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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate high school music teachers’ perceived influence of student enrollment in accelerated learning programs on student enrollment, participation, and attitude in band and choir. Participants (N = 100) were Florida high school band and choir directors. The dependent measure was a researcher-developed questionnaire asking for directors’ perceptions of the three research questions as they related to students enrolled in Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Dual Enrollment, or Advanced International Certificate of Education courses. Respondents also provided what types of accommodations they use within their own program to allow the successful participation of these students. Results indicated that some music educators did perceive a negative influence of accelerated learning program enrollment on all three measures, yet variability in the sample was indicated by high standard deviations on nearly all questions. Further, the study yielded evidence that not all accelerated learning programs affected students similarly. Students in AP courses, for instance, were perceived as having fewer issues with enrollment in both primary and secondary ensembles than students in IB courses. The most commonly reported accommodation was permitting tardiness or absence from required events. Though the results of this study demonstrated a lack of agreement amongst Florida’s music teachers about the influence of accelerated learning program enrollment on student participation in music, perhaps this disagreement itself is the most significant finding. If music study is a valued part of a complete education, then music educators and related parties should develop strategies that encourage and allow students to be successful in both music and accelerated learning programs.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The American high school is unique among its international counterparts due to the breadth of courses and experiences it offers to students (Mahoney & Cairns, 1997). The institution as we know it today, however, is the result of many philosophical conflicts regarding what subjects are important and what educational expectations should be placed on students (Angus & Mirel, 1999). School-based participation in the performing arts does not exist in a vacuum, and understanding the history and rationale behind strengthened academic coursework provide a relevant backdrop to modern-day conflicts like scheduling.

The Great Debate

Secondary education became increasingly available in post-Civil War America, first in the form of private academies which were later eclipsed by public schools (Angus & Mirel, 1999). These early high schools were open to students who completed the prerequisite 6 or 7 years of primary study and passed required entrance exams. These schools offered locally-controlled curricula separated into college-bound and diverse commercial tracks. Further, elective courses like music and art also started to appear. Though high school enrollment was small, likely around 5-6 percent of American teenagers were enrolled in the late 1800s, the growing number of institutions sporting radically different curricula warranted discussion at the national level (Clemmitt, 2006; Mirel, 2006).

Committee of Ten Report

In 1892 the National Council of Education (a group of the National Education Association) appointed a committee to standardize curriculum for college-bound high school students. The ten-member committee included five university presidents (Harvard, University of Michigan, Vassar College, University of Missouri, and the University of Colorado), one collegiate faculty member (Oberlin), the U.S. Commissioner of Education, two private school headmasters, and one public high school principal. Their report, released in 1894, advocated for a rigorous college-preparatory education for all high school students regardless of student intention to either pursue collegiate study, to enter the workforce, or to remain in school at all.
Further, the report advocated for schools across the country to use a more uniform curriculum focused on nine “core” subject areas. One caveat provided that individual schools could make minor adjustments to the Committee’s guidelines to meet their unique local needs and keep some of the specialized courses that had been developed over the years. Following these principles, the report stressed, would lead to greater recognition of high school credentials by universities, thus simplifying the college admissions process (Angus & Mirel, 1999; Mirel, 2006).

The committee’s report was widely condemned as elitist following its release as critics accused the authors of being unconcerned with the average non-college-bound student (Angus & Mirel, 1999, Clemmitt, 2006). Yet growth in high school enrollment continued across America, which coupled with the immigration driven demographic changes of the early twentieth century, likely made the arguments of critics more acceptable and the changes suggested by the report impractical. Meanwhile, the growing class of professional educators, including superintendents, principals, and college professors of education, began to formulate their own ideas about the future direction of the high school.

The Cardinal Principles

Like the Committee of Ten years earlier, The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (CRSE) was co-sponsored by the U.S. Bureau of Education and the National Education Association, though similarities between the two groups ended there. In 1918 the CRSE’s 26-member oversight committee, composed of professional educators including college professors of education, representatives of school-based leadership, state and national administrators, and a single college president, issued a general statement called Cardinal Principles. Instead of a curriculum, the statement offered seven “objectives” for secondary education: “1. Health, 2. Command of fundamental processes, 3. Worthy home-membership, 4. Vocation, 5. Citizenship, 6. Worthy use of leisure, and 7. Ethical character” (as cited in Angus & Mirel, 1999, p. 15). To achieve these goals with an increasingly diverse high school population, one that was considered “less intelligent than previous generation[s],” the Cardinal Principles advocated for an expansion of program offerings that met the interests, needs, and abilities of students (Angus & Mirel, 1999; Mirel, 2006).

These objectives described the new comprehensive high school, and placed students into clearly defined tracks like “college prep,” “commercial,” “vocational,” and the non-specific
“general” (Clemmitt, 2006, p. 206). Beyond specifying different courses of study for every individual student, the Principles strongly advocated different levels of academic rigor based on student ability as determined by the newly developed intelligence tests (Angus & Mirel, 1999). This tracking signified a major shift in the definition of equal educational opportunity when compared with the Committee of Ten vision of education. The latter created equality through actually equivalent coursework, whereas the Cardinal Principles offered equal access to unequal programs leading to a universal credential, the high school diploma (Mirel, 2006).

The model of school described by the Cardinal Principles still exists today and has been given many new names such as the shopping mall high school (Powell, Farrar, & Cohen, 1985), the cafeteria-style curriculum (Clemmitt, 2006; NCEE, 1983), or democracy’s school (Angus & Mirel, 1999; Swan & McGrath, 1977; Ravich, 2010). These titles reflect the great amount of student freedom and choice that educators have built into schools over the years as a response to criticism. For instance, during the Depression era when school enrollments surged due to youth unemployment and many feared the potential problems caused by masses of unoccupied youth, schools responded with a life skills curriculum. Designed to assist schools with their new “custodial” function, this curriculum kept students in school by offering appealing non-academic courses of little rigor (Minel, 2006). It was during this period that courses like health and physical education became more prominent in American education while the enrollment in academic courses decreased slightly (Angus & Mirel, 1999, p. 204). Similarly, as the USSR’s launch of Sputnik in 1957 threatened America’s hegemony in the sciences, criticism of the American education system started to argue for the very principles advocated by the Committee of Ten in 1894. Educational leaders responded with a reaffirmation of the tracking model already in place with more differentiation in curriculum for the brightest students (Angus & Mirel, 1999). The Accelerated Learning Programs discussed below were developed and grew in prominence during this era, starting with the Advanced Placement program.

A Nation at Risk

During the late 1970s the American public, struggling economically and facing an increasingly hostile world, started questioning the foundations of society including the public schools (Angus & Mirel, 1999). The national news media echoed these concerns like a Time magazine article from November 1977 describing the “declining performance,” “rising
violence,” “mounting absenteeism,” and the “taxpayer rebellions against ever-rising educational costs” of American suburban schools (Swan & McGrath, 1977, p. 62-64). An article in Newsweek presented results of a new Gallup poll showing that 47% of Americans rated the performance of their public schools as “fair” or “poor” while “seven years ago… two-thirds in a similar poll rated schools excellent or good” (Williams et al., 1981, p. 64). In August 1981, the growing public outcry led President Reagan’s Department of Education to form the National Committee on Excellence in Education (NCEE) with a mandate to “define the problems afflicting American education and to provide solutions” (NCEE, 1983, p. iii). The committee’s final report, A Nation at Risk, published in 1983, decried how the “educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity” and captured public attention (p. 5). The report criticized high school curricula as “homogenized, diluted, and diffused to the point they no longer have a central purpose” (p. 18) and further criticized the “cafeteria-style” model that permitted “50 percent or more of the units required for high school graduation [to be] electives chosen by the student” (p. 20).

One of the report’s major recommendations, increasing high school graduation requirements for all students to reflect a focus on the “Five New Basics” of English, math, science, social studies, and computer science (NCEE, 1983, p. 24), was adopted by 45 states by 1986 (Mirel, 2006). The report’s calls for a stronger more unified curriculum engendered a movement started in the late 1980s and early 1990s to create sets voluntary education standards for states. Though initially championed by both Presidents Bush and Clinton, lobbying from professional educators, groups representing minorities in America, staunch conservatives, and evangelical groups made their political support untenable. The U.S. Senate dealt a death blow to the movement in 1995 by voting 99-1 for a resolution condemning the standards projects (Angus & Mirel, 1999; Clemmitt, 2006; Ravich, 2010). Instead, during the late 1990s individual states developed or refined their own statewide standards with the intent of boosting student achievement (Clemmitt, 2006).

Though A Nation at Risk did not bring an end to the comprehensive high school model, it did pare down some of its excesses such as non-rigorous life skills courses. Further, strengthened graduation requirements brought about increased enrollment in academic coursework for all students, much as the Committee of Ten suggested in 1893 (Mirel, 2006). Yet, in light of schools that despite reforms still fail to achieve highly enough, the debate between a rigorous liberal-
studies education for all students (Committee of Ten) and an education differentiated for each individual student (Cardinal Principles) still continues today and underlies modern educational decisions.

**Florida’s Accelerated Learning Programs**

The two most recent national laws focusing on American education, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, both placed emphasis on providing American students with an education based on high academic standards in preparation for college and career success. To accomplish these higher standards, many schools nationwide have adopted one or more preexisting accelerated learning programs for qualified students (Callahan, 2003; Clemmitt, 2006). In the state of Florida, statute has designated the Advanced Placement program, the International Baccalaureate program, the Advanced International Certificate of Education program, and the dual enrollment program as “articulated acceleration mechanisms” for public secondary students (Fla. Sta. § 1007.27, 2016).

**Advanced Placement (AP)**

In the era following World War II, American society faced pressures in the form of the ongoing Cold War with the Soviet Union and the new military conflict in Korea. The American education system came under increasing scrutiny in an effort to better prepare American youth for successful collegiate study and future employment. In 1951 the philanthropic Ford Foundation created the Fund for the Advancement of Education (FAE), which played a critical role both in the movement to reform public education and in the creation of the Advanced Placement program. In 1951 the FAE supported a group collegiate faculty members (from Harvard, Princeton, and Yale amongst other similar institutions) in their effort to articulate the problems of curricular alignment between secondary and higher education (Rothschild, 1995, 1999). While their final report, which was published in 1952, proposed that high school seniors should be offered freshman-level college courses in their own schools (Callahan, 2003), it was also “unashamedly elitist” in suggesting that “we have been particularly concerned about the superior students [emphasis in original] … this concern is partly the result of our belief that standards can be pulled up from the top more easily” (as cited in Rothschild, 1999, p. 177). The report concluded by calling for the creation of achievement examinations administered in high
school that would yield “advanced placement” to students as they matriculate into universities (Rothschild, 1995, p. 26).

Another FAE-supported project, conducted during a similar timeframe, united college faculty and high school leaders to develop descriptions of freshman-level college courses that could be taught in high schools. This group, the School and College Study of Admission with Advanced Standing (SACSAAS), created courses that were adopted by a growing number of high schools reaching 27 pioneer schools by late 1953 (Rothschild, 1995, 1999). The Educational Testing Service (ETS) administered the first Advanced Placement (AP) exams in May of 1954 and ETS further compared the high school students’ results to work submitted by actual college freshman. Results of the comparison suggested that the AP exams did effectively measure student achievement on collegiate standards and the SACSAAS proceeded to develop exams in 10 disciplines (Rothschild, 1999, p. 179).

From the initial 1000 exams taken in 1954 to over 1.5 million exams taken in 2005, the AP program has grown immensely in the United States and beyond (Clemmitt, 2006; Rothschild, 1999). This growth occurred not only due to participation by more schools and the addition of more AP subjects over the years (from 10 in the 1950s to 38 in 2016), but also to modification of the program’s original goals. Instead of a focus on only high achieving students, AP courses are now offered by schools to both younger and less-gifted students in order to easily provide more challenging curricula for all (Callahan, 2003; Clemmitt, 2006). Now administered by the nonprofit College Board, the AP program still operates as it did in the 1950s where high school students take standardized exams at the end of the school year that are scored on 5-point scale. These results, representing levels of “qualification” for accelerated placement, are submitted to the students’ choice of colleges and universities who then decide the amount, if any, of college-level credit to award the student (College Board, 2016).

International Baccalaureate (IB)

Whereas the AP program focused on curricular alignment between American secondary schools and universities, the International Baccalaureate (IB) program grew to serve the needs of international schools. The originators of IB sought to solve the problems faced by families in diplomatic service whose frequent mobility forced children to deal with changing school cultures and curricula (Fox, 1985; Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997). In the early 1950s, the United Nations
Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) founded the International Schools’ Association (ISA) to study these issues and provide a forum for their discussion. Following the work of Robert Leach and his fellow educators at the International School of Geneva, the ISA created the International Schools Examination Syndicate (ISES) in 1965 to develop exit examinations and curricula for high school students that would be accepted by universities across the world (Fox, 1985; International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015a; Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997). The International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) succeeded the ISES in 1968 and runs the IB program to this day (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015a).

In 1967, a delegation of educators and observers from across the world met in Sèvres, France to outline the framework and goals of the IB program and the Diploma Program specifically. The goals of the IB are to provide “a broad general education” including the knowledge and skills needed for university studies, and, true to IB’s global roots, to develop “international understanding and citizenship as a means to a more peaceful, productive future” (Clemmitt, 2006, p. 204-5). Unlike AP, the IB Diploma Program from its inception has been a prescribed course of study, requiring completion of a predetermined number of courses, examinations in certain subject areas, and other non-academic requirements (i.e. a student-selected “creative, aesthetic, or social service activity”) to receive the internationally recognized diploma (Callahan, 2003; Fox, 1985). After a period of pilot testing the examinations beginning in 1964 (and continuing until 1974), the IBO offered its first diplomas starting in 1970 (Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997). The final examinations achieved international acceptance through usage of a variety of assessment strategies from varying countries including extended essays, multiple-choice, short answer, and oral examinations (Fox, 1985).

During the initial offering of exams for credit in 1970, 20 schools participated worldwide (Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997). In 2017, 3,101 schools worldwide offered the IB Diploma program (http://www.ibo.org/about-the-ib/facts-and-figures/). In Florida, 58 schools offer the program (Florida Department of Education, 2013). Similar to AP, the growth of the IB program in American schools has been driven in part by the desire to offer more challenging coursework to students as well as modifications to the program’s original goals and mission (Callahan, 2003; Clemmitt, 2006); however, the growth of the IB program likely lags behind that of AP due to higher associated costs and difficult administration (Fox, 1985).
Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE)

The newest of the accelerated learning programs offered in Florida (OPPAGA, 2006) the Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) program shares many similarities with the IB program. Administered by Cambridge Assessments, the international testing department of the University of Cambridge, the AICE program was developed during the mid-1990s as a university entrance qualification. Cambridge Assessments and its precursors have provided international achievement examinations (based on British models) to the United Kingdom’s colonies, developing countries, and international schools for over 150 years (Cambridge Assessments, n.d.; Lowe, 1999). The AICE program continues this legacy, using the international reputation of the Cambridge brand to market itself in the crowded educational credential marketplace (Cambridge, 2002; Lowe, 1999). Today, the program strives to provide “broad and balanced study” with emphasis on critical thinking, independent research, effective communication, and a multifaceted understanding of global issues (Cambridge International Examinations, 2015a, p. 3). Though billed as an international curriculum, Hayden and Thompson (1995), Lowe (1999), and Cambridge (2002) suggest its international merits are less than those of IB primarily due to the AICE program’s deep foundational and organizational ties to the United Kingdom.

Similar to IB, the AICE program is a prescribed course of study requiring completion of a predetermined number of courses and exams but lacks the non-academic requirements of IB. It should be noted that these required examinations are not created specifically for the AICE program but are rather borrowed from Cambridge Assessment’s AS & A level program (Cambridge International Examinations, 2015a). A total of 100 schools worldwide participated in the AICE program during its initial years leading to the awarding of its first diplomas in 1997 (Lowe, 1999). Today 300 schools offer the AICE program in the United States including 26 schools in Florida since the state recognized AICE in 2002 (Florida Department of Education, 2013; OPPAGA, 2006).

Dual Enrollment (DE)

Unlike the AP, IB, and AICE programs, Dual Enrollment (DE) programs are not governed by an overarching organization and are diverse both in purpose and structure across the United States. Essentially, DE courses are college courses (instead of the college-level courses of
AP, IB, and AICE) that participating students take at a local community college, university, or their own high school. In many instances, completion of a course will result in both high school credit towards a diploma and college credit towards a baccalaureate or associate degree though all such details vary between states and participating institutions (Klopfenstein & Lively, 2012; U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). California was the first state to adopt a statewide policy on DE in 1976 and in the 40 years since, all but three states have followed California’s lead (Mokher & McLendon, 2009). Even in the three states without overarching statute, Alaska, New Hampshire, and New York, DE is present through direct agreements between local schools and postsecondary institutions (Education Commission of the States, 2016).

One of DE’s great benefits is the flexibility in coursework it offers to students and institutions. As a result there are three general types of dual enrollment programs offered in the United States. The first, traditional dual or concurrent enrollment, functions as described above with students individually choosing courses to earn both high school and collegiate credit (Hoffman, Vargas, & Santos, 2009). As such, these programs target not only the academically advanced but also students from populations that are historically underserved in postsecondary education. A second and more recent program model, dual-enrollment pathways, offers a prescribed course of study, usually consisting of a few courses coupled with academic support systems, that is designed to lead specifically to earning a credential (Hoffman, Vargas, & Santos, 2009). These programs are geared to serve students who would not otherwise be attending college. Early college high schools, the third model of dual enrollment, replace the entire high school experience with hybrid one where students earn high school and collegiate credentials concurrently. These programs are usually housed at community colleges and can be completed in 4-5 years (Hoffman, Vargas, & Santos, 2009).

The state of Florida was third in the United States to adopt a statewide DE policy in 1979 (Khazem & Khazem, 2012; Mokher & McLendon, 2009). The Florida Legislature refined policy regarding DE in 2006 by defining fundamental rules governing the program. Specifically, each local school district must create an “articulation agreement” with its local post-secondary institution that defines eligibility requirements (beyond those specified by the state), course offerings, credit equivalencies, locations of instruction, and financial issues amongst others (Fla. Stat. § 1007.271(21), 2016; Khazem & Khazem, 2012). This level of local control allows for a wide variation of DE programs across the state of Florida and indeed in states across the nation.
During the 2008-2009 school year, over 37,000 Florida high schoolers were enrolled in at least one DE course at a local state college or university, reflecting the popularity of this program (Khazem & Khazem, 2012, p. 136).

Arts versus Academics: The Role of Scheduling

Powell, Farrar, and Cohen’s (1985) description of the American high school includes the “extracurriculum,” or “sports and other nonacademic or avocational activities” (p. 2). They argue, in fact, that there is nothing extra about these activities and that teachers and students alike see great educational value therein. Artistic subjects like music (or other extracurricular activities like sports, student council, etc.) “teach some of life’s important lessons” (p. 134) and “provide students and staff with a powerful incentive to do well” (p. 137), thus giving these experiences great value. The writers of A Nation at Risk, while strongly condemning the over-differentiation and diffuse nature of American high school curricula, expressed strong support for the Arts: “The high school curriculum should also provide students with programs requiring rigorous effort in subjects that advance students’ personal, educational, and occupational goals such as the fine and performing arts and vocational education. These areas complement the New Basics, and they should demand the same level of performance as the Basics” (NCEE, 1983, p. 26). In support of similar ideas, both the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 advocated for increased spending and participation in the Arts.

In support of similar ideas, both the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 advocated for increased spending and participation in the Arts.

The idea that a musical education is a fundamental component of every child’s schooling is older than the reform movement that started in the 1980s. For example, the Tanglewood Symposium expressed a similar idea in the 1960s while considering how the Arts and music education would exist in American society moving into the 21st century. One “critical issue” discussed was students’ inability to take music courses in school: “[b]ecause of existing academic pressures, college entrance requirements, and rigid scheduling, less than twenty percent of high school students in the United States are engaged in the systematic study of music as an art” (Choate, Fowler, Brown, & Wersen, 1967, p. 75, emphasis added). Furthermore, students’ ability to enroll in music classes was an issue more than a decade earlier where Lickey, Rafferty, and Michael (1955), while advocating “good music program[s]” for all students, offered advice for constructing school schedules allowing for increased music participation by
eliminating scheduling conflicts. It is worth noting that the writing of Lickey et al. predates the development of the accelerated learning programs discussed in the previous section.

Unfortunately, scheduling conflicts did not abate after the 1950s or 1960s and continued to appear in professional literature as a problem to overcome, often citing the addition of accelerated learning programs as a source of conflict. During the late 1990s, many high schools adopted the then-new block scheduling model to improve student learning by modifying the allocation of class time (Blocher & Miles, 1997). Blocher and Miles surveyed music educators in three states, Kentucky, Indiana, and Michigan, finding that the block schedule had a negative impact on enrollment due to more frequent scheduling conflicts. Further, these conflicts in many instances were with AP courses. Hansen, Gutman, and Smith (2000), in describing how to successfully implement a block schedule model, explained how important it is to have an AP coordinator tasked with planning school schedules to not conflict with elective courses like music. Further Hansen et al. state, “our best academic students are also among our best musicians,” thus making the avoidance of scheduling conflicts a major issue for the success of performing ensembles (p. 211).

Many authors spanning the decades have expressed a similar sentiment about music students and decry the situations where students must choose between academics and the Arts (Berman, 2016; Poliniak, 2012; Powell, Farrar, & Cohen, 1985; Warrener, 1984; Zorn, 1970). Sternbach (2008) and Williams (2011) both discussed the increasing pressure students face to perform academically for college admissions, inspiring enrollment in accelerated learning programs like AP, and how those pressures could translate into decreased participation in the arts. Though a majority of articles cite conflicts with AP, the other accelerated learning programs are not excluded from conflict. The added pressure and increased course load of Junior and Senior students participating in the IB program for instance, can entirely preclude some students from participating in their school’s performing ensembles (Ruffino, 2007). This is usually caused by how each individual school decides to structure their master schedule and if students elect to take IB Music.

Purpose

Despite the ever-changing landscape of secondary education in America over the course of the 20th century, Angus and Mirel’s (1999) examination of student course enrollment in years
between 1914 and 1982 showed that enrollment in music and art was rather stable (p. 204, 206). However, no research could be located that examines how more recent changes in course-taking has affected enrollment moving into the 21st century. Of special interest to the current study is how participation in accelerated learning programs, with their associated changes to course requirements and school structure (discussed in Chapter 2), has affected student enrollment in music. Thus, the lack of research examining how increasing academic demands, in the form of accelerated learning programs, affects the performing arts formed the impetus for this study. Its purpose was to investigate the music teacher’s perceived influence of Florida high school students’ enrollment in accelerated learning programs on students’ ability to enroll and participate in high school band and choir. Specific research questions included:

1. To what extent does participation in accelerated learning programs limit or inhibit students’ enrollment in music classes?
2. To what extent does participation in accelerated learning programs limit or inhibit students’ participation in high school band or choir?
3. To what extent do music educators perceive a difference in attitude towards music study in students enrolled in accelerated coursework as compared to students who are not?
4. To what extent did director ratings on the previous three questions differ when considering students enrolled in different accelerated learning programs?
5. What is the relationship between the number of accelerated learning programs in which each band or choir’s students participated and the director perception of enrollment?
6. What types of strategies do Florida’s music educators use to deal with any hardships created by student participation in accelerated learning programs?

**Operational Definitions**

*Accelerated Learning Programs* (or advanced articulation mechanisms) are defined as the AP, IB, AICE, and Dual Enrollment programs as indicated by Florida Statute § 1007.27 (2016).

*Advanced Placement (AP)* is the accelerated learning program offering college-level exams to high school students and is administered by the College Board, located in the United States.
Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) is the accelerated learning program offering college-level curriculum and exams to high school students and is administered by Cambridge Assessments of the United Kingdom.

Dual Enrollment (DE) is the accelerated learning program offered by many colleges to high school students and is governed by state laws and individual agreements between school districts and postsecondary institutions.

International Baccalaureate (IB) is the accelerated learning program offering curriculum and exams to students of all age levels and is administered by the International Baccalaureate Organization of Geneva, Switzerland.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In their work describing the state of the American high school, *The Shopping Mall High School*, Powell, Farrar, and Cohen (1985) reported the *extracurriculum* to be of equal importance to that which is *academic*. Activities like sports, the arts, student council, and the school newspaper are not *extra* at all, they contended, but were essential to “attach students to something that makes them feel successful” (p. 2). Researchers have long sought to quantify and explain the relationship between schools and the extracurricular activities that make them unique (Fredricks, 2012; Mahoney & Cairns, 1997). The National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS), conducted by the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) starting in 1988, found that a majority of students, 60% of Sophomores in 1990 and approximately 70% of Seniors in 1992, participated in at least one such activity (Zill, Nord, & Loomis, 1995). A NCES follow-up study, the Educational Longitudinal Study (ELS) collected similar data during the early 2000s. Participation rates of tenth grade students had increased to nearly 80% in 2002 (Fredricks, 2012). Researchers have now started to quantify that which educators have long known, that participation in organized activities developmentally benefits students.

**Benefits of Extracurricular Activity**

In addition to academic measures, both the NELS and ELS collected data about how American youth used their time outside of school or school-based activities. Using both of these data sets, Dumais (2008) found that two such activities, hanging out with friends and watching television, were negatively correlated with measures of academic success. Cooper, Valentine, Nye, and Lindsay (1999), using a smaller independent set of data, found similar results. Both studies, however, went on to demonstrate how *organized* extracurricular activities positively benefit student development, a finding that has been repeated in a multitude of studies. Lerner, Fisher, and Weinberg (2000) developed a taxonomy called “the five Cs” to classify these positive outcomes in a behavioral context: (a) competence; (b) confidence; (c) connections; (d) character; and (e) caring and compassion. The literature on the academic and personal benefits of extracurricular participation conveniently fit within these five categories (p. 15,17).
Academic Benefits

Measures of academic adjustment usually include grades, test scores, educational expectations, and educational attainment. Frequently, higher classroom grades and related measures like GPA are positively correlated with participation in extracurricular activities (Cooper, Valentine, Nye, & Lindsey, 1999; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Eccles, Barber, Stone, & Hunt, 2003; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006). Expanding on this idea, both Fredricks (2012) and Marsh and Kleitman, (2002) found that breadth of extracurricular participation (number) and intensity of extracurricular participation (number of hours involved per week) moderated the effect on student grades. Shernoff (2010), studying a small sample of middle school students, demonstrated that quality of the experience, defined as challenging and relevant for students, further modified academic benefits. Finally, the specific activities in which students participated influenced the correlation with grades. Finding that interscholastic sports had the highest correlation with course grades in both mathematics and English, Broh (2002) also demonstrated that school musical groups were the only other activity to yield consistent benefits. Broh also found that some organized activities had detrimental effects on grades such as less-organized intermural athletics, meaning that choosing the right activity was key. Like grades and GPA, standardized test scores are positively related to extracurricular participation in the literature, usually on mathematics exams (Cooper et al., 1999; Dumais, 2008; Fredricks, 2012). Broh (2002) likewise examined scores on standardized reading tests but found little positive connection except for drama club participants. Lastly, in her dissertation Jones (2008) found a correlation between participation in high school vocal music classes and increased achievement on the state of Virginia’s Standard of Learning examinations in both reading and math.

Like grades and GPA, educational expectations or aspirations, defined as how far students intend to continue their education, have been positively linked to extracurricular activity participation (Fredricks, 2012; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006; Marsh & Kleitman, 2002). Interestingly Dumais (2008), comparing both NELS and ELS data, found that this relationship has grown more complex and changed over time reflecting changes in youth behavior. The first measure of educational attainment is high school graduation and both Mahoney and Cairns (1997) and Mahoney (2000) found that participation in extracurricular activities reduced the risk of dropout for all students to some degree. More importantly, the magnitude of the decrease in dropout rate was greatest for students identified as high-risk based on outside factors such as
SES, personality, and academic competence. In analyzing music course enrollment and graduation data of Florida’s graduating high schoolers, Kelly (2012) demonstrated that students who participated in arts classes graduated at higher rates than students who do not participate in the arts. Enrollment in study at the university level marks the next step in educational attainment and extracurricular activities were correlated with higher matriculation two years after high school (Eccles & Barber, 1999; Eccles et al., 2003; Fredricks, 2012). Gardner, Roth, and Brooks-Gunn (2008) considered the impact of prolonged extracurricular participation (more than one year) on post-high school measures including college matriculation and completion. Nonparticipants and 1-year participants entered college at equal rates in their data; however, 2-year participants were 54% more likely to matriculate than their peers. When considering odds of post-secondary completion, nonparticipants were 36% less likely to finish than 1-year participants and 2-year participants were 78% more likely than 1-year participants to finish (p. 820-1).

**Personal Benefits**

The personal benefits students gain from extracurricular participation are multifaceted and occur over the long term. Increased psychological adjustment, defined by lack of depressive symptoms, increased self-esteem, and rates of internalizing/externalizing behaviors, was observed in the athletes studied by Fredricks and Eccles (2006). Further, other types of extracurricular activity were beneficial in some but not all of the measures. Athletes similarly benefitted from participation in Fauth, Roth, and Brooks-Gunn (2007), though the effect was nonsignificant when background characteristics were factored into the analysis. Yet, youth who participated in no activities were more likely to have higher scores of anxiety and depression. Development of different facets of personality was linked to participation in each different type (sports, leadership, and music) of extracurricular activity (DeMoulin, 2002). Broh (2002) found significantly higher ratings of self-esteem and internalized locus of control in competitive athletes. As with his findings on grades, the choice of extracurricular activity matters because no other activity showed these benefits. Kort-Butler and Hagewen (2011) reported similar results in the development of self-esteem in students participating in school sponsored sports and clubs. In direct contradiction to Broh (2002), students involved in clubs only, not athletics or any combination of the two, experienced the highest growth in self-esteem over the long term.
Finally, reduction of risky behaviors such as substance abuse, smoking, and teenage pregnancy, was found to be associated with extracurricular participation in the NELS sample (Marsh & Kleitman, 2002; Zill, Nord, & Loomis, 1995). Usually positive, this relationship was repeated in later samples though it was mitigated by both gender (Fredricks & Eccles, 2012) and type of extracurricular activity (Eccles & Barber, 1999; Eccles et al., 2003). These reductions of antisocial extended beyond the high school years in Mahoney (2000), where at-risk students were significantly less likely to be arrested as young adults after participation.

In addition to personal development and any skills gained in specific activities, intangible things like leadership can be very valuable later in life. Westlake (2015) examined the development of leadership skills among high school students in both an extracurricular service club and a marching band. These students developed positive traits in five key areas; citizenship, collaboration, communication, modeling the way, and representing the group; traits that beyond personal development started to support their own academic behavior. Possibly due to learning like that described in Westlake’s study (2015), Gardner, Roth, and Brooks-Gunn (2008) discovered that measures of increased civic engagement such as voting and volunteering up to eight years after high school were correlated with extracurricular participation. Their research included a measure for both intensity and duration with increases in either yielding a stronger correlation, though completion of post-secondary degrees in intervening years did certainly play a role. With a similar caveat, increased intensity of extracurricular participation was correlated with greater occupational success years after high school.

Cautions and Negative Benefits

One frequent limitation in all research on this subject addresses the issue of correlation versus causation. Shulruf (2010) selected 29 studies quantitatively examining extracurricular activities, including many contained in this review, and transformed results to the same scale for interstudy comparison. Once standardized, the effect sizes of results from all of the studies were very small thus posing questions about validity. Future research, for Shulruf, should use quasi-experimental models with emphasis on causal effects.

The growth in extracurricular participation over the years has led some students to participate in activities to the extreme thus, some hypothesize, accruing negative benefits both academically and socially (Mahoney, Harris, & Eccles, 2006). This over-scheduling hypothesis
is observable in studies like Fredricks (2012) where increasing breadth and intensity of participation eventually sees a leveling off and then a decrease in academic measures. However, only a very small portion of students reach this point of diminishing returns, thus the benefits of extracurricular activities for the many outweigh any negatives. Finally, as some correlations between extracurricular activities and risk behaviors are positive, others are negative. One commonly found example is increased underage drinking amongst student athletes (Eccles & Barber, 1999; Eccles et al, 2003; Fauth et al., 2007).

Why Music? Student Recruitment and Retention

Researchers have examined the factors relating to both initial student enrollment in school music ensembles and long-term retention in those ensembles, especially with younger students and during transitional periods (i.e. when students change schools). Despite the varied focus on differing student ages and differing levels of school urbanicity, results remained consistent. Though both intrinsic and extrinsic factors appear in the literature, only extrinsic factors will be discussed in this review. These include academic performance, demographics, personal relationships, incentives, music teacher characteristics or behavior, and school scheduling.

Kinney (2010) collected both achievement test scores and socioeconomic data (in the form of free and reduced lunch enrollment) for 6th and 8th grade band students in two urban middle schools. High academic achievement predicted both 6th grade enrollment and 8th grade retention, whereas SES only predicted 8th grade student participation. Conversely, Corenblum and Marshall (1998) found a stronger yet different relationships with SES. They surveyed Canadian 9th grade students to assess student attitude towards band, outside musical interests, and their own perceptions of parental, director, and school attitudes towards music study. Students self-reported their own socio-economic status and academic performance through a combination of indirect questions. Results indicated that SES did not relate directly to students’ intention to continue music study but instead related to perceived parental support for music study, which in turn strongly predicted continued music study the next school year.

Personal connections and the relationships students share with others have been connected to student recruitment and retention at all levels. As with perceived parental support in Corenblum and Marshall’s study (1998), Cook’s (2013) survey of elementary orchestra members
who did not continue orchestra study in middle school found that less than half of these students felt that their own parents saw participation in orchestra as important. Further, only a similar margin agreed that their parents had tried to convince them to keep playing. Alekna (2016) and Vasil (2013), qualitatively studying elementary string players in the urban southwest and elementary instrumentalists in the urban northeast respectively, both found that students’ relationships with their peers provided strong reasons for starting or continuing study in music. Alekna (2016) further identified that students specifically recalled one-on-one conversations with both the orchestra director and older orchestra members as meaningful parts of recruitment and retention. Pointing to the importance of creating a family atmosphere in the music program, Albert (2006) suggested that creating a safe space was especially important for students in low SES schools. Finally, Hayes (2004) surveyed high school band directors in the Midwest about the factors they perceived as positively affecting student retention during the transition from middle to high school. His participants rated “current friends are in band” the single highest rated factor on the survey with the second lowest standard deviation suggesting strong agreement (p. 13-14).

The tangible benefits students receive from participation in music are often cited as reasons for both enrollment and retention in music programs. From chocolate Symphony bars for completing a year of orchestra (Alekna, 2016), to end-of-year banquets and trips (Hayes, 2004; Zamboni, 2012), directors have creatively developed diverse ways to effectively motivate their students. Albert (2006), who interviewed Midwestern middle school music teachers in low SES rural and urban schools, found situations where these tangible benefits were used to encourage long-term participation and academic growth. He recounted that students would work harder to prepare for the opportunity to present frequent community performances or attend adjudicated festivals in the future.

The behaviors of music teachers and directors themselves can affect both student recruitment and retention. During transitions between schools, simply knowing a student’s future music teacher and having a conversation with him or her could improve retention (Cook, 2013; Hayes, 2004). Developing positive teacher-student relationships was seen as necessary by teachers teaching in difficult low-SES situations (Albert, 2006; Zamboni, 2012), and teacher attitude in face of challenges could have either a positive or negative effect on students depending on how the teacher mitigates those challenges (Zamboni, 2012). Corenblum and
Marshall (1998) found that teacher perceptions of student performance ability predicted student continuation in music, more so than student attitudes towards music study. Lastly, Brakel (1997) compared self-reported teacher behaviors or elements of classroom structure (which translated into measurements of teaching style such as student independence, teacher authority, flexible classroom structure, etc.) to high school band student attrition. While individual teaching styles did not relate to attrition individually, pairs of these measurements did. For instance, directors with low dropout rates had significantly related scores on both student independence and positive learning environment. Altogether, how teachers structure and manage both their teaching persona and their classroom play a role in student recruitment and retention.

Finally, the ability for students at all levels to participate in music classes is dependent on scheduling. Both Alekna (2016) and Cook (2013) noted that when elementary music students move to middle school, the increased number of offered elective classes causes some students to leave music. Later when students transition from middle to high school, Hayes (2004) found that the ease with which students can enroll in high school music was perceived as an important factor in student retention. Zamboni (2012) highlighted the scheduling difficulties that small rural schools face after surveying and interviewing teachers working in such schools in Pennsylvania, some of whom were the only employed music teacher in their respective school systems. The researcher determined that scheduling issues were the largest hindrance to the music programs in these schools. During the school day, some respondents explained that students enrolled in certain programs, like vocational courses, were unable to take music classes due to those courses being offered at the same time. Also, in these rural schools, many music ensembles meet outside of school hours which puts them into direct competition with other school activities like athletics. The end result of these situations was increased difficulty in retaining students and growing the music program. Surprisingly, none of the located research directly mentioned how accelerated learning programs affect retention of high school students. Zamboni’s (2012) discussion of school administration not scheduling music classes first, thus creating scheduling conflicts, could however be seen as related.

**Florida’s Accelerated Learning Programs: A Closer Look**

To accurately judge the impact of accelerated learning program enrollment on student ability to both enroll and participate in music coursework, one must understand the basic
structure and functioning of each program. Required courses and how those courses are scheduled within a high school career are of particular importance. Further, an understanding of Florida’s high school graduation requirements, the blueprint on which each student’s educational plan is built, illuminates where potential conflicts with music coursework can occur.

**Florida High School Graduation Requirements**

The State of Florida gives much latitude to individual school districts concerning the day to day functioning of the public schools; however, state statute does strictly govern the accordance of high school diplomas. Students have two options, the 24-credit standard diploma and the 18-credit ACCEL option (Fla. Stat. § 1002.3105(5); 1003.4282(1), 2016). Table 2.1 summarizes the specific credits that statute requires for graduation under the 24-credit option,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>4 Credits (English I – IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>4 Credits including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 credit in Algebra I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 credit in Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3 Credits including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 courses must include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>3 Credits including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 credit in World History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 credit in US History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>½ credit each in American Government and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine / Performing Arts</td>
<td>1 Credit (includes speech, debate, or practical arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1 Credit (including Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>8 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>2.0 out of 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The 18-credit option lowers the elective requirement to 3 credits and removes the fine/performing arts requirement. Everything else is the same. Source: (Fla. Stat. § 1003.2842, 2016)
including exceptions made for music students (Fla. Stat. § 1003.4282(3,4,6), 2016).

For high school graduation, statute further defines a credit as “135 hours of bona fide instruction in a designated course of study” (Fla. Sta. § 1003.436, 2016). Florida apportions state money to every public school through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) based on student enrollment (Fla. Sta. § 1011.62, 2016). Each student enrolled for the complete school year counts as 1 FTE, or a full-time equivalent student, meaning not less than 900 hours of instruction for secondary students (Fla. Sta. § 1011.61, 2016). Thus for full-time high schoolers, the state funds approximately 6 to 7 credits per-year for a total of 24-28 credits over the course of a high school career. Put in context of music coursework, a student enrolled in band or choir for an entire school year would earn 1 credit towards graduation and be able to take 5-6 other credits of courses during that year. If that student continued in band or choir until they graduate they would have 4 credits in music, fulfilling the required fine/performing arts credit as well as earning 3 elective credits. In reality the FEFP program is much more complex than this simple explanation, though this fundamental understanding is useful when considering the impact of accelerated learning programs on music course enrollment.

Advanced Placement Program Details

Managed by the American not-for-profit College Board, the Advanced Placement program strives to offer students “college-level work in high school” that demonstrates to postsecondary institutions that they have “sought out an educational experience that will prepare them for success in college and beyond” (College Board, 2016, p. 3). Schools are free to offer to their students any of the 38 courses and exams offered by AP, provided that the curriculum for each schools’ courses are approved each year during the AP Course Audit process (College Board, 2016). Thus, schools and teachers are free to choose materials and develop their own curriculum for the courses they teach as long as course materials document that College Board specified core elements are present in the course. Unlike other accelerated learning programs, there are no requirements as to which courses students must take, but to receive college credit upon matriculation in a postsecondary institution, students must receive a passing score on the nationally standardized AP exams offered each year in early May.

Since students are free to choose which courses they take, the impact of enrollment in AP classes on student ability to participate in music is minimized. For instance, many courses that
are required for high school graduation, such as English and all required Social Studies courses, have AP course equivalents. Thus, students can simply take the AP section of a required course without losing an elective credit. However, scheduling conflicts could arise if music coursework is scheduled against the only period in which a particular AP course is offered. AP does offer one non-performance music course, AP Music Theory, which provides students with a broad overview consistent with introductory courses in music theory at the college level (College Board, 2012).

**International Baccalaureate Program Details**

Organized by the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) of Geneva, Switzerland, the IB program strives to create “internationally minded learners who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of this planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world.” This is accomplished through a “challenging and comprehensive education” that additionally “addresses students’ social, emotional, and physical well-being” (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015c, p. 1, 3). The IBO offers multiple programs for students of different ages with the **Diploma Program** being for upper-division high school students (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015c). To receive the internationally recognized diploma, students must select coursework from a predefined framework, complete an extended essay, and complete a Creativity, Activity, or Service (CAS) project of the student’s choosing (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b). Students select one course each from six categories: studies in language and literature (in the student’s native language), language acquisition (in a foreign language), individuals and societies (essentially social studies courses), sciences, mathematics, and the arts. Further, two different levels of courses, the 1-year **standard level** (SL) and the 2-year **higher level** (HL), are offered in each of the six categories with students being required to take at least 3 HL courses. Another course, **Theory of Knowledge**, is required of all students and unifies all academic disciplines in an examination of “the nature of knowing and [deepening] understanding of knowledge as a human construction” (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b, p. 2). The student-directed extended essay of 4000-words answers a question of “global significance” related to two of the courses the student elects to study in the program. Finally, the CAS project is entirely student-developed and can focus on
either creativity (artistic endeavor), activity (physical activity leading to a healthy lifestyle), service (community outreach), or some combination of the three.

The IBO creates detailed briefs, including lists of prescribed texts from which schools must choose, for its numerous courses. Schools do select which courses to offer students and that flexibility allows for differing IB experiences between schools. Conferral of the IB Diploma requires that students pass the internationally developed criterion-based end-of-course exam for each subject they study (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b, p.4). Exams are graded on a scale of 1-7 and students much reach a combined total of 24 points or higher on attempted exams along with completion of the extended essay and CAS project to earn the diploma.

As with the AP program, some IB courses fulfill Florida’s graduation requirements, though courses to complete the diploma program are taken mostly during the 3rd and 4th year of high school (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b). The 2-year HL courses however, necessitate 2 credits to complete meaning students will potentially earn more credits in a particular subject than necessary to meet graduation requirements. These additional credits, as well as Theory of Knowledge, count towards the elective credits that students must earn, thus potentially reducing the number of opportunities students have to enroll in music programs. Both an SL and HL level course in music is offered by IB (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2010). Content for this course includes a mixture of music history and theory, coupled with evidence of student performance as a soloist, group member, and/or composer.

**Dual Enrollment Program Details**

As was discussed in Chapter 1, no overarching organization governs dual enrollment programs. Instead, individual school districts and Florida’s community colleges, state colleges, and universities develop contractual agreements governing the rules of student participation, under the auspices of state statute (Fla. Stat. § 1007.271, 2016). This flexibility permits a wide variety of dual enrollment programs to exist within the state and thus their effects on music programs vary, though some interaction is sure to occur because state statute mandates that dual enrollment options be offered at every public secondary school (Fla. Stat. § 1007.271(4,8), 1007.271(21)(n), 2016). For instance, eligible students may enroll in dual enrollment courses offered at either the high school itself or a post-secondary institution (Fla. Stat. § 1007.271(6),
Additionally, students can take those courses during the school day, after the school day or during summer terms (Fla. Stat. § 1007.271(2), 2016). The state Department of Education decides which college level courses count for high school graduation requirements (Fla. Stat. § 1007.271(9), 2016) and further, developmental education and physical education courses are deemed ineligible for dual enrollment study (Fla. Stat. § 1007.271(14), 2016).

**Advanced International Certificate of Education Program Details**

Cambridge Assessments, the international testing arm of the University of Cambridge, administers the Advanced International Certificate of Education program. Designed to emphasize the “value of broad and balanced study,” AICE functions similarly to IB (Cambridge International Assessments, 2015a, p. 3). To earn the AICE diploma, students must earn 7 credits via AICE courses and their associated exams during the junior and senior year of high school (Cambridge International Assessments, 2015a, p. 9). Courses are divided into four categories and students must earn at least one credit in the first three: mathematics and sciences, languages (both English and foreign languages), Arts and Humanities (social studies, literature, and some vocational coursework), and Interdisciplinary or skills-based subjects (optional for students). Coursework in these categories are offered at the 2-year A level and the 1-year AS level with completion of the former courses being worth two credits and the later only one. To complete the AICE diploma, students must take six credits of coursework from the categories plus a seventh credit of the mandatory Global Perspectives and Research course. Then, students must pass the associated exams (graded on a scale A*-E which translate into points) earning at least 140 points (Cambridge International Assessments, 2015a, p. 12). Unlike the IB program, the AICE program does not require any student-directed work for completion of the diploma.

Like AP and IB programs, some AICE coursework fulfills Florida’s graduation requirements, though courses to complete the program are only taken during the 3rd and 4th year of high school (Cambridge International Assessments, 2015a). Like the IB program, the 2-year A courses necessitate 2 credits to complete meaning students will potentially earn more credits in a particular subject than necessary to meet graduation requirements. These additional credits, as well as Global Perspectives and Research, count towards the elective credits that students must earn, thus potentially reducing the number of opportunities students have to enroll in music programs. Both an AS and A level course in music is offered by Cambridge Assessments.
Content for the course includes a mixture of music history and theory, coupled with evidence of students’ practical musicianship as a soloist, group member, or composer.

State Requirement, Funding, and Promotion of Accelerated Learning Programs

The state of Florida, through both legislative and administrative action, has sought to increase students’ access to advanced curricula intended to quicken the process of earning both high school and collegiate degrees (Fla. Stat. § 1007.27, 2016). State statute moves beyond just encouraging these programs to specifically requiring them:

Beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, each high school shall offer an International Baccalaureate Program, and Advanced International Certificate of Education Program, or a combination of at least four courses in dual enrollment or Advanced Placement, including one course each in English, mathematics, science and social studies. ( Fla. Stat. § 1003.4295(2), 2016)

Statute further ties student performance in several of these programs to school funding through the Florida Education Finance Program. After the statute legislature sets the base value of 1 FTE, the FEFP retroactively rewards schools with 0.16 additional FTE for each passing score on an AP examination, an IB examination, or an AICE level A examination a student receives (Fla. Stat. § 1011.62(1)(l-n), 2016). Further, when a student graduates with either an IB or AICE diploma, the FEFP retroactively rewards schools with 0.3 additional FTE (Fla. Stat. § 1011.62(1)(l-m), 2016). Statute does go on to specify that these additional monies are to be used to fund the respective program and to provide bonuses for successful students’ teachers.

Nonetheless, a school or district with many students participating in these accelerated learning programs stands to benefit financially from students’ good academic performance. That the state wants students to accelerate the rate at which students complete high school is further demonstrated by additional FTE funding of 0.25 or 0.5 for students who graduate one-half or one full year earlier than they should (Fla. Stat. § 1011.62(1)(p), 2016).

As a national leader in the education reform movement, the state of Florida was one of the first states to adopt a system for assigning grades to public schools based on student performance. Though the formula varies from year to year, for the 2015-2016 school year the majority of the calculation considered student performance on state standardized tests in math,
English language arts, science, and social studies (Florida Department of Education, 2016, p. 1). In addition to 4-year graduation rates, “college and career acceleration” is the final factor of high school grading under the current model (Florida Department of Education, 2016, p. 23). This measure counts the percentage of graduating students who received a passing score on either an AP, IB, or AICE exam or who received a C- or better in an approved dual enrollment course during their time in high school. Therefore, good performance on accelerated learning program exams (or in courses) could be a deciding factor for schools that need a small bump in score to earn a higher school grade. Khazem and Khazem (2014), using Florida’s 2012 school grade calculation model, demonstrated how schools could easily influence their assigned grade by modifying how students enroll in accelerated learning programs. They found that by enrolling a small percentage of new students (7% of the cohort) in dual enrollment courses, administrators could effectively guarantee a school grade increase from a C to a B if all other factors remained constant. Neither a similar increase in AP enrollment, nor an outlandish increase in AP enrollment (essentially every student in the hypothetical school), could accomplish the same feat. While the current model for school grading no longer functions as the one Khazem and Khazem (2014) described, the fact that accelerated learning programs are still included in the calculation, albeit in a smaller way, demonstrates their importance within the school grading system.

During the mid-2000s the Florida Legislature’s Office of Program Policy Analysis & Government Accountability conducted two studies of student enrollment and participation in accelerated learning programs. The first examined the enrollment of 2002’s graduating seniors finding that 35% of them took at least one AP, IB, or DE course during their high school careers (OPPAGA, 2006). A follow up study examined 2007’s graduating seniors finding that 43% of that cohort had taken at least one course (OPPAGA, 2008), suggesting rapid expansion of accelerated learning program participation during the intervening years. Unfortunately, OPPAGA has not conducted a third study since. The Florida Department of Education published a factsheet of accelerated learning programs in 2013 noting that a similar number of school districts offered AP and IB as in 2008 but now included districts using the AICE program.

**Accelerated Learning Programs and Music Enrollment**

Little to no research could be located directly examining how accelerated learning programs affect student enrollment in the arts. Some studies have discussed scheduling as a
factor affecting arts programs. For instance, Abril and Gault (2008) surveyed several hundred secondary school principals about how they perceived the arts programs in their schools. The survey also asked respondents to rate how positive or negative an influence things like standardized testing, budgets, scheduling, or parents were on their music programs. Though the average scores for scheduling were not overwhelmingly negative, when asked open-ended questions about what issues inhibited principals’ full support of music programs, scheduling was a common response. Abril and Gault (2008) concluded that if scheduling issues were an issue for a particular school, “the magnitude of the effect was quite strong” (p. 79). A qualitative study of Texas band directors’ perceived reasons for decreasing student enrollment in bands, conducted by Jolly (2008), found similar results. Scheduling issues stemming from more strenuous graduation requirements and remedial coursework due to poor standardized test performance were commonly cited as causes, including, in some instances, pressures for students to enroll in AP or IB programs.

Finally, Baker (2009) surveyed freshman music majors in Texas about what music courses they took in high school as well as the extent to which continued participation was difficult. Scheduling conflicts between music and academic courses were the most commonly reported obstacle to participation in the sample, a large percentage of which were with AP classes. To solve these conflicts and allow for continued enrollment in music, students acquired academic credits outside the school day such as during the summer.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Participants

The participants \((N = 100)\) in this study were high school band \((n = 65)\) and choir \((n = 35)\) directors teaching within the state of Florida during the 2016-2017 school year. All participants were members of the Florida Music Educators Association (FMEA). Additionally, participants taught in a school that offered one of the accelerated learning programs in this study and whose music students were enrolled in at least one of those programs.

Dependent Measure

The dependent measure for this project was an online questionnaire developed by the researcher and administered through the Qualtrics Survey Software™. Prior to this study, a pilot study, conducted in the fall of 2016 and surveying Florida high school band directors \((N = 16)\), provided feedback on the initial design, question structure, and time needed for completion. Data from the pilot test was not used for this current project.

Demographic Questions

After displaying the voluntary consent message, the participant first selected whether or not he or she was a current band or choir teacher in the state of Florida. A positive response allowed the respondent to continue the survey. Then, respondents selected their primary teaching assignment, either band or choir, the type of school they worked in; either public, private or, charter; and the student enrollment of their school from a set of 6 predefined options (i.e. less than 500, 500-1000, 1001-1500, 1501-2000, 2001-2500, and more than 2500). Finally, respondents selected from a list the different accelerated learning programs that were both offered at their school and those programs in which their music students participated. That list was the same for both questions and included: Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), Dual Enrollment (DE), Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE), and none of the above. The first question also served as a qualifying question because any respondent who selected “none of the above” was not permitted to complete the survey.
Survey Questions

After the demographic section of the survey, the operational definitions of terms in use for the rest of the survey were presented. *Accelerated learning programs* were defined as only the AP, IB, Dual Enrollment, and AICE programs as mentioned in the previous questions. *Enrollment* was defined as “a student’s ability to take a music class during the school day, for that class to appear on his or her schedule, and for him or her to receive a grade.” *Participation* was defined as “[referring] to everything else about a student’s participation in music class beyond enrollment[:;] some students may participate in the arts but not be enrolled”.

**Student enrollment.** Two separate dichotomous questions about enrollment, asking both if students enrolled in an accelerated learning programs could concurrently enroll in band or choir and whether students could participate in band or choir without being enrolled, were first. Next, a new page of questions asked for participants’ *general* feelings regarding students in accelerated learning programs and the dependent measures. The difficulty of concurrent enrollment in an accelerated learning program and the participant’s *primary* and *secondary* performance groups were measured on a 6-point Likert-type question anchored with “extremely difficult” and “not difficult at all.” The meaning of “secondary performance ensemble” was not specified though jazz band and show choir were listed as possible examples. Finally, the extent to which students enrolled in accelerated learning programs leave band or choral programs before they are seniors was measured on a 6-point Likert-type question anchored with “students frequently leave” and “students rarely leave.”

**Student participation.** The same page of questions continued by asking the extent of student participation in band or choir in four specific ways: attendance at rehearsals and events *during* school hours, attendance at rehearsals and events *after* school hours, on-time arrival to events *during* school hours, and on-time arrival to events *after* school hours. These questions were blocked together and rated on 6-point Likert-type scales anchored by “never” and “always”. Attendance and punctuality were chosen as measures for this question because they are both non-subjective and easily observed.

**Student attitude.** A bank of questions assessed student attitude on a 5-point Likert-type scale anchored by “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree.” A 5-point scale was chosen for this question to provide respondents with a neutral option. Respondents were asked to rate how they felt about the following statements:
(1) Students who are enrolled in accelerated learning programs actively participate in my program as much as students who are not enrolled in accelerated programs.

(2) Students who are enrolled in accelerated learning programs are as excited about their performance in my program as other students.

(3) Students who are enrolled in accelerated learning programs are as committed to the success of my program as other students.

(4) Students who are enrolled in accelerated learning programs perform equally as well as students who are not enrolled in accelerated learning programs.

Other blocks. The questions in the general block (including question on enrollment, participation, and attitude as described above) were repeated for each of the accelerated learning programs in which the respondent’s students participated as indicated in the demographic questions. The wording of the questions was modified so that each page of questions asked about students enrolled in a specific accelerated program. This change permitted collection of data that could compare perceptions of each specific program. The final question of the survey was open-ended and asked participants to briefly explain what types of accommodations they had made within their program for students enrolled in accelerated programs.

**Procedure**

After revisions and expansion of the pilot test survey, the survey was retested by the researcher and his colleagues to correct any lack of clarity. Testing found that the average response took approximately 8 minutes. Following project approval by the university Institutional Review Board and the Research Committee of FMEA, the researcher drafted a letter of invitation to participate in the study including an anonymous link to the online survey. The invitation and link were distributed by FMEA to its members who indicated interest in teaching high school band and choir \(N = 1,675\). FMEA sent a reminder email 6 days later. The anonymous link contained in the email generated approximately 65 responses, but due to the nature of this distribution method, a precise response rate cannot be determined.

Due to the small number of high schools in Florida that offer either the IB or AICE programs, the researcher sent a second round of emails to this population. Using the websites of both the International Baccalaureate Organization and Cambridge International Examinations, all
high schools located in the state of Florida offering either curriculum were listed. Next, the email addresses of band and choir directors were taken from those school websites, when available, to create a new list of potential participants. Further, to ensure that the director was a member of FMEA, the most recent MPA results for band or choir were checked to see if the school participated (FMEA membership is required for participation). Non-participating directors were removed, resulting in a list of 180 directors. The researcher sent new letters of invitation with personalized links 8 days after the initial FMEA message. Two follow-up messages were sent four and eight days later. This second mailing resulted in a total of 35 responses for a response rate of 19%. It is important to note that the individuals who received this second invitation likely also received the initial invitation sent out by FMEA. While there is no way of knowing whether or not an individual director responded two times, the relatively low response rate to the second message suggests that directors who had already responded simply ignored the second set of emails.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate music teachers’ perceived influence of student enrollment in accelerated learning programs on students’ ability to enroll and participate in high school band and choir. All participants in this study (N =100) were high school band (n = 65) or choir (n =35) directors. The large majority of the teachers worked in public schools (n = 89), followed by private (n = 9), and a single charter school. For analysis, the demographic question regarding school size was condensed from six options to three. This yielded a total of 14 small sized schools (a reported population of less than 1000 students), 43 medium sized schools (1001-2000 students), and 43 large sized schools (more than 2000 students). All participants reported that their school offered at least one accelerated learning program. Further, all but 10 directors (7 band directors and 3 choir directors) reported that students in their band or choral program also participated in all of the accelerated learning programs offered at their school. Table 4.1 contains a specific breakdown of accelerated learning program offerings and enrollment by band and choir. Table 4.2 contains the same information broken down by school size.

Table 4.1
Sums and Percentages of Accelerated Learning Program Offerings and Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Offered By School</th>
<th>Music Students Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All (n = 65)</td>
<td>Band (n = 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All (n = 65)</td>
<td>Band (n = 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33
Table 4.2
*Sums and Percentages of Accelerated Learning Program Offerings and Student Enrollment by School Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Offered By School</th>
<th>Music Students Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small (n = 14)</td>
<td>Medium (n = 43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large (n = 43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Σ 10 % 71.4</td>
<td>Σ 41 % 95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 97.7</td>
<td>% 97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Σ 0 % 0</td>
<td>Σ 16 % 37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 30.2</td>
<td>% 30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Σ 12 % 85.7</td>
<td>Σ 39 % 90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 97.7</td>
<td>% 97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE</td>
<td>Σ 1 % 7.1</td>
<td>Σ 13 % 30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 41.9</td>
<td>% 41.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1

All respondents, with the exception of three band directors reported that it was possible for students to concurrently enroll in an accelerated learning program and band or choir. Yet when asked whether students could participate in band or choir without being enrolled in the actual courses, results were mixed. Band directors (n = 65) responded in the negative (n = 41, 63.1%) whereas choir directors were evenly split with a majority of directors responding in the positive (n = 18, 51.4%).

Descriptive statistics for all three survey items examining student enrollment, separated by both band/choir and school size, are presented in Table 4.3. Means for both the first question, ratings on enrollment in primary ensembles, and third question, ratings on student retention, were mostly above the midpoint on the 6-point scale when data were sorted by band and choir. Both band and choir directors’ ratings on these questions when considering students enrolled in AP courses were highest, suggesting that primary ensemble enrollment and retention was easiest for those students. Ratings of students enrolled in AICE courses were close behind the AP ratings.
### Descriptive Statistics for Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question*</th>
<th>All Responses</th>
<th>Band Responses</th>
<th>Choir Responses</th>
<th>Small Schools</th>
<th>Medium Schools</th>
<th>Large Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-PE</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-SE</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-LP</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-PE</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-SE</td>
<td>3.33**</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.33**</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-LP</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-PE</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-SE</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-LP</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-PE</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-SE</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-LP</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-PE</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-SE</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-LP</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations: G=general, PE=Primary Ensemble Enrollment, SE=Secondary Ensemble Enrollment, LP=Leaving Program before Senior year

**One band director did not respond to this question making the N=64.

***There were no students in Small Schools participating in either IB or AICE.

Note. The number of responses for each question can be found in the “Music Students Enrolled” portions of Table 1 and Table 2.

Conversely, means for the second question, ratings on enrollment in secondary ensembles, were consistently below the midpoint except for the AICE program. More specifically they were between one-half and one full point lower than the means for question 1, suggesting that enrollment in secondary ensembles was consistently more difficult. Finally, ratings on all three questions were lowest for students enrolled in the IB program. These ratings were between 1 and 2.25 points lower than their highest counterparts, indicating the most difficulty in enrolling and
retaining IB students in both band or choir. Standard deviations for these three survey items in general were consistently high, all but five were above 1.4, suggesting a great amount of variability in responses. Those five examples, however, were all from questions 1 and 2 relating to the IB program. Low average ratings, coupled with the lowest standard deviations indicated the strongest agreement amongst respondents for these questions on the survey, though not in a positive way.

Direct comparison between band and choral director’s ratings for these three questions showed minimal differences, usually less than half of a point. Choral directors did consistently rate primary ensemble enrollment higher than band directors. Band directors, however, consistently rated student retention higher.

When the data were reorganized to reflect student enrollment at each director’s school, some results remained and new patterns emerged. As before, ratings for question 2 consistently remained lower than ratings for question 1. Ratings on all three questions for IB students were similarly lower than ratings for students participating in other accelerated learning programs. However, when grouped by school size, the ratings for these three questions were collectively more positive than before with fewer scores falling below the midpoint of the 6-point scale. Further, ratings on all three questions were lower for medium-sized schools than for both smaller or larger institutions in all but two cases (general ratings of student retention and student retention of dual enrollment students). Though this pattern could not be confirmed for the IB or AICE ratings (no small schools in the sample had students participating in those programs), the medium-sized schools’ ratings were lower than their large counterparts in all but one measure (enrollment in secondary ensembles by AICE students).

Research Question 2

Descriptive statistics for all four survey items examining the quality of student participation, separated by both band/choir and school size, are presented in Table 4.4. Ratings for all four questions were well above the midpoint of the 6-point scale by at least one full point or more. This suggested that directors might not have perceived accelerated programs as affecting either attendance or punctuality in a major way. Band and choir directors rated AP and AICE students highest with low standard deviations, indicating strong agreement between
Table 4.4

Descriptive Statistics for Student Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question*</th>
<th>All Responses</th>
<th>Band Responses</th>
<th>Choir Responses</th>
<th>Small Schools</th>
<th>Medium Schools</th>
<th>Large Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-AdS</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-AaS</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-PdS</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-PaS</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-AdS</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-AaS</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-PdS</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-PaS</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-AdS</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-AaS</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-PdS</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-PaS</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-AdS</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-AaS</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-PdS</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-PaS</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-AdS</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-AaS</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-PdS</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-PaS</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The number of responses for each question can be found in Table 1 and Table 2.

*Abbreviations: G=general, AdS=Attendance during school, AaS=Attendance after school, PdS=Punctuality during school, PaS=Punctuality after school

**There were no students at small schools participating in either IB or AICE

directors. Ratings for IB and DE were lowest suggesting decreased attendance and punctuality, though the difference in means from the highest to lowest ratings was usually less than one point.
Lastly, choir directors uniformly rated AP students as most present and punctual whereas band directors rated AICE students with higher attendance and AP students with greater punctuality.

As with the results to research question 1, when the data were reorganized to reflect student enrollment some results remained and new patterns emerged. As before, AP or AICE students had the highest ratings of both attendance and punctuality, which coupled with lower standard deviations suggested agreement between participants. Directors again rated IB and DE students lowest though differences between the highest and lowest ratings on every question were usually less than one point. Interestingly, when comparing mean responses for each individual question across school size, the highest mean was most frequently the smaller schools. The only exceptions (general ratings of attendance after school, AP ratings of attendance after school, and IB ratings of attendance after school and punctuality after school) saw large schools with the highest rating.

**Research Question 3**

Descriptive statistics for all four survey items examining student attitude, separated by both band/choir and school size, are presented in Table 4.5. On the whole, ratings on these questions were positive with only a single mean being below the midpoint (band director’s ratings of IB students’ active participation). Ratings of active student participation were the lowest for all accelerated learning programs. Standard deviations were lowest for ratings of AP students but were inconsistent for all other programs. Unlike the previous questions where band and choir directors’ ratings agreed on a highest and lowest rated accelerated learning program, directors perceived the attitude of their students so differently that this was impossible for these questions. For instance, band directors consistently rated their students’ attitudes lower than their choral counterparts with only two exceptions (the general rating of active participation and the AICE rating of active participation). Band directors (as before) rated the attitudes of both AP and AICE students highest and those of IB students lowest. Conversely, choral directors rated IB students the highest, a full point higher than the band directors, for the attitude questions on excitement about performance, commitment to program, and performance quality. AP students were rated highest on the measure of active participation. It must be noted that choral directors did rate AP and AICE students highly, just not as highly as band directors. Curiously, choral
Table 4.5

Descriptive Statistics for Student Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question*</th>
<th>All Responses</th>
<th>Band Responses</th>
<th>Choir Responses</th>
<th>Small Schools</th>
<th>Medium Schools</th>
<th>Large Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Part</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-EaP</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Perf</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-Part</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-EaP</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-Perf</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-Part</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-EaP</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-Perf</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-Part</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-EaP</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-Perf</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-Part</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-EaP</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICE-Perf</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of responses for each question can be found in Table 1 and Table 2.

Abbreviations: G=general, Part=active participation, EaP=excited about performance, CtP=commitment to program, Perf=perform as well as peers

**There were no students at small schools participating in either IB or AICE

directors rated general ratings of attitude, those without mention of a specific accelerated learning program, lowest. Standard deviation, other than those for AP, also reflected the differences between band and choral directors. Band directors’ ratings for both IB and DE
students had higher standard deviations whereas the same ratings from choral directors were more consistent.

When the data were reorganized to reflect school enrollment, AP and AICE students received the highest attitude ratings. For the medium and large schools, the lowest ratings were split between IB and DE students. Small schools’ general ratings of student attitude were lowest, likely since there were no IB or AICE students.

**Research Question 4**

To test for statistical difference between the ratings for questions about each accelerated learning program, the researcher created a new sample to equalize the number of responses in each group. All 100 survey responses were ordered using a random number generator and the rankings for either the general, AP, IB, DE, or AICE questions were extracted from each response. Once all 100 surveys were sampled, the process was repeated to gather the additional 25 responses needed.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was calculated to determine if there was a difference between music educators’ ratings of AP, IB, DE, and AICE students’ enrollment, participation, and attitude as well as music educators’ general ratings of the same. Descriptive statistics of the sample used and statistical results are summarized in Table 4.6. Significant differences were found in director ratings of primary ensemble enrollment, secondary ensemble enrollment, attendance during school, punctuality during school and active participation. For primary ensemble enrollment, $F (4, 124) = 5.14, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.146$, Tukey post hoc analysis indicated that ratings of IB students were significantly lower than general ratings ($p < 0.05$) as well as AP and AICE ratings ($p < .01$). For secondary ensemble enrollment, $F (4, 124) = 6.73, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.183$, Tukey post hoc analysis indicated that ratings of IB students were significantly lower than AP ratings ($p < 0.05$) as well as general ratings and AICE ratings ($p < 0.01$). For attendance during school, $F (4, 124) = 3.21, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.097$, the only significant difference was between ratings of IB and AICE students ($p < .05$). For punctuality during school, $F (4, 124) = 3.76, p < .01, \eta^2 = 0.111$, there was an overall statistical difference, though the Tukey post hoc analysis did not find any significance between the individual groups. Finally, for ratings of student’s active
Table 4.6

*Descriptive Statistics of the Sample and Statistical Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question*</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>AICE</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdS</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AaS</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PdS</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaS</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EaP</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CtP</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The \(n\) for each group was 25.

* Abbreviations: PE=primary ensemble enrollment, SE=secondary ensemble enrollment, LP=leaving program before senior year, AdS=attendance during school, AaS=attendance after school, PdS=punctuality during school, PaS=punctuality after school, Part=active participation, EaP=excited about performance, CtP=commitment to program, Perf=perform as well as peers
participation, $F(4, 124) = 3.30, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.099$, a significant difference was found between IB and both AP and AICE ($p < 0.05$).

**Research Question 5**

A series of Pearson Correlation Coefficients were conducted to determine if there were relationships between the number of accelerated programs in which directors’ students participated, and the directors’ general ratings of enrollment. Data were further separated by band/choir and school size. A single band director indicated that none of his or her students participated in any accelerated learning program and those ratings were excluded from further analysis. A summary of ratings is included in Table 4.7. All ratings, except for those of small school directors, showed a weak negative correlation between the number of accelerated learning programs represented in a band or choir program and ratings of enrollment. Further, correlations were stronger for both choir directors and for directors teaching at large schools.

### Table 4.7

*Correlations Between Accelerated Learning Program Participation and General Ratings of Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Responses $(n = 99)$</th>
<th>Band Responses $(n = 64)$</th>
<th>Choir Responses $(n = 35)$</th>
<th>Small Schools $(n = 13)$</th>
<th>Medium Schools $(n = 43)$</th>
<th>Large Schools $(n = 43)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Ensemble</strong></td>
<td>-0.1495</td>
<td>-0.1261</td>
<td>-0.2041</td>
<td>0.5556</td>
<td>-0.1691</td>
<td>-0.2105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Ensemble</strong></td>
<td>-0.2137</td>
<td>-0.0782</td>
<td>-0.4712</td>
<td>0.8224</td>
<td>-0.2607</td>
<td>-0.2806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Retention</strong></td>
<td>-0.0057</td>
<td>-0.0044</td>
<td>-0.0920</td>
<td>0.2788</td>
<td>-0.0729</td>
<td>-0.1498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 6

To explore this research question, respondents answered the following question in free-response format: “Briefly, what types of accommodations or changes (if any) have you made within your program for students enrolled in accelerated learning programs in order to either allow their participation or to meet your educational/artistic goals (or both)?” A total of 79 music teachers answered the question (49 band directors and 30 choir directors), and approaches to the question varied. After an initial reading where main ideas were identified, the researcher created 16 categories to classify responses. Classification into multiple categories was necessary for some of the more detailed responses. An independent inter-reliability rater read and classified 25% of the responses to test reliability of the devised taxonomy. Reliability was calculated at 80% using the formula agreements/agreements + disagreements (Madsen & Madsen, 2016). A separate tally recorded the number of responses in which each of the accelerated learning programs was mentioned to gauge which programs teachers reported needed more accommodations.

The number of responses placed in each category, separated by band and choir directors, is summarized in Table 4.8. While the question specifically asked about the accommodations music teachers make, many responses went further and explained specific details about the respondents’ school and how it handles accelerated learning programs. These responses were classified as “Comments” in the main taxonomy, and will be discussed in the next paragraph. The most frequently mentioned accommodation for both band and choir directors were permitting students in accelerated learning programs to either be late or miss rehearsals and/or performances. Some schools in this category also had elaborate schedules where music students attend other courses during the same time as music class on an alternating basis. The next most common accommodations were: avoiding schedule conflicts through careful planning of the school master schedule in conjunction with administration, imposing enrollment requirements on the students (such as requiring dual enrollment schedules to not conflict with class or rehearsal, signing performance contracts, or requiring students take other classes outside school to free up schedule space), and working with students individually to improve performance. The category of general flexibility included comments where directors did not necessarily change their program for accelerated learning program students, but rather made small accommodations like
Table 4.8

Frequency of Free-Response Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Responses (N = 79)</th>
<th>Band Responses (n = 49)</th>
<th>Choir Responses (n = 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Tardiness/Absence</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Master Schedule</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impose Enrollment Requirements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Individually with Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Flexibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Accommodations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust Course Enrollment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before/After School Ensembles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Stakeholders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before/After School Classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More After-School Commitments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Non-Enrolled Performers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify Curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer After-School Commitments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch Rehearsals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Detailed definitions of each category can be found in Appendix D.

striving to keep rehearsal times consistent, or altering starting or ending times of events to help students with conflicts. The remaining categories were represented in less than 10% of the responses, but two of them deserve further description. Those responses in the “modify curriculum” category expressed the idea that participation in accelerated learning programs necessitated a change in what was taught in the classroom. For instance, several responses mentioned that performance of higher-level literature became more difficult if not impossible. The offering of school-based academic courses outside of the school day was unique to schools offering the IB program. In those five schools, IB Music was scheduled before or after the school day so that students could still participate in performance classes with their peers.
Responses within the “comments” category were very diverse reflecting the many different teaching situations in Florida. The most frequently occurring comments ($n = 9$) described forced scheduling problems, where students enrolled in an accelerated learning program would be scheduled out of music unless they did one specific thing (i.e. take a class online, enroll in IB Music, etc.). There were also comments ($n = 8$) about the students themselves, explaining how music students enrolled in accelerated learning programs are frequently the best students in a program and further how these students sometime struggle under intense academic pressure to succeed. Finally, a small group of responses ($n = 3$) described situations where students had to choose between participation in music or continuation in an accelerated learning program. In an effort to gauge which of the accelerated learning programs included in this study needed the most accommodations or were more present on the minds of respondents, the number of responses that mentioned each program by name were tallied. DE and IB programs were mentioned the most frequently ($n = 19$ or 24.1% and $n = 17$ or 21.5% respectively). The AP and AICE programs appeared less frequently ($n = 9$ or 11.4% and $n = 4$ or 5.1% respectively).
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived influence of student enrollment in accelerated learning programs on student ability to enroll and participate in high school band and choir. In addition, Florida music teachers reported the perceived influences on student attitude as well as what accommodations they employed to minimize conflicts. Results indicated that some music educators did perceive a negative influence of accelerated learning program enrollment on all three measures, yet variability in the sample was indicated by high standard deviations on nearly all questions. It would seem that some schools struggled with conflicts between music and academic coursework, yet others did not share similar problems. The study yielded evidence that not all of the accelerated learning programs present in Florida’s high schools affected students similarly. Teachers reporting the presence of the IB program in their schools, for instance, consistently rated IB lower on some questions of student enrollment, participation, and attitude. When compared to responses for the other accelerated learning programs, these IB ratings were the only ones in the study to be statistically lower. The most commonly reported accommodation made by teachers for students in accelerated learning programs was permitting tardiness or absence from required events. Other common yet more complicated accommodations included preemptively working with administration to eliminate scheduling conflicts, imposing enrollment requirements on students, and finding ways to work individually with students to improve musical performance or to make up lost time.

The sample of music educators used for this study was diverse, including public, private, and charter schools, as well as schools with small, medium, and large student populations. The balance of band directors to choir directors was not ideal with band directors being almost twice as prevalent. However, bands outnumber choirs in the state of Florida and in cases where a teacher directs both subjects, the survey required participants to choose their primary teaching responsibility which may have contributed to this imbalance. Teacher self-reports of accelerated learning program offerings at their schools showed that all schools offered at least one such program. One could see this as a continuation of educational reforms started with *A Nation at Risk* (NCEE, 1983), or, at least for public schools, as conforming to state statute (Fla. Stat. § 1003.4295(2), 2016). When asked in which accelerated learning programs their own
music students participated, 90% of the teachers indicated participation in every program that was offered. This supported the commonly held belief that the best academic students are frequently musicians (Hansen, Gutman, & Smith, 2000), a belief that respondents reiterated in their comments, saying for instance: “The vast majority of our AP and dual enrollment students are in either band or choir.” or “The majority of the students in my top ensembles are students that are in the magnet program or choose to dual enroll.” The most common accelerated learning programs were AP and DE (93% and 84% of schools respectively), which makes sense since DE is required by law in public schools (Fla. Stat. § 1007.217(4,8), 1007.271(21)(n), 2016) and AP is one of the most prevalent programs in the United States (Baker, 2009; Clemmitt, 2006). IB and/or AICE were present in less than one-third of schools in the sample, though when present students nearly always participated. That IB and AICE were unequally represented is reflective of the state of Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2013) to an extent and possibly reflects both the newness of the AICE program (OPPAGA, 2006) and the long-acknowledged administrative challenges of running the IB program (Fox, 1985). Nonetheless, the high participation of music students in these programs increases the opportunity for conflicts affecting student enrollment, participation, and attitude.

The first research question focused on potential conflicts between accelerated learning programs and enrollment in music classes. Results indicated that nearly all respondents reported that students could concurrently enroll in both. Yet if a student was unable to do so, band directors were much less likely to allow student participation in a purely extracurricular sense than choir directors. As with many of the differences between band and choir directors found on this survey, the cause likely stems from the fundamental differences between the two subjects. Marching band, for instance, starts immediately each year and it might be impractical for a band director to allow volunteer participation due to that fact, whereas choral directors could potentially have more time to handle such situations before their earliest performance. However, it was curious that no choir directors reported allowing volunteer performers as an accommodation in the final question on the survey. Future research should examine the usage, efficacy, and potential ramifications of this accommodation since it is one of the easiest to implement.

When asked to rate on a scale how accelerated learning programs influenced enrollment in primary ensembles and student retention over the high school career, band and choral directors
were mostly positive. Students enrolled in AP classes had less perceived difficulty with primary ensemble enrollment, probably because AP has no coursework requirements, thus allowing students more freedom to choose classes (College Board, 2016). Conversely, enrollment in the IB program was perceived as more of a hindrance by both band and choral directors, with means below the midpoint of the scale. This could be attributed to the rigid coursework requirements to earn the IB diploma (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b, 2015c). Many respondents commented on IB’s impact on student course selection, for example: “By the time students are juniors there is no elective anymore and I lose them to a required elective.” A solution for this issue, frequently mentioned in the comments, was for students to select IB music as their 6th subject. However, if that option is not available or students would rather choose a different subject, they may have no choice but to quit music (Ruffino, 2007). AICE ratings were slightly lower than AP ratings and were followed by DE ratings, yet it is difficult to explain why these two programs rated how they did. Only a small number of schools offer AICE, which does features more enrollment requirements than AP but not as many as IB (Cambridge International Assessments, 2015a). The flexibility inherent in the DE program, where every district and school develops its own plans and subsequent issues (Fla. Stat. § 1007.271(21), 2016; Khazem & Khazem, 2012), likewise makes generalization difficult. Director ratings of student retention across the high school career mirrored the results of primary ensemble enrollment just discussed. Since many students only enroll in a single music class each year, the reasons explaining ratings of primary ensemble enrollment apply to these results as well.

Ratings of the difficulty of secondary ensemble enrollment were understandably lower than those of primary ensemble enrollment. Since a second music class requires a second credit, many regular students could potentially struggle to enroll. The AICE program had the highest ratings and was the only program rated above the midpoint of the scale followed closely by AP and DE. That these three programs, being all very structurally different, received similar ratings suggests that outside factors played a role in whether students could enroll. IB ratings on this question were much lower than the other programs, lower than any other ratings on the survey in fact. One comment explained this finding well: “We have IB music in our IB program, which keeps those students in their primary ensemble all four years, but they have no space in the schedule for secondary ensembles by their senior year.”
The means on the data for all three enrollment questions were paired with large standard deviations with DE ratings on all three questions being the highest (likely due to DE’s decentralized nature). These high variances further suggested that other school factors beyond the accelerated learning programs themselves may relate to student enrollment. The type of schedule a school uses (6-period, 7-period, block, modified block, etc.), amount of administrative or parental support, or characteristics of the music classroom like program success or teacher quality could be possible influences (Abril & Gault, 2008; Baker, 2009). Or it is possible that the influences of accelerated learning programs on student enrollment in music courses really do vary to such a large degree from school to school. In a study examining perceptions of secondary music programs and the struggles they face, Abril and Gault (2008) said: “it is possible that when budgeting and scheduling issues did affect a given program, the magnitude of the effect was quite strong” (p.79). A similar situation might be the case in this study.

One outside factor that this study cursorily explored was that of school size. When data for the three enrollment questions were so sorted, one interesting new pattern appeared. Means for medium sized schools were almost consistently lower than means for both small and large schools. This finding could be purely coincidental, the directors at medium sized schools just could have been more negative on the survey for personal or completely unrelated reasons, or maybe the differences in student opportunity at smaller versus larger schools were the reason. A smaller school, having less funding due to fewer students (Fla. Stat. § 1011.62, 2016), might offer fewer classes and programs creating less of an opportunity for conflict with music. A large school is the exact opposite where more funding leads to more programs but also to a larger faculty and more potential scheduling options which allows administrators to avoid conflicts with music. Medium schools fall somewhere in between their small and large counterparts, having more offerings than a small school but lacking the flexibility of a large school due to fewer resources.

Measurement of student participation in music classes is inherently difficult to do objectively. The researcher chose to request director perceptions of student attendance and punctuality both during and outside of school because these are among the most concrete measures available. For all four questions of student participation mean ratings were high and well above the midpoint of the scale. In general, this might suggest that directors did not feel that accelerated learning programs had a meaningful effect on student attendance and punctuality. As
with enrollment, AP and AICE students were rated the highest, but unlike enrollment ratings, DE was rated lowest for some ratings both during and after school. Unlike the other three programs, DE courses can be offered both on a high school campus or at local post-secondary institutions (Fla. Stat. § 1007.271(6), 2016), and students who select the latter option invariably will need transportation time to move between school sites, thus yielding tardiness. One respondent’s comment speaks to this issue: “Dual enrolled students have no problem enrolling in the top ensembles, but they must leave campus after about 8:30 to go to the college campus. They often have trouble making it back in time for extra rehearsals.” By contrast, AP, AICE, and IB courses are all offered on the high school campus itself, yet only AP and AICE received higher ratings with low standard deviations. IB programs, even when students can enroll in a music class, sometimes cause attendance issues: “In order for IB diploma students to continue in band, they must take IB music… this class [meets] on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. On Tuesdays and Thursdays they rotate with [Theory of Knowledge] and attend the Wind Ensemble Class.” Higher standard deviations for these questions of DE and IB students again likely reflect the school-by-school variability in structuring these programs. Further, though mean ratings remained high, higher standard deviations reflect the fact that permitting tardiness and absence was the most common accommodation mentioned during the free-response question on the survey. Many of those comments mentioned IB and DE by name as causes of the attendance or punctuality problem.

The final set of survey items gauged the effect of accelerated learning program participation on student attitudes including students’ “active participation,” “excitement about performance,” “commitment to program success,” and “quality of musical performance.” Means of all four questions were high for all of the accelerated learning programs and were coupled with lower standard deviations, especially for AP and AICE students. Comments supported these high ratings in many instances, including: “Generally speaking, these are the smarter and more involved kids” or “AICE students are generally more motivated and are better at playing their instruments than my traditional students.” Questions of attitude also revealed the only disagreement between band and choir directors. The IB program was rated lowest by band directors and conversely rated highest by choir directors. Since completion of the IB program requires a great deal of student-directed work (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b, 2015c), these additional projects might affect band students’ attitude more due to the larger time-
commitment required by activities such as marching band. This same logic could be applied to the academic workload assigned by any of the accelerated learning programs, leading directors to perceive the active participation of these students to be lower (which the ratings suggest in nearly every case). For these questions, standard deviations tended to be lower than the questions on enrollment and participation, especially for the AP and AICE programs.

The largest differences between the results of this current investigation and its pilot study were smaller correlations between the number of accelerated learning programs at a school and participants’ general ratings of ensemble enrollment. The increased sample size of the current study did not lead to greater agreement on ratings of enrollment as expected, but instead increased the diversity of responses thus weakening the relationships. Curiously, small schools were found to have positive relationships between the variables. While this result could be the result of a limited sample size, perhaps smaller schools need accelerated learning programs to create a more vibrant school culture, which could then translate to participation in music programs.

The wide variety of accommodations directors reported using within their programs were equally as diverse as the schools and programs they represent. While permitting students in accelerated learning programs to be tardy or absent from music events is an easy solution to a complex problem and is certainly preferable to students leaving music study, is that really the best we can offer our students? In many music programs, the ultimate representation of student achievement occurs in public performance and several respondents commented how students can be deprived of those opportunities: “Holiday concerts in December often conflict with DE exams, so students usually miss a concert or rehearsal during exam week.” Another director continued the same thought: “The worst is December and April/May, when concerts are occurring and final exams for DE are happening, and we as a choral department end up having to compromise (because the community college will not).” Further, some respondents suggested that the music students have the opportunity to perform are limited by these programs: “I have had to drop my expectation level for performances. I have had to choose easier music” or “Almost all of my junior and senior [IB students] come to class on an every-other day schedule. They are still allowed to be in the top performing group; however, it makes it extremely difficult when preparing higher-level literature. After school rehearsals become a necessity.” As Hansen, Gutman, and Smith (2000) noted in their article on school scheduling, it is the responsibility of
teachers and school staff to ensure that students don’t need to choose between music courses and accelerated learning programs. If we value music study as a part of the complete education of our children, is just excusing them from some of the most important aspects of music participation, like concerts or performing advanced literature, really all we as educators should do? There is certainly no single solution to solve the many different problems accelerated learning programs can present in Florida high schools. Yet, future research could identify potential solutions to some common problems so that instances of forced scheduling conflicts and instances where students are made to choose between music and academics, as documented by respondents in this study, are minimized or eliminated.

The largest limitation for the present study comes from its sample size. The imbalance of band and choral directors coupled with the participation of too few directors whose students participated in IB or AICE made more statistical analysis of the results impossible. More robust recruitment efforts may have alleviated this problem, but since IB and AICE are present in a relatively small number of Florida schools when compared to AP or DE, this problem may require an adjustment in methodology. A second limitation in this study was its basis in music teachers’ perceptions of the subject matter. Though this methodology allowed for a larger and wider set of participants, it also allowed for both bias and errors of omission. For instance, when reporting what types of accelerated learning programs were offered at their schools, some directors at public schools did not select DE as being offered, even though state statute mandates DE be available at every public school (Fla. Stat. § 1007.217(4,8), 1007.217(21)(n), 2016). Such omissions could also have affected how directors perceived subjective things like student participation or attitude. The final limitation of this study was its use of strictly descriptive and qualitative methodologies. A more quantitative approach to these same research questions might reveal very different results.

Since very little research examining the relationship between accelerated learning programs and music classes could be located, the opportunities for future research are vast. On the question of how accelerated learning programs affect student enrollment in music classes, a quantitative approach tracking how individual students continue or discontinue music study while participating in the various programs would be valuable. In addition to clarifying patterns, additional factors such as intensity of participation (i.e. the number of accelerated courses taken) could be included. A similar study examining student participation by measuring attendance and
punctuality is equally possible. Utilization of a qualitative methodology could effectively examine differences in student attitude caused by accelerated learning programs. Further, if centered around a small number of accomplished music programs in Florida or elsewhere, qualitative methodologies could more clearly reveal other factors that impact this study’s research questions like school scheduling models or levels of administrative support. This coupled with a more in-depth understanding of the strategies schools use to mitigate potential conflicts could be very beneficial to those schools at large that struggle with similar problems. Once more detailed information is gathered, returning to a broad survey model could more effectively gauge the extent of conflicts between accelerated learning programs and music programs in the state of Florida and beyond.

Though the results of this study demonstrated a lack of agreement amongst Florida’s music teachers about accelerated learning programs’ influence on student enrollment, participation, and attitude in music classes, perhaps this disagreement itself is the most significant finding. In the twenty-first century educational environment, characterized by high-stakes and pressure to achieve academically (Ravich, 2010), these programs are going to grow, not shrink. This is especially true in Florida where state funding (Fla. Stat. § 1011.62(1)(l-n), 2016) and school grading (Florida Department of Education, 2016) are affected by accelerated learning program success. If music study is a valued part of a complete education, then music educators and related parties must develop and implement strategies that encourage and allow students to be successful in both music coursework and advanced academic coursework.
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Dear Colleague,

Greetings, I hope this message finds you well and ready for a productive semester! I write today to ask for your help with a new research study examining how enrollment in the various high school accelerated learning programs (like AP, IB, and Dual Enrollment) affects student ability to participate in band or choir. I know this is an issue that affects many of us in some way, and this project will help us better understand the extent of problems in the state of Florida.

To study this topic, I am asking high school band and choir directors across the state of Florida to complete a short online survey that will take approximately 8 minutes to complete. All different perspectives on this issue are welcome, both positive and negative!

If you are willing to participate in this project, please click on the link provided below to begin the survey. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or my faculty advisor at the coordinates below.

Survey Link: [https://fsu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_b31wXA4CwjKjzcF](https://fsu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_b31wXA4CwjKjzcF)
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Matthew Boswell       Dr. Kimberly VanWeelden
Graduate Assistant in Teaching     Faculty Advisor
College of Music       College of Music
Florida State University     Florida State University

mab05j@my.fsu.edu       kvanweelden@fsu.edu
You have been invited to take part in a research survey about high school students enrolled in accelerated learning programs (AP, IB, Dual Enrollment etc) and their participation in band or choir. If you choose to participate, the survey will require less than 8-10 minutes. The results of this survey may benefit the field of music education for both inservice teachers and teacher trainers.

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this voluntary survey. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with Florida State University. All responses will be kept strictly confidential, and digital data will be stored in secure computer files. Any report of this research that is made available to the public will not include your name or any other individual information by which you could be identified.

The researcher for this study is Matthew Boswell, a graduate student at Florida State University who is overseen by Dr. Kimberly VanWeelden, the faculty advisor for this study. If you have any questions, you may reach Mr. Boswell at [redacted] or Dr. VanWeelden at [redacted] If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the FSU Institutional Review Board at [redacted]

By clicking the “Next” button below, you are indicating that you provide your consent to participate in this survey.
APPENDIX D

FREE-RESPONSE CATEGORY DEFINITIONS

1. **No Accommodations:** Response literally says “none” or something like it and indicates no other categories listed below.

2. **Permit Tardiness / Absences:** Response indicates that students in accelerated learning programs are allowed to miss rehearsals (either during or after school) and performances if they have direct conflicts. This includes splitting class time with another course during school.

3. **Coordinate Master Schedule:** Response indicates that respondent worked with administration and/or guidance counselors ahead of time (like during the summer) to arrange the school and music department schedules to avoid conflicts with ALP.

4. **Imposed Enrollment Requirements:** Directors attach requirements to participate in music such as requiring that all outside classes (like DE) do not conflict with rehearsal time. Situations where students must take classes online, during the summer, or otherwise not during the school day to participate in music fall into this category. Things like performance contracts too.

5. **Work Individually with Students:** This category is for any interactions that are between a single student and the teacher such as giving extra help to improve student performance, assigning make-up work for missed rehearsals, or any independent study.

6. **General Flexibility:** Responses that suggest being flexible in a general sense. Such as keeping rehearsal times consistent across the year or modifying rehearsal schedules to better fit students’ time demands.
7. **Adjust Course Enrollment:** Responses in this category indicate that teachers enroll students in a class other than the one in which the student belongs due to schedule conflicts.

8. **Before/After School Ensemble:** Creating groups that meet only before/after school so that more students can participate.

9. **Communicate with Stakeholders:** For instance, response discusses advising students on how to proceed with ALP enrollment or talking to other teachers to avoid conflicts after school.

10. **Before/After School Classes:** Instituting academic coursework before or after school hours, offered by the school itself, to allow students to participate in a during-school ensemble.

11. **More After School Commitments:** Adding extra rehearsals because students are not in class.

12. **Allow Non-Enrolled Performers:** This category contains responses which indicate that students not enrolled in music classes are allowed to participate or perform with ensembles.

13. **Modify Curriculum:** This category is for comments indicating that directors have changed how or what they teach (like difficulty of music), that they have to work harder than before to play harder music, or that they modify how school time is used.

14. **Fewer After-School Commitments:** For instance, eliminating after school rehearsals, having fewer concerts, participating in fewer competitions.

15. **Lunch Rehearsals:** Using student free-time as rehearsal time.
16. **Comments:** All responses that did not speak about specific accommodations but instead provided details about the respondent’s specific situation.
REFERENCES


Fla. Stat. § 1002.3105 (2016)


Fla. Stat. § 1007.27 (2016)


Fla. Stat. § 1007.61 (2016)


Florida Legislature, Office of Program Policy Analysis & Government Accountability. (2008). *Student participation in acceleration programs has increased; Legislature has taken steps to reduce program costs* (Report No. 08-70). Retrieved from http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/ReportsByTopic.aspx?topic=Education


BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Matthew Alan Boswell, born in San Antonio, TX, spent his formative years in Martin county on Florida’s Southeastern coast. A 2005 graduate of Martin County High School, he completed a Bachelor of Music Education degree in music and French at the Florida State University in 2010. Boswell started his teaching career at Fort Pierce Central High School in St. Lucie county that fall. During his five-year tenure, he grew the bands and choirs under his direction and was selected both as FPC’s Teacher of the Year and a finalist for District Teacher of the Year in 2014. In 2015, he returned to Florida State to earn a Master of Music Education degree, which he completed in 2017. He looks forward to returning to the public-school band room for a time before starting his terminal degree.