levels, school sizes, geographic locations, and socioeconomic status were explored. Although several interesting results emerged from this study, additional questions concerning the undergraduate music education curricula, teacher certification practices, and individual school characteristics arose. Continued research in this area may lead to more conclusive results and implications for the preparation of music educators and the secondary music education curricula.
1. Demographic Data

* 1. Please select your gender from the following:
   - Female
   - Male

* 2. Please select your highest earned degree:
   - No degree
   - Bachelor’s degree
   - Master’s degree
   - Doctoral degree

* 3. Please select the following track(s) of study/expertise in your music education training:
   - Choral
   - General
   - Instrumental
   - Other (please specify)

* 4. Please enter the total number of years you have been teaching (including the current year):
5. Which of the following represents the FHSAA classification/total enrollment of the school where you currently teach? (If you teach in more than one school, select the school where you spend most of your instructional time)

- Class 1B/258 or fewer students
- Class 1A/259 to 521 students
- Class 2B/522 to 1014 students
- Class 2A/1,015 to 1,390 students
- Class 3A/1,391 to 1,739 students
- Class 4A/1,740 to 2,014 students
- Class 5A/2,015 to 2,362 students
- Class 6A/2,363 or more students

6. Please select the percentage of students receiving free and reduced meals at your school:

- 0% to 20%
- 21% to 40%
- 41% to 60%
- 61% to 80%
- 81% to 100%

7. Which of the following best describes the surrounding community environment of your school?

- Rural
- Suburban
- Urban

2. Professional Responsibilities
1. Please type the average number of classes per week that you teach the following subjects:

- Band
- Chorus
- Orchestra
- Private instrumental lessons (as part of regular school day)
- Private voice lessons (as part of regular school day)
- Music Technology
- Class Guitar
- Class Piano
- Music Theory
- Special musical productions (musicals, talent shows, etc.)
- Other instrumental group instruction
- Other choral group instruction
- Non-music subjects

3. Undergraduate/Graduate Coursework

1. Please select the basis upon which your credits were earned

- Semester
- Quarter

4. Private Lessons/Applied Study

1. Please select the total number of courses you received formal instruction in applied/private lessons in the following areas:

- Private Voice
- Private wind and/or percussion
- Private keyboard
- Private orchestral strings
- Private guitar

5. Class/Group Instruction or Methods Coursework
Please do not include teaching pedagogy courses

* 1. Please select the total number of courses you received formal class or group instruction in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>over 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winds and/or percussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestral strings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Conducting Courses

* 1. Please select the total number of courses you received formal instruction in conducting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>over 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Course of Choral/Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Performance Ensemble Participation

* 1. Please select the total number of courses you received formal instruction in the following performance ensembles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensemble</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>over 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chorus (mixed, women’s or men’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Choral (vocal jazz, show choir, gospel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band (concert, symphonic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Band (jazz, marching, pep)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra (symphony, chamber)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World/Other Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensembles (Irish fiddling, Mariachi, African drumming)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Pedagogy Courses

* 1. Please select the total number of courses you received formal instruction of methods coursework in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>over 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choral techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Music techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Additional Information

* 1. Why did you accept your current teaching position?
   - location
   - salary
   - assignment responsibility
   - personal
   - career change
   - Other (please specify)

2. Please note any other background (non-collegiate) training that has prepared you for your teaching assignments.

10. Survey Completed

Thank you for participating in this study and responding to the survey questions.
Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 10/7/2009

To: Wilbur Baker, Jr.

Address: 2772 Whitmore Court  Tallahassee, FL 32312
Dept.: MUSIC SCHOOL

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
A Descriptive Analysis of the Academic Training Experiences and Teaching Responsibilities of High School Music Educators Within the State of Florida

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 10/5/2010 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.
You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the Chair of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Kimberly VanWeelden, Advisor
    HSC No. 2009.3223
Dear Music Educators:

You are invited to be in a research study investigating the academic preparation and professional responsibilities of high school music educators in the state of Florida. You were selected as a possible participant because you were identified as a high school music educator in the state of Florida. Please read the following form before agreeing to participate in the study.

This study is being conducted by Billy Baker, a graduate student in the College of Music at Florida State University currently working on his dissertation under the direction of Kimberly VanWeelden.

Background Information:
The purpose of this study is:
To analyze the academic preparation and professional responsibilities of high school music educators in the state of Florida

Procedures:
If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Complete a demographic section which will ask you to indicate your gender; your highest earned degree; the track of study/expertise in which you specialized (choral, general, instrumental); the total number of years you have been teaching; the FHSAA classification/total enrollment of your school; the percentage of students receiving free and reduced meals at your school; and your school setting (rural, suburban, urban).

2. Answer 8 questions related to your academic preparation and current professional assignment. All questions are multiple choice and fill in the blank formats.

3. Note any other background (non-collegiate) training that has prepared you for your teaching assignment in an optional text format.

The length of time for your participation in this study should be approximately five minutes.

For your convenience, I have made the survey available electronically through the survey website. Please follow the link provided below to access it:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6Y3YJY8

Risks and benefits of being in the study:
There are no known risks or benefits to you for participating in this research study.

Compensation:

You will receive no compensation for participation in this study.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private and confidential to the extent permitted by law. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Florida State University. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships. To withdraw at any time after beginning the survey, simply close your web browser.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Billy Baker. If you have any questions, you are encouraged to contact him at Florida State University, (850) 222-0726, wrb07@fsu.edu. You may also contact his faculty advisor, Dr. Kimberly VanWeelden at Florida State University, (850) 644-4042, kvanweelden@fsu.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the FSU IRB at 2010 Levy Street, Research Building B, Suite 276, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2742, or 850-644-8633, or by email at humansubjects@magnet.fsu.edu.

You may print a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Consent to Participate:

Electronic submission of the completed survey will be considered your consent to participate.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6Y3YJY8
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