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The purpose of this study was to describe the current status of students with special needs in the instrumental musical ensemble and to examine the effect of selected educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion. An online survey was designed by the researcher and distributed electronically to 600 practicing K-12 instrumental music educators in the states of Idaho, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, and Rhode Island. While 13.6% of the total school-aged population nationwide received special education services, demographic data provided by respondents revealed that students with special needs accounted for 6.8% of all students participating in bands, orchestras, and other instrumental musical ensembles. The relationship between the rate of inclusion and selected educator variables (gender, age, level of education, special education coursework, primary teaching area, and teaching experience) and institutional factors (geographic location,
community setting, institution type, and student population) was examined using multiple regression with backward elimination. The institutional factor ‘student population’ was found to be a significant predictor of inclusion; as the overall school population increased, the rate of inclusion among students with special needs in instrumental music classes decreased. Respondents also indicated that instructional and administrative aspects of teaching (scheduling, funding, allotted planning time, etc.) played a limited role in their ability or inability to include students with special needs. In the observations and experiences of instrumental music educators, special education students were most accomplished in the areas of public performance, exhibiting acceptable behavior, and movement, while the ability to sight-read, perform and/or read rhythms, and memorization were more problematic. Although 42% or respondents had no college coursework in special education, 97% were currently teaching students with special needs and most were willing to provide students with a variety of accommodations.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

A number of seminal court decisions and consequential legislation guarantee the rights of all students, including those with special needs, equal access to the nation’s public schools. Among the earliest litigation concerning inequality in education was the landmark United States Supreme Court case Brown v. Board of Education (1954). Although this case was argued on behalf of school children discriminated against based on their race, Brown v. Board (1954) set precedence for other segments of the population to challenge educational placements based on other variables, including disability.

Among these notable Federal cases were Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1972) and Mills v. District of Columbia Board of Education (1972). In Pennsylvania (1972), the court ruled that even students with moderate, severe, or profound retardation were entitled to a suitable educational program provided at the public’s expense and that parents could request hearings concerning a child’s placement. The Mills v. District of Columbia Board of Education (1972) case expanded this ruling to include all students with disabilities, as well as those with behavior problems as in this case. While the PARC (1972) decision formed the basis for a number of provisions within Public Law 94-142 and Mills (1972) established the

Among the first legislative endeavors guaranteeing the liberties of all citizens was The Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbid discrimination based on race, religion, sex, or national origin. Section IV of this law pertains to the desegregation of our nations public schools, thereby eliminating a “separate but equal” educational system based on any of the aforementioned attributes (*The Civil Rights Act of 1964*). Similar to the manner in which the *Brown v. Board* (1954) decision provided precedence for litigation specific to special education, *The Civil Rights Act (1964)* provided a framework for subsequent legislation more directly addressing the rights of individuals with disabilities.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 was among the earliest civil rights legislation specifically intended to provide equal access to services and to preserve the rights of individuals with disabilities. It addressed the hiring practices of the federal government (Title V, Section 501); removed architectural and transportation barriers (Title V, Section 502); prohibited discrimination in the hiring of individuals with disabilities by
Federal contractors or subcontractors (Title V, Section 503); and ensured that all entities receiving Federal financial assistance do not discriminate on the basis of a disability (Title V, Section 504).

Title V, Section 504, typically referred to simply as “Section 504,” prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities by any program or activity conducted by Federal agencies or by programs or agencies receiving Federal funding. This would include public school districts, institutions of higher education, and a variety of other state and local education agencies. Title V, Section 504 of The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 reads:

No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States, as defined in section 7(6), shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. (The Rehabilitation Act of 1973)

Perhaps the most comprehensive special education legislation was enacted by the United States Congress and signed by President Gerald R. Ford on November 29, 1975. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (EAHCA) also referred to as Public Law 94-142 aimed to:

- ....assure that all children with disabilities have available to them...a free appropriate public education which emphasizes
special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs,

- assure that the rights of children with disabilities and their parents...are protected,
- assist States and localities to provide for the education of all children with disabilities,
- assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate all children with disabilities...

This legislation not only established the right of children with disabilities to receive a “free and appropriate public education” (FAPE), but also provides access to related services, including audiology, counseling, occupational and physical therapy, psychological services, speech pathology, and medical diagnosis and evaluation among other services. EAHCA further requires that an Individualized Education Program (IEP) be implemented addressing the learning goals, needs, and accommodations for individuals and that, to the maximum extent possible, students receive services in the “least restrictive environment” (The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975).

The 1983 amendments to this legislation (Public Law 98-199) provided funding for demonstration projects and research in early intervention and childhood special education. Where the original 1975 legislation guarantees services from ages 6 to 21, the 1986 amendments to The Education of the Handicapped Act (Public Law 99-457) guarantee
early intervention services for children with disabilities beginning at birth to age two, and preschool services to children ages three through five. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 was reorganized and termed The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 (Public Law 101-476), was amended in 1991 (Public Law 102-119), and reauthorized and amended again in 1997 (Public Law 105-17) and 2004 (Public Law 108-446).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 brought about significant changes in the terminology used to describe “handicapped children.” “Children” are now referred to as “individuals” in IDEA and “handicapped” was replaced with the phrase “with disabilities” or “disabled.” In fact, “person-first” language is utilized throughout IDEA in lieu of “disability-first” language, i.e., “individuals with disabilities” rather than “handicapped individuals” or “disabled individuals.” The 1990 IDEA legislation also indentified autism and traumatic brain injury as distinct categories of disability, included rehabilitation counseling and social services among those “related services,” defined assistive technology devices and services, and required transition services for individuals with disabilities.

The IDEA Amendments of 1997 further emphasized the Individualized Education Program as the primary tool used in the planning, implementation, and evaluation stages of an individual’s special education and the parent as a vital part of the process.
Reauthorization again in 2002 and 2004 aligned IDEA with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, while altering the IEP process and content, defining the “highly qualified” special educator, and establishing new provisions for identifying students with specific learning disabilities (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990). IDEA, working in conjunction with P.L. 94-142, Section 504, and other directives is the most current legislation addressing the rights of the nearly 6.5 million infants, toddler, and children with special needs.

Decades before the civil rights of school children and the broader population was addressed through litigation and legislation though, leaders in our field recognized the professional obligation of music educators to bring music to the masses. As early as 1915, music supervisors espoused their desire to provide universal music education as Willis P. Kent presented his speech “Music for Every Man” at the Pittsburg meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference (Mark & Gary, 1999). Later, Osbourne G. McConathy (1919), President of MSNC (now MENC: The National Association for Music Education) from 1918-1919, selected as the theme for the 1919 meeting in St. Louis: “Every child should be educated in music in accordance with his capacities at public expense and his musical development should function in the life of the community” (McConathy, 1919, pp. 24-25).

Shortly after being elected President of MSNC in 1922 Karl Wilson Gehrkens (1933) adopted the phrase “Music for Every Child—Every Child
for Music” as the theme for the 1923 proceedings to be held in Cleveland (Gehrkens, 1933). “Music for Every Child” was again the theme of the 1924 conference held in Cincinnati and the title of the presidential address given by Dr. William Otto Miessner (1924), who delivered the following message: “We, as Music Educators, must accept our obligation and take a definite stand to the end that, in Music also, every child shall have a fair and equal chance” (Miessner, 1924, p. 11). The phrase “Music for Every Child—Every Child for Music” became the official slogan of the organization and has since been utilized, in all or part, in countless other publications, programs, and discussions (Oberlin College Archives, 2010).

The desire to provide all students a quality music education extended beyond catchy slogans, conference themes and memorable position statements and essays. As MENC continued to advocate for the inclusion of music among the core subjects, the organization and its leaders engaged in efforts to address inequalities in music instruction for traditionally underserved population of students. Among a variety of commissions and projects undertaken in the 1940’s and 1950’s was the establishment of a standing committee to address music for exceptional children (Mark, 2008).

Later, in 1967, members of MENC as well as leaders from a variety of other fields gathered at the Tanglewood Music Center in order to assess the current and future “role of music education in American
society and education...” In addition to their declaration that music “...be placed in the core of the school curriculum,” attendees agreed that:

6. Greater emphasis should be placed on helping the individual student to fulfill his needs, goals and potentials.

7. The music education profession must contribute its skills, proficiencies, and insights toward assisting in the solution of urgent social problems as in the “inner city” or other areas with culturally deprived individuals.

8. Programs of teacher education must be expanded and improved to provide music teachers who are specially equipped to teach high school courses in the history and literature of music, courses in the humanities and related arts, as well as teachers equipped to work with the very young, with adults, with the disadvantaged, and with the emotionally disturbed (Choate, 1968, p. 139).

In order to implement the recommendations of the Tanglewood Symposium, MENC instituted the Goals and Objectives Project, or GO Project, beginning in 1969. The result of the project was four broad goals and thirty-five objectives, of which, eight were identified by the MENC National Executive Board for swift action. Among those eight objectives was a directive for MENC to: “1. Lead efforts to develop programs of music instruction challenging to all students, whatever their sociocultural condition in a pluralistic society” (Mark & Gary, 1999, p. 313). The GO Project resulted in the establishment of various
commissions and committees to address these objectives, while existing entities received other directives related to the results of the Tanglewood Symposium and the GO Project. The *Music Educators Journal*, for instance, has since devoted entire issues to the topics of music in urban education, electronic music, youth music, world musics, and music in special education (Mark, 1999). More recently, MENC established the “Children with Exceptionalities” Special Research Interest Group (SRIG) with a mission to “promote understanding of children with exceptionalities” (*Teaching Music*, 2008, p. 14).

In 1992, Past National Presidents issued the “Child’s Bill of Rights in Music,” at the MENC National In-Service Conference in New Orleans (Glenn, 1992). Among these guarantees is that:

3. As their right, all children must receive the finest possible education in music, every child must have an equal opportunity to study music, and the quality and quantity of children’s music instruction must not depend upon their geographical location, social status, racial or ethnic status, urban/suburban/rural residence, or parental or community wealth.

It is also worthwhile to note that each of the seven rights begin with the phrase, “As their right, all children...” (MENC, 1991). Similarly, the current Mission and Values statements of MENC also include language referring to the right of “every individual” to receive a music education and the belief that “music is for all” (MENC, 2009 & 2011).
Indeed, music is an essential component of a well-rounded curriculum. Even for students with multiple, profound, and severe disabilities, music is an important aspect in their education and lives (Okelford, Welch, & Zimmermann, 2002). Furthermore, research has demonstrated that music instruction benefits the ongoing academic progress of students with special needs (Baumberger & Bangert, 2001; Catterall, 2002; Catterall, Chapleau, & Iwanaga, 1999; Cuitta, Hamann, & Walker, 1995; Linsenmeier, 2004; Overly, 2000) and that these individuals can and do achieve at levels commensurate with regular education students (Linsenmeier, 2004; Tooker, 1995).

In spite of this evidence, students with special needs are not always included in music classes at rates comparable with their nondisabled peers (Cooper, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994; Linsenmeier, 2004; Zdzinski, 2001). This is also true within the music curriculum itself, where it appears students with special needs may not be included in ensemble programs as often as they are the general music class (Cooper, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994). Stephen Zdzinski (2001) concurs: “...the idea of teaching instrumental music to special learners is less common” (Zdzinski, 2001, p. 27). The most recent study comparing participation among regular and special education students in school ensembles revealed that only 5.86% of all special education students were enrolled in instrumental music activities. The same research revealed that 18% of regular education
student attending the same schools were involved in these programs, a 13.14% discrepancy (Linsenmeier, 2004).

Existing research indicates that inequities within music education persist. This may be true more so for students with special needs attempting to access the instrumental musical ensemble (Zdzinski, 2001). Likewise, the vast majority of research concerning inclusion in music has centered on the general music classroom as opposed to ensembles (Atterbury, 1986; Cooper, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphrey, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Shehan, 1977; White, 1981). While a legal and professional justification for inclusion across the music curriculum has been established and music educators may very well be willing to include students with special needs in instrumental music, many feel unprepared to address the unique needs of this population (Adamek, 2001; Damer, 2001; Tooker, 1995). This research sought to better inform music educators, special educators, and all stakeholders by: characterizing the special needs population included in instrumental music, determining what factor or factors affect a music educator’s ability to include those students, and describing the extent to which inclusionary challenges and accommodations exist in the instrumental musical ensemble.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to describe the current status of students with special needs in instrumental musical ensembles and to
examine the effect of selected educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion.

**Research Questions**

This study addressed the following research questions:

(1) What is the rate of inclusion in K-12 instrumental musical ensembles, what types of student disabilities are most prevalent in those ensembles, and is this rate and representation in instrumental music congruent with K-12 education as a whole?

(2) Do selected educator or institutional variables have significant effects on the rate of inclusion?

(3) What challenges or issues arise when including students with special needs in the instrumental musical ensemble?

(4) Are instrumental music educators prepared for inclusion and willing to accommodate students with special needs?

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, the following terms were defined:

**Free Appropriate Public Education**

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, later The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, guarantees all qualified persons residing within the jurisdiction of a school district a free appropriate public education (FAPE). An appropriate education is designed to meet the specific needs of the individual, and may include instruction in the regular classroom, the use of aids, or special education
or related services in separate classrooms, at home, or in public or private institutions. The FAPE clause of IDEA aims to:

...ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for employment and independent living... (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990).

**Inclusion**

Inclusion is the practice of educating students with special need in the regular classroom instead of isolated environments devoted to the education of student with special needs. The extent to which students with special needs are included is often determined by the abilities and needs of the student. According to Bowe (2005), students who are included spend approximately two-thirds of the normal school week in the regular classroom, and may be removed for individual assistance or related services. Students who are fully included in the regular classroom would receive such individual assistance and accommodations in the regular classroom (Bowe, 2005).

**Individualized Education Program**

Students who receive special education services are required to have an Individualized Education Program, commonly referred to by the acronym IEP. IEP’s are documents constructed to describe the needs of students with disabilities and to record what accommodations will be
implemented to address those needs. An IEP “team” consisting of teachers, parents, administrators, and, when appropriate, the student, create and periodically review and update the document. While the format of the IEP may vary by school district, it will typically include the following information: current performance, annual goals, related and/or transitional services, participation in district and state testing, and how the students; progress will be measured (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990).

**Instrumental Musical Ensemble**

For the purpose of this study, the terms “instrumental music ensemble” or “instrumental ensemble” are used to designate any large or small ensemble where the primary medium for the study of music includes the use of a musical instrument. This will typically consist of bands and orchestras, but may also include guitar and keyboard classes or small chamber ensembles.

**Least Restrictive Environment**

The Least Restrictive Environment mandate of The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act mandates that students with disabilities be educated with their nondisabled peers to the greatest extent possible. The Least Restrictive Environment is typically considered to be the regular classroom, but it the responsibility of the IEP team to determine the best education environment(s) for individuals. IDEA states:
To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not disabled, and special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990).

**Special Education**

IDEA defines special education as, “specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability” (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990).

**Student with Special Needs**

Any school-aged student, age 3-21, possessing one or more disabilities as identified by IDEA and who is granted an Individualized Education Program (IEP). There are thirteen official disabilities categories as designated by IDEA: autism, deaf-blindness, developmental delay, emotional disturbance, hearing impairment, mental retardation, multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, specific learning disability, speech or language impairment, traumatic brain injury, and visual impairment (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990). In this and other cited research, “students with
special needs” may also be referred to as “exceptional learners,” “exceptional students,” “special needs students,” “special education students,” “special learners,” “students with disabilities,” “individuals with disabilities,” or “disabled students” among others.

**Delimitations of the Study**

This study was delimited to include only practicing K-12 music educators with teaching duties in instrumental music during all or part of the school day. These participants were sampled from six targeted states and may not be representative of instrumental music educators or instrumental music programs nationwide. For the purpose of determining the effect of educator variables on rates of inclusion, only the respondents’ gender, age, teaching experience, level of education, and special education coursework were examined. Institutional variables were delimited to geographic location, community type, school type, and school student population.

While this research focuses on inclusion in the instrumental ensemble setting, it is not implied that music instruction within this context is more or less meaningful for students with special needs than instruction in vocal or general music. Furthermore, this study investigated the perceived challenges and successes associated with inclusion and the willingness of instrumental music educators to accommodate students with special needs. No attempt is made to
determine or suggest how students should be included, only to describe what is taking place in the inclusive instrumental musical ensemble.

**Basic Assumptions**

In this study of inclusion in the instrumental ensemble, the following assumptions were made:

1) It was assumed that respondents were practicing K-12 music educators with teaching responsibilities in instrumental music.

2) It was assumed that respondents were aware of those students with special needs participating in their instrumental ensembles.

3) It was assumed that respondents could identify specific disabilities within the thirteen designated categories.

**Theory**

This study identified the rate at which students with special needs participated in instrumental musical ensembles and explored the extent to which factors of educator background or institutional circumstance had any significant effect on rates of inclusion. The model for this particular study was based on the theory that the decision to include students with special needs may be, in part, a function of the educators’ background and experiences (educator variables). As the decision to include students with special needs may not rest entirely with the music educator, institutional variables were also examined to determine if the inclusion of students with special needs may also be impacted by
circumstance (institutional variables). Figure 1 below illustrates the factors examined in this study.

![Figure 1] Theoretical model: Variables influencing the decision and ability to include student with special needs in the instrumental musical ensemble.

The educator variables examined included the respondents (1) gender, (2) age, (3) level of education, (4) the completion of special education coursework, (5) primary teaching area, and (6) teaching experience in years. Institutional variables were: (1) geographic location, (2) community setting, (3) institution type, and (4) student population.
Methodology

This section includes a brief description of the study: (1) subjects, (2) personnel and facilities, (3) equipment and materials, (4) procedure, and (5) data analysis.

Subjects

The subjects of this study were practicing elementary, middle, and high school (K-12) instrumental music educators. Individuals with teaching responsibilities in instrumental music during all or part of the school day were included in this study. A convenience sample of 600 instrumental music educators was provided by state associations of music educators in the states of Idaho, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, and Rhode Island. These local associations were affiliated with one or more national or international organizations including: MENC: The National Association for Music Education (MENC), the National Band Association (NBA), the National Symphony Orchestra Association (NSOA), and/or the American String Teachers Association (ASTA).

Personnel and Facilities

A panel of practicing music educators and special educators was consulted in person, by telephone, and/or via email during the evaluation and piloting of the online survey (see Appendix B and Appendix C). The researcher, with the assistance of executive officers of state associations of music educators, secured membership lists of current instrumental music educators from which the sample was
The online survey required that participants complete the online survey using an internet-ready computer (see Appendix G). Review of the survey data was completed with the assistance of quantitative analysis experts at the Nebraska Evaluation and Research (NEAR) Center on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus.

**Equipment and Materials**

It was necessary for potential survey participants to have access to email and an internet ready device as respondents were required to respond to an email invitation (see Appendices D, E, and F) sent to a personal or institutional email address. This email invitation(s) included an embedded link to the online survey created and launched using Survey Gizmo. *Survey Gizmo* provides free “Enterprise Level” accounts to students engaged in academic research. Users at the “Enterprise Level” are able to launch customized surveys, gather and store responses securely, and export data for analysis.

**Online Survey Instrument**

Because no existing questionnaire was deemed appropriate for the purposes of this study, a survey was developed by the researcher. The resulting 20-item questionnaire focused on four areas of interest: (1) music educator demographics, (2) community and institutional demographics, (3) music program demographics, and (4) inclusion.

Section I (questions one through seven) asked instrumental music educators to provide basic demographic information about themselves,
including their gender, age, education, and teaching experience. Section II of the online survey included four items concerning the geographic location of the respondents’ institution, the community setting, type of institution, and the estimated total student population. Questions 12 through 15 (Section III) required respondents to describe their institutions music offerings by grade level, course type, as well as provide ensemble enrollment statistics while distinguishing regular education students from those special education students qualifying for an Individualized Education Program (IEP). Section IV of the online survey asked responding music educators, using five point scales, to respond to a given list of potential challenges associated with inclusion and their willingness to implement specific accommodations. Item 19 of the online survey allowed respondents to describe, in an open response format, their experiences including students with special needs in music classes. Those music educators willing to participate in future research or follow-up questioning were asked to provide their name and contact information in item 20 at the conclusion of the online survey.

Survey data was compiled and stored on the researcher’s personal computer and in Survey Gizmo. Analysis of the survey data was completed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS, again, with the assistance of the Nebraska Evaluation and Research (NEAR) Center on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus.
Document Review

A variety of online and print materials were examined in order to create the online survey tool and to corroborate, contradict, or further analyze data received during this study. Sources included the Data Accountability Center (DAC), the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the National Center for Special Education Research (NCSER), the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), and the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Disability Statistics and Demographics (StatsRRTC). The researcher consulted relevant data gathered by these entities and made available to the public through a variety of national studies, including, the Annual Disability Statistics Compendium, the Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Digest of Education Statistics, and the National Longitudinal Transition Study – 2.

Procedure

A thorough review of relevant literature and existing questionnaires was conducted in order to better inform items of the online survey tool. The resulting survey was piloted and reviewed by a panel of practicing educators. Permission to proceed with this study was granted by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board (see Appendix A) prior to the distribution of the online survey.
A link to the online survey was distributed to all subjects via email on April 1, 2010. This email contained the cover letter (see Appendix D) which served as the initial invitation for participation and included a description of the study’s purpose. A second invitation (see Appendix E) was distributed to those who had not completed the online survey by April 10, 2010. A third and final online survey invitation (see Appendix F) and link was distributed on April 20, 2010 allowing a full month for participants to complete the online survey. Those who did not respond by May 1, 2010 were disregarded due to mortality.

**Data Analysis**

Survey data was securely stored in *Survey Gizmo* or the researcher’s personal computer and exported to SPSS and Microsoft Excel for analysis. The data was analyzed in order to describe the current status of students with special needs in instrumental musical ensembles and to examine the effect of selected educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion.

**Research Question One:** *What is the rate of inclusion in K-12 instrumental musical ensembles, what types of student disabilities are most prevalent in those ensembles, and is this rate and representation in instrumental music congruent with K-12 education as a whole?* A respondents’ rate of inclusion was determined using his/her self-reported, overall ensemble enrollment and specified population of students with special needs. Simple descriptive statistics were used to
characterize the prevalence of various disabilities and then compared to current national inclusionary data.

**Research Question Two:** Do selected educator or institutional variables have significant effects on the rate of inclusion? Multiple regression with backward elimination was used to determine whether or not educator (gender, age, level of education, special education coursework, primary teaching area, and teaching experience) or institutional variables (geographic location, community setting, institution type, and student population) had any significant effects on the rate of inclusion.

**Research Question Three:** What challenges or issues arise when including students with special needs in the instrumental ensemble? This question was addressed using simple descriptive statistics.

**Research Question Four:** Are instrumental music educators prepared for inclusion and willing to accommodate students with special needs? Simple descriptive statistics were again used to answer research question number four.

**Significance of the Study**

As the world’s largest and most visible organization of professional music educators, MENC has devoted a significant amount of time and countless resources advocating for the inclusion of music among the core curriculum. Whether intentionally or otherwise, this pursuit has also resulted in language that justifies the inclusion of all individuals in the
study of music. If music is in fact a vital component of the core curriculum, it must be available to every individual, including students with special needs. Society, through the courts and legislative chambers, concurs that students of all abilities should have equal access to these and other experiences available in our public schools.

Since the passage of The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, public schools have been required to educate the historically segregated population of handicapped school children (The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1990) further mandates that all individuals with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment, typically considered the regular classroom, to the greatest extent possible (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990). Inclusion of students with special needs is not limited to any specific subject area, therefore, music educators must prepare to embrace this growing segment of the greater K-12 student population.

In fact, the percentage of students qualifying for special education services has increased substantially in the thirty-five years since the passage of The Education of All Handicapped Children Act. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), special education enrollment grew from 8.3% in 1976 to 13.6% of the total school-aged population by 2006 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). The rate at which these students are being identified may also be outpacing
the growth of K-12 student enrolment. While the number of students attending the nation’s public schools increased by 13.5% during the 1990’s, the number of students identified as learning disabled grew by 39% (McLeskey, Hoppey, Williamson, & Rentz, 2004). The number of students qualifying for special education services due to autism has risen 20 to 25 percent each year since the mid-1990’s as well (Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Disability Statistics and Demographics, 2009). It is worthwhile to note that there were eleven other categories of disability for which a student may qualify for special education and related services.

Music educators have a legal and professional obligation to ensure that these students, regardless of ability or disability, have equal access to all facets of the K-12 musical experience. Yet existing research indicates that students with special needs may not be participating in music classes at rates congruent with the general education student population. Furthermore, it appears that when students with special need do participate in music classes, they are more likely to be included in general or vocal music experiences than in instrumental musical ensembles.

This research sought to gather current data on the participation of student with special needs specific to the instrumental ensemble and to determine what educator or institutional factor or factors impact inclusion in this setting. The demographic information reported in this
study provide music educators with a better understanding of the types and frequencies of disabilities that may occur in instrumental musical ensembles as well. Because inclusion in such demanding music courses requires that music educators, administrators, special educators, support staff, parents, and peers are also prepared to work in inclusive settings, a discussion of the challenges associated with the inclusion of students with special needs and possible accommodations were also included in the study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This study was designed to describe the current status of students with special needs in the K-12 instrumental musical ensemble and to examine what factors affect the inclusion of these students in this setting. The literature review begins with a summary of the litigation and legislation establishing the educational rights of students with special needs. Databases made available by the Data Accountability Center (DAC), the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the National Center for Special Education Research (NCSER), the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), and the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Disability Statistics and Demographics (StatsRRTC) were also consulted to characterize changes in the nation’s school-aged special education population and to chronicle inclusionary trends since special education specific legislation was first passed in 1975.

In order to provide a foundation for this research and to better inform the content and distribution of the survey, a review of existing literature related to the inclusion of students with special needs within school music programs also took place. Utilizing a variety of electronic search engines including Academic Search Premier: EBSCO, Lexis Nexis,
JSTOR, ProQuest: Dissertation Abstract International, and Google Scholar among others, a variety of books, studies, articles, and resources were consulted. The resulting review of literature is organized into four sections: (1) special education legislation, (2) students with special needs, (3) inclusion of students with special needs in education, and (4) inclusion of students with special needs in music. To maintain the integrity of the literature reviewed in this chapter, the use of once familiar, but now obsolete, vocabulary (terms such as handicapped, disabled, mainstreaming, etc.) was preserved.

**Special Education Legislation**

**The Rehabilitation Act of 1973**

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 replaced the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and subsequent amendments of the 1940’s, 1950’s, and 1960’s and is considered the precursor to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). A number of amendments to the Rehabilitation Act have been enacted since its initial passage in 1973, the most recent added in 1992.

The Rehabilitation Act was the first piece of legislation intended to provide equal access for individuals with disabilities by addressing the hiring practices of the federal government (Title V, Section 501), removing architectural and transportation barriers (Title V, Section 502), prohibiting discrimination in the hiring of individuals with disabilities by Federal contractors or subcontractors (Title V, Section 503), and
ensuring that all entities receiving Federal financial assistance do not discriminate on the basis of a disability (Title V, Section 504). A priority to serve persons with severe disabilities is mandated through this legislation, as The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 seeks to:

(1) empower individuals with disabilities to maximize employment, economic self-sufficiency, independence, and inclusion and integration into society, through-

(A) statewide workforce investment systems implemented in accordance with title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 that include, as integral components, comprehensive and coordinated state-of-the-art programs of vocational rehabilitation;

(B) independent living centers and services;

(C) research;

(D) training;

(E) demonstration projects; and

(F) the guarantee of equal opportunity; and

(2) to ensure that the Federal Government plays a leadership role in promoting the employment of individuals with disabilities, especially individuals with significant disabilities, and in assisting States and providers of services in fulfilling the aspirations of such individuals with disabilities for meaningful
and gainful employment and independent living (The Rehabilitation Act of 1973).

Section 504 of The Rehabilitation Act of 1973

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, more specifically Title V, Section 504, typically referred to as “Section 504,” prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities by any program or activity conducted by Federal agencies or by programs or agencies receiving Federal funding. This would include public school districts, institutions of higher education, and a variety of other state and local education agencies.

Title V, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 reads:

No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States, as defined in section 7(6), shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance (The Rehabilitation Act of 1973).

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (EAHCA) also referred to as The Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) or Public Law 94-142, was enacted by the United States Congress and signed by President Gerald R. Ford on November 29, 1975. The 1983 amendments (Public Law 98-199) provided funding for demonstration projects and research in early intervention and childhood special education. Where
the original 1975 legislation guarantees services from ages six to 21, the 1986 amendments to The Education of the Handicapped Act (Public Law 99-457) guarantee early intervention services for children with disabilities beginning at birth to age two, and preschool services to children ages three through six. EAHCA aims to:

- assure that all children with disabilities have available to them...a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs,
- assure that the rights of children with disabilities and their parents...are protected,
- assist States and localities to provide for the education of all children with disabilities,
- assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate all children with disabilities...

This legislation not only established the right of children with disabilities to receive a “free and appropriate public education (FAPE),” but also provides access to related services, including audiology, counseling, occupational and physical therapy, psychological services, speech pathology, and medical diagnosis and evaluation among other services. EAHCA further requires that an Individualized Education Program (IEP) be implemented addressing the learning goals, needs, and accommodations for individuals and that, to the maximum extent
possible, students receive services in the Least Restrictive Environment (The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975).

**The Individual with Disabilities Education Act of 1990**

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 was reorganized and termed The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 (Public Law 101-476), was amended in 1991 (Public Law 102-119), and reauthorized and amended again in 1997 (Public Law 105-17), 2002 (Public Law 107-110), and 2004 (Public Law 108-446).

The reauthorization of EAHCA as IDEA 1990 brought about significant changes in the terminology used to describe “handicapped children.” “Children” are now referred to as “individuals” in IDEA and “handicapped” was replaced with the phrase “with disabilities.” In fact, “person-first” language is utilized throughout IDEA in lieu of “disability-first” language, i.e., “individuals with disabilities” rather than “handicapped individuals” or “disabled individuals.” The 1990 IDEA legislation also indentified autism and traumatic brain injury as distinct categories of disability, included rehabilitation counseling and social services among those “related services,” defined assistive technology devices and services, and required transition services for individuals with disabilities.

The IDEA Amendments of 1997 further emphasized the Individualized Education Program as the primary tool used in the planning, implementation, and evaluation stages of an individual’s
special education and the parent as a vital part of the process.

Reauthorization in 2002 and 2004 aligned IDEA with the No Child Left Behind Act, while altering the IEP process and content, defining the “highly qualified” special educator, and establishing new provisions for identifying specific learning disabilities (The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990).

**Implications for Educators**

Existing special education legislation establishes six key principles governing the education of individuals with disabilities. They are:

1. Zero reject – no student may be denied access to schools because he or she has a disability, regardless of the severity of that disability.
2. Non-discriminatory evaluation – requires schools to fairly evaluate students and, if necessary, to determine appropriate provisions, accommodations, and settings so as not to be discriminatory in any way.
3. Free and appropriate public education (FAPE) – provision granting individuals with disabilities access to general education and special education services, as deemed appropriate and without cost, as is provided to non-disabled students.
4. Least restrictive environment (LRE) – the environment best suited to meet the educational needs of the student; when possible, the setting in which non-disabled students are also educated.
5. Due process – provides for a formal review of provided services if requested by the parent or guardian of a student with special needs.
(6) Parental and student participation – encourages collaboration between special educators, school administrators, parents, and adolescent students throughout the planning and implementation of special education and related services (Hammel & Hourigan, 2011).

**Figure 2.** Special education legislation and the six principles of educating individuals with disabilities.

**Students with Special Needs**

The United States Department of Education’s National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) began monitoring compliance with The Education for All Handicapped Children Act following its passage 1975. During the initial 1976-1977 reporting period, NCES found that 3.7 million school-aged children received special education services through some type of federally supported program. This constituted 8.3% of the
total enrollment of all students in public school grades pre-kindergarten through grade 12 during the 1976-1977 academic year.

Initially, NCES data was gathered across nine categories of disability. Students were identified as having speech or language impairments (2.9% of the total student population), mental retardation (2.2%), learning disabilities (1.8%), emotional disturbance (.6%), other health impairments including students with “limited strength, vitality, or alertness due to chronic or acute health problems such as a heart condition, tuberculosis, rheumatic fever, nephritis, asthma, sickle cell anemia, hemophilia, epilepsy, lead poisoning, leukemia, or diabetes (.3%),” orthopedic impairments (.2%), and visual impairments (.1%).

NCES also reports .2% of the 1976-1977 special needs population as having “hearing impairments,” although legislation labeled them separately as “hard-of-hearing” and “deaf” at the time (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010).

Data was collected for two additional disability categories, “multihandicapped” and “deaf-blind” beginning with the 1978-1979 reporting period (Data Accountability Center, 2010). By the 1980-1981 reporting period, multiple disabilities accounted for .2% of the special education population, while deaf-blindness accounted for less than .05% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

The reauthorization of EHA in 1990 as The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (P.L. 101-476) instituted additional categories
of disability and brought about changes in labels, definitions, and criteria for qualifying individuals to ensure further access. Additional data was therefore gathered for students receiving services under two new categories, autism and traumatic brain injury, and by 1995-1996 incidences of autism accounted for .1% and traumatic brain injury, less than .05% of the total special education population. Again, those students previously classified as hard-of-hearing and deaf were labeled as hearing impaired as a result of the 1990 legislation. Developmental delay for students ages six through nine was the final addition to categories as a result of IDEA’s reauthorization in 1997. Initially, less than .05% of students with special needs received services under this new label (Data Accountability Center, 2010).

The most significant shift during the 35 years since EHAs passage was in the categories of specific learning disabilities category, where the portion of students identified increased from 1.8% in 1976 to 5.4% by the 2006-2007 reporting period. Additional increases were seen in the categories of other health impairments (.3% to 1.2%), speech and language (2.9% to 3%), and emotional disturbance (.6% to .9%). Declines were seen in the number of special needs students identified as having mental retardation (2.2% in 1976 to 1.1% in 2007-2008) and orthopedic impairments (.2% to .1%), with no significant changes in the number of hearing impairments or visual impairments since data was first gathered 30 years ago (Data Accountability Center, 2010).
Because of these changes in labeling and the recognition of additional disabilities since NCES began collection in 1976, this data, while helpful for purposes of this and similar research, should be interpreted with caution. Comparisons of data points across time or within specific categories of disability may not be useful due to the addition and consolidation of the original categories of disability. For instance, students with autism were not classified within a separate and distinct category until IDEA’s reauthorization in 1990, even though these individuals would have been eligible for services under the previous law. It may be interesting to note that the number of students qualifying for services under the mental retardation label has declined proportionately with an increase in the number of students identified with autism.

There have also been changes in the reporting of students within certain age groups, specifically, those preschooler’s ages 3 to 5. From the 1987-88 through the 1999-2000 reporting periods, preschoolers with any qualifying disability were placed in a distinct group. Prior to 1987 and after 2000, preschool-aged students with special needs were once again identified within the denoted disability categories alongside students ages 6-21. Another point of contention may be the inconsistent tracking and reporting standards. NCES relies on individual states to report overall enrollment figures and each states eligibility criteria within the 13 categories of disability may vary (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).
Over the course of the past three decades, the number of students qualifying for special education and/or related service has grown to 6.7 million students nationwide, an increase of 81% from the initial 1976 report to the 2007-2008 reporting period. This constitutes 13.6% of the total student population in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade schools in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. These increases in the number of the students receiving a special education may be attributed to true growth in this population, the addition of qualifying categories, changes in the criteria and process used to identify students with special needs, or a combination of growth and identification factors. Regardless of how and why students with special needs are identified, it is clear that approximately 14% of the current school-aged population may qualify for special education and related services and that the number of students qualifying for these services has more than doubled since the passage of The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010).

**Inclusion of Students with Special Needs in Education**

The 1986 Amendments to EHA (known today as IDEA, Part B) mandated the collection of data concerning the environments in which special education students received instruction. The categories of educational placements included: regular school, public separate school for students with disabilities, private separate school for students with disabilities, public residential facilities, private residential facilities, and
hospital/homebound placements. These environmental classifications were altered for 2006 reporting period to include categories for those students education in correctional facilities and those parentally place in private schools. Data for the categories public separate schools for students with disabilities and private separate schools was combined as was the public and private separate residential facility classifications (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

For the purposes of determining the extent of inclusion in today’s public and private schools, data for students with special needs educated in the regular school was further disaggregated according to the percentage of time spent inside and outside the regular classroom: those who received special education and related services outside the regular classroom for less than 21% of the school day, those who spent between 21% and 60% outside the regular classroom, and those who were educated outside the regular classroom for more than 60% of the school day. In these scenarios, students with special needs may receive services within the regular classroom or may be self-contained throughout all or part of the school day (Data Accountability Center, 2010).

The earliest complete data set utilizing the current environmental categories provided by NCES is from the 1989 reporting period. During that year, 24.9% of all students with disabilities in regular public schools spent more than 60% of the school days outside the regular education classroom. Additionally, 31.7% of all students spent less than 21% of
the school day outside the regular classroom, and the largest portion, 37.5%, were educated outside of the regular classroom between 21 and 61 percent of the school day. Almost 5% of all school-aged students with special needs were served in public (3.2%) and private (1.3%) separate schools specifically for students with disabilities as well. Students were placed in public residential facilities in 0.7% of all cases, 0.3% in private residential facilities, and 0.6% were considered homebound or hospitalized. Again, no data was collected for students with special needs educated in regular private schools or correctional facilities until the 2006 report (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

By 2004, environmental data was also reported specific to the 13 categories of recognized disability. Students with multiple disabilities were among those most often educated outside the regular classroom or in separate facilities. Almost 20% of school-aged students identified with multiple disabilities received educational and related services in separate schools for students with disabilities while another 2.2% were placed in public or private residential facilities; an additional 2.2 were homebound or hospitalized. The remaining 45.2% spent more than 60% of the school day outside the regular classroom but in regular schools, while another 16.9% spent between 21% and 60% and the remaining 12.8% spent less than 21% of the school day outside the regular classroom. Students who qualified for special education services due to deaf-blindness, emotional disturbances, or autism were also more likely to receive those services in
special facilities or classes. Those with speech or language impairments were most likely to be included, some 88.3% spending less than 21% of the school day outside the regular classroom. Students with other health impairments and developmental delays also spent large portions of the school day in the regular class (National Center for Education Statistics, 2006).

Environmental categories were altered for the 2006 reporting period. By then, 53.7% of all special education students enrolled in public schools spent less than 21% of the school day outside the regular classroom, an increase from the 31.7% who spent the same portion of the school day in special classes in 1989. Similarly, 23.7% were spending between 21 and 60 percent and only 17.6% were spending more than 60% of the school day outside the regular class environment. For the 2006 report, data for public and private separate schools were combined with 2.9% of the special education population receiving instruction and services in this school setting. Likewise, data for students with special needs enrolled in public and private residential facilities was aggregated, accounting for 0.4% of the total special education population. The year 2006 was the first time data was made available for enrollment in regular private schools, 1%, and correctional facilities, 0.4% of the total special needs population (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).
As of the most recent NCES report, 56.8% of all students with special needs enrolled in regular schools spent less than 21% of the day outside the regular classroom. Another 22.4% of students spent between 21 and 60 percent of the school day in the regular classroom while the smallest portion of regular school special education students, 15.4%, received instructional and/or other services outside the regular classroom for more than 60% of the school day. Three percent were educated in separate schools dedicated to the special needs populations. Smaller portions, 0.4%, were served in separate residential facilities, correctional facilities, or were homebound/hospitalized. Another 1.1% were placed in regular private schools by their parents or guardians (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010; Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 2009).

The Data Accountability Center (2010) suggests that data collected since the 2006 reporting period is not comparable with that of earlier periods due to changes in the environmental definitions and categories. Because few reports have been published since the most recent changes were implemented, it is difficult to characterize trends for including students with special needs within specific classroom environments or educational facilities at this time. This data though does provided some indication of the prevalence of students with certain disabilities in today’s public and private schools, residential facilities, hospitals, homes, and corrections facilities. Educators should note that almost 95% of all
6-21 year old students with special needs were educated in regular, public school during the most recent reporting period. Within these public educational facilities, special education students were most often included in the regular classroom for at least 80% of the school day (Data Accountability Center, 2010).

**Inclusion of Students with Special Needs in Music**

One of the earliest studies concerning the mainstreaming of exceptional children in music was conducted in 1976. Shehan (1977) surveyed Ohio music supervisors in order to describe the educational placement of handicapped children and to determine the extent of training for those music educators responsible for working with disabled students. Overall, 79% of responding music supervisors reported that mainstreaming was practiced within their school districts, while only 6% indicated that exceptional children were mainstreamed in all subjects. More than 62% of the respondents stated that educable mentally retarded students were mainstreamed in their school district. Additionally, only 6.25% of school districts mainstreamed those labeled trainable mentally retarded, learning disabled and physically handicapped students were mainstreamed at a rate of 21.87%, and emotionally disturbed/behaviorally disordered, hearing impaired, and visually handicapped were mainstreamed in 18.75% of the reporting districts.
Many responding Ohio music supervisors indicated that exceptional children received music instruction within “special music classes” (p. 50). The educable mentally retarded were most likely to receive such provisions (in 34.27% of responding districts), followed by the learning disabled (21.7%), emotionally disturbed/behaviorally disordered (18.75%), physically handicapped (12.75%), hearing impaired (9.37%), and trainable mentally retarded or visually handicapped in 6.25% of reporting districts.

Shehan (1977) also found that the vast majority of music educators are not trained to work with exceptional children in special music classes or the mainstreamed setting. Only 9.36% of responding administrators employed music teachers with coursework in special education while 18.72% reported their music educators had participated in some in-service training. More than 62.56% of school districts though recommended that music educators complete coursework, training, or a degree program that would better prepare them for mainstreaming the music classroom (Shehan, 1977).

Similar student demographics were obtained from an attitudinal survey of elementary and secondary general, choral, and instrumental music educators in three North Carolina school systems. Respondents indicated that students who were educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, or emotionally disturbed were most likely to be mainstreamed
into the music classroom. Teachers most often worked with the educable mentally retarded in “homogeneous” settings as well (White, 1981, p. 38).

Gilbert and Asmus (1981) conducted a nationwide survey of general, instrumental, and vocal elementary and secondary music educators to determine their familiarity with pertinent special education legislation, the extent of their involvement with disabled students, and their needs when working with this population. Of the 789 surveys received, 90.3% of all general music teachers reported classroom contact with handicapped students, while only 60.5% of choral and 55.8% of all instrumental music educators indicated a similar history. The survey also asked individuals to identify their primary grade level, with 53.7% of secondary and 76.8% of responding elementary level music educators indicating some experience working with mainstreamed students. Overall, 62.9% of those surveyed across all grade levels and specialty areas had professional experiences with handicapped students.

While the majority of those surveyed were responsible for teaching handicapped children, only 23.8% participated in the development of their students’ Individualized Education Program. Approximately three-quarters of all respondents also indicated a need for information pertaining to P.L. 94-142 and/or techniques and strategies for mainstreaming. Secondary instrumental and vocal music educators, who indicated less experience teaching handicapped children and involvement in IEP development than their elementary and general music
counterparts, demonstrated a higher level of concern in the operation and management of the mainstreamed music classroom (Gilbert & Asmus, 1981).

In an effort to illustrate mainstreaming practices in the Southern United States, Atterbury (1986) surveyed a random sample of 440 (10%) elementary music specialists who held membership in MENC’s Southern Division. Of the 133 responses received (30%), 69.7% indicated they taught only elementary general music for at least half the school day, instructing, on average, 717 students each week. Of these, 5.3% were identified as mainstreamed students.

The questionnaire also asked elementary music educators to respond to 12 administrative, instructional, and mainstreaming belief statements using a 3-point Likert scale. The overwhelming majority of respondents, 98%, indicated they had moderate or no administrative support in terms of scheduling, assistance from teacher aides, or information pertaining to mainstreamed individuals. Fifty-one percent indicated a moderate amount of adapted instructional materials were available in order to meet the needs of mainstreamed learners; 6% indicated a high level and 43% indicated a low level of instructional assistance. Respondents believed that mainstreamed students were highly, moderately, or not successful at rates of 25%, 61%, and 14% respectively. Overall indications were that participating elementary music educators lacked appropriate administrative support, were not
included in I.E.P. development, and felt their music classes contained too many mainstreamed children (Atterbury, 1986).

In the late 1980s, Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) investigated the perceived status and effectiveness of mainstreaming in two Midwestern states. A survey was distributed to 5% of Iowa and Kansas music educators \( (n = 350) \), of which 76% and 70% responded respectively. Participants provided demographic information on specialty area, age groups taught, and mainstreaming experience. In the state of Kansas, 58.5% of responding elementary and secondary music educators mainstreamed handicapped students compared with 41.5% of Iowa music teachers. The majority held teaching positions in grades K-6 with combined teaching duties in instrumental, choral, and or general music.

Four and five point scales were used to assess respondents’ educational preparation and amount of instructional support as well. A mean score of 10.78, where 5.00 designated no preparation and 25.00 maximum preparation, indicated that Kansas and Iowa music educators completed limited coursework or received little training relevant to mainstreaming. Only one quarter completed college coursework related to mainstreaming, psychology being named most frequently. In terms of instructional support, the study revealed that only 13% of respondents were engaged in the IEP process, 21% were involved in placement decisions, and 27% were assisted by aides. While 65% of responding music teachers were expected to mainstream handicapped students, only
1% was granted extra preparation time, 18% felt they had adequate time to individualize instruction, and 31% had adequate resource materials.

In Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990), 56% of respondents reported that students with emotional or behavioral disorders were the most difficult to work with. Between 20% and 40% of all participants also experienced difficulty mainstreaming students who were hearing impaired, educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, trainably mentally retarded, visually impaired, physically handicapped, and those with speech or communication disorders. A smaller portion, 9%, encountered obstacles mainstreaming those diagnosed with other health impairments such as sickle cell or cystic fibrosis (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990).

Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994) developed a questionnaire to examine mainstreaming practices in Arizona and to, in part, compare those results to that presented by Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990). Music educators with K-12 teaching experience were systematically selected from the Arizona Music Educators Association membership roster and surveyed to collect demographic information on grade level, teaching area, level of education, teaching experience in years, number of special needs students taught, and school/district policies on inclusion or lack thereof. Of the 107 usable responses (53% response rate), 84% of those questioned were currently teaching special learners, 50% stated that only a portion of their schools special learners were mainstreamed.
into music classes and 42% indicated that all were mainstreamed. Mainstreaming of special learners was the only music placement available at more than three-quarters of respondents’ schools, while 15% of those surveyed indicated such students also received instruction in “special classes” (p. 97). Approximately 6% indicated that they had no mainstreaming experience whatsoever, the majority of those being instrumental music teachers.

Although 94% of Arizona music educators had worked with special learners at some point in their teaching career, more than 40% received no training pertinent to the mainstreamed classroom. Others prepared for teaching special learners by attending in-service workshops (20%), completing a college course (8%), participating in both a college course and workshop (4%), or received some training as part of a course in education (10%). Only 7% completed multiple college courses and workshops pertaining to mainstreaming special learners. While Arizona music educators received little training in special education, nearly 62% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the statement, “I feel successful in my teaching of special learners” (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994, p. 100).

Arizona music educators were also asked to characterize the special needs population by specific disability. Sixty-nine percent reported working with students having learning disabilities, 55% with emotionally/behaviorally disordered students, 39% worked with the
speech impaired, and 33% and 32% taught students with physical handicaps or hearing impairments respectively. Respondents also indicated working with students having the following disabilities: educable mentally handicapped (29%), visually handicapped (22%), trainable mentally handicapped (19%), multiply disabled (13%), and 8% reported having a history of teaching students with autism. Additionally, 16% of those surveyed worked with students having disabilities not among those listed on the questionnaire. Results of this study indicate that music educators perceive students with emotional/behavioral disorders to be the most difficult to mainstream. Participants also identified physically handicapped and speech-impaired students among those easiest to mainstream.

Only 8% of respondents indicated that they were involved in placement decisions for these students and only 3% of Arizona music programs mainstreamed disabled students on the basis of musical achievement. Six percent felt they were given sufficient time to prepare individualized programs for each special learner and 12% engaged in ongoing consultation with special educators (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphrey, 1994).

Sideridis and Chandler (1995) found that 85.7% of a random sample of Kansas elementary music educators \( n = 54 \) had experience working with children with developmental disabilities. The vast majority, 98.1%, indicated that they had worked with children with learning
disabilities, 88.5% worked with those having emotional/behavioral 
disorders, 61.5% with children with mental retardation, and 59.6% and 
52.9% worked with students having orthopedic or multiple disabilities 
respectively. A smaller percentage of Kansas music educators worked 
with students who were deaf (18%), blind (7%) and those with autism 
(1.8%) and attention deficit disorder (1.8%).

Utilizing an original survey, The Teacher Integration Attitudes 
Questionnaire (TIAQ), the researchers discovered that music teachers 
had negative attitudes toward integrating students with multiple 
handicaps ($M = 2.50$, where “1” indicated a positive attitude and “4” a 
negative attitude), mental retardation ($M = 2.61$), and emotional and 
behavioral disorders ($M = 2.78$). More positive attitudes were displayed 
regarding integrating children with orthopedic handicaps ($M = 2.06$) or 
learning disabilities ($M = 1.83$).

In terms of music teacher preparation and instructional 
assistance, Sideridis and Chandler (1995) reported that 40.4% of 
participants had less than three hours of college coursework credits in 
special education while others had up to 12 college credits; the mean 
was 2.98 college credits. Responses to attitudinal statements indicated 
that general music teachers were willing to participate in additional 
workshops though ($M = 1.85$, where “1” was “strongly agree” and “4” was 
“strongly disagree”). While adequate support services were provided ($M =
teachers lacked the required funding ($M = 3.19$) and materials ($M = 2.98$) for effective integration to take place (Sideridis & Chandler, 1995).

Using the instrument created by Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994) and distributed in Arizona, Atterbury (1998) surveyed a random sample of 300 music educators in the state of Maine. Of the 111 respondents (return rate of 39%), 58% stated that they received aid from paraprofessionals while teaching, 46% consulted with special educators to their satisfaction, and 39% were involved in the formulation of IEPs for their students. When compared to results reported by Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994), Maine music educators reported a higher level of support from special educators and greater involvement in the IEP process. Although only 21% of participants had participated in a workshop related to special education and 62% completed a college course with a similar focus, all respondents indicated they taught students with special needs (Atterbury, 1998).

New Jersey music educators were surveyed by Cooper (1999) to music mainstreaming practices and teacher opinions. Of the 500 questionnaires distributed, 301 were returned and 233 were deemed usable (47%). In addition to collecting demographic information about the survey respondents and his/her school and students, participants completed three open-ended questions and responded to 18 Likert-type opinion statements. Reported mainstreaming rates varied from 44.6% for teachers of general music classes, 24.9% for instrumental music
educators, 18.9% for individuals with combined teaching areas, and choral educators included special needs students at a rate of 7.7%. Students with “perceptual impairments (73%)” were most often mainstreamed in music classes, while students with “other learning disabilities (11.6%)” were seen least frequently. It was the perception of respondents that emotionally disturbed or behaviorally disturbed (28.3% each) students were easiest to included while students with perceptual impairments (36.9%) were believed to be the most difficult to accommodate. Those surveyed reported that the greatest benefit of mainstreaming was socialization skills (56.3% of respondents) and disruptive behavior (36.5%) was the most frequent problem associated with inclusion.

Cooper (1999) also found that approximately one-third (33.3%) of those surveyed had no preparation or training specific to special education, while 73.3% attended workshops, 21.9% and 17.5% completed undergraduate or graduate coursework respectively. Similar to the findings of Atterbury (1986) and Gilbert and Asmus (1981), few respondents indicated that they were part of the IEP development (15.9%) and only 3.9% indicated that they were involved in placement decisions (Cooper, 1999).

Graduate research conducted by Linsenmeier (2004) focused specifically on special education students in high school bands and choirs. A survey of 942 band and choir directors at 471 mid-sized Ohio
high schools found that only 5.86% of all special education students were involved in high school band. Meanwhile, 15% of all regular education students at the same Ohio high schools participated in band activities. Of the 165 responding band directors, 154 (94.86%) were currently teaching special education students in an ensemble setting. While the vast majority of participants were teaching in an inclusive setting, less than half of the band and choir directors who participated in follow-up telephone interviews indicated that they had completed a college level course related to special education (Linsenmeier, 2004).

Shelfo (2007) also conducted graduate level research in order to describe the status of inclusion in the instrumental music programs of Maryland and to gauge the attitudes of instrumental music educators towards teaching in inclusive environments. Of the 214 respondents, the majority, 67.3%, taught band, 17.8% strings, and the remaining 15% a combination of the two. Nearly half, 47.7%, worked at the elementary school level, 30.4% middle school, 14.5% high school, while others taught multiple grade levels.

While an overall rate of inclusion was not established, instrumental music teachers reported the frequency of special education students served in Maryland’s instrumental music programs based on disability. All types of disabilities were represented, with higher incidences of students with a specific learning disability, speech/language impairment, or serious emotional disturbance.
More than half of responding instrumental teachers, 51.4%, indicated that the regular band, orchestra, or general music class was the only instructional environment available for music students with disabilities. Self-contained music classes were available in 31.3% of all cases and music therapy services were offered in 5.6% of responding schools. Almost two-thirds, 63.6%, of reported no participation in the development of the IEP and 57.9% had no input in placement decisions. Class placement decisions were most often based on the LRE principle, followed by placement determined by ability level, and finally, inclusion for the purpose of socialization.

Shelfo (2007) also investigated the extent to which Maryland instrumental music teachers were trained to teach special education students. College coursework or in-service training in child psychology or child development was most often identified. More than three-quarters (76.5%) of those respondents with one to five years work experience engaged in pre-service fieldwork as a college student. Only 25.7% of veteran teachers, participants with more than 25 years teaching experience, had similar undergraduate experiences. In-service training was made available once or twice per year, typically at the request of staff. Despite limited training, Maryland band and orchestra directors were familiar with special education terminology (Shelfo, 2007).
Summary

A review of existing data demonstrates that the number of school-aged children identified as special needs, and therefore the number of students qualifying for special education services in our schools, has grown substantially in the more than 35 years since the passage of The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. Not only has there been an increase in the number of students qualifying for and receiving services, but the demographic make-up of today’s special education population has evolved. Likewise, the types of services offered and the environment in which services are unlike those of the past.

Today, the overwhelming majority of students with special needs are educated in regular public schools and spend the greatest portion of the school day in the regular classroom setting. However, existing research in music indicates that students with special needs may not be included in music classes at rates comparable with their regular education peers. Moreover, most descriptive studies concerning inclusion in music focused on the elementary and/or general music setting and were typically conducted within a single state or region.

Data specific to the inclusion of students with special needs in the instrumental musical ensemble or classroom is virtually nonexistent. This study determined the rate of inclusion among responding instrumental music educators and institutions in six selected states. The effect of educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion
was also considered. As music educators in previous studies desired more information to better include students with special needs, this research described the prevalence of students with specific disabilities, while assessing what challenges and accommodations are most often associated with inclusion in instrumental musical ensembles.
CHAPTER 3

METHODODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe the current status of students with special needs in instrumental musical ensembles and to examine the effect of selected educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion. Following a review of the research questions addressed, this chapter describes: (1) Research Design, (2) Subjects, (3) the Survey Instrument, (4) Procedure, and (5) Data Analysis.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following four research questions:

(1) What is the rate of inclusion in K-12 instrumental musical ensembles, what types of student disabilities are most prevalent in those ensembles, and is this rate and representation in instrumental music congruent with K-12 education as a whole?

(2) Do selected educator or institutional variables have significant effects on the rate of inclusion?

(3) What challenges or issues arise when including students with special needs in the instrumental musical ensemble?

(4) Are instrumental music educators prepared for inclusion and willing to accommodate students with special needs?
Research Design

This quantitative, non-experimental study utilized the survey method as the primary means of data collection. The original survey was developed by the researcher, informed by a thorough review of the literature and questionnaires utilized in previous studies, and evaluated by a panel of expert music educators and special educators prior to its online implementation using Survey Gizmo. When possible, the information gathered in response to the online survey was compared to special education and disability data made available to the public.

Subjects

Existing literature concerning inclusion in music typically focused on music educators within a specific state, utilizing a variety of different research methods, survey instruments, or interview protocols (Cooper, 1999, New Jersey; Damer, 1979, North Carolina; Darrow, 1999, Kansas; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994, Arizona; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990, Iowa and Kansas; Jellison, 1992, Texas; Linsenmeier, 2004, Ohio; Sharrock, 2007, South Carolina; Shehan, 1977, Ohio; Shello, 2007, Maryland; Sideridis & Chandler, 1995, Kansas; White, 1981, North Carolina). Few studies sampled music teachers from multiple states (Atterbury, 1986, MENC Southern Division; Gilbert & Asmus, 1981, nationwide), while others addressed teachers of students with specific disabilities (Darrow & Gfeller, 1991, teachers of the hearing impaired; Darrow, 1999, teachers of students with severe disabilities) or
other music professionals (Furman & Steele, 1982, private music teachers; Jones & Cardinal, 1998, music therapists). In most instances, music educators with a teaching focus in elementary or general music constituted the majority of respondents. This study attempted to produce data from a more varied geographic representation of the United States, utilizing a single research method and a uniform survey instrument, with a focus on inclusion in the instrumental musical ensemble.

The subjects of this study, therefore, were elementary, middle, and high school (K-12) instrumental music educators in the states of Idaho, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, and Rhode Island who held an active membership in their local association(s) of instrumental music educators. A convenience sample of 600 instrumental music educators was provided by state chapters of MENC: The National Association for Music Education (MENC), the National Band Association (NBA), the National Symphony Orchestra Association (NSOA), and/or the American String Teachers Association (ASTA). Factors for the selection of the aforementioned states were: 1) the absence of existing literature focusing on inclusion in music within those specific states, 2) the availability of a comprehensive membership roster, including members’ institution or personal e-mail addresses, and, 3) the researchers direct association with instrumental music education associations in the states of
Mississippi and Nebraska and a professional relationship with at least one music educator in many of the remaining states.

Membership rosters were obtained from officers of state associations’ of instrumental music educators or from databases available to the public via the World Wide Web. In order to ensure that only active K-12 music educators were selected as participants, any association member indicating a status of “student,” “retired,” “college/university,” “honorary,” or “private/studio instructor” were eliminated. Individuals with teaching responsibilities in instrumental music during all or part of the school day were considered.

Of the 600 invitatory emails distributed, eleven (11) were returned undeliverable. Additionally, seventeen (17) recipients contacted the researcher by email indicating they were no longer active K-12 instrumental music educators or had no current teaching responsibilities in instrumental music. The resulting number of valid participants therefore was 572. After the third email invitation, 181 surveys were submitted at an initial return rate of 31.6%. Of the 181 responses received, a total of 166 respondents completed the online survey to the satisfaction of the researcher for a final response rate of 29%.

Of the 166 instrumental music educators who submitted usable responses, 72.3% taught band for the largest portion of the school day, 11.4% strings, 9.6% general music, 1.8% choir, and 4.8% listed their primary teaching area as “other.” All respondents had some
instructional responsibilities in instrumental music, with more than 70% teaching in one or more middle or high school grade levels (6th-12th).

The average population of the respondents’ schools was 844 students. The vast majority of participants, 94%, were teaching at public schools, 4.2% at private schools, 1.2% at charter schools, and the remaining 0.6% at military or boarding schools. Descriptors for the community in which these institutions were located included rural (44.2%), suburban (38.8%), and urban (17%) areas in the states of: Mississippi (30.3%), Nebraska (27.3%), New Mexico (13.3%), Idaho (11.5%), Nevada (10.9%), and Rhode Island (6.6%).

Music educator demographics for gender were, female (36.4%) and male (63.6%). Responses to age included: 6.1% between the ages of 20 and 25, 13.3% were 26 to 30, 10.3% were 31 to 35, 8.5% were 36 to 40, 10.9% were 41 to 45, 17% were 46 to 50, 15.2% were 51 to 55, and 18.8% were aged 56 or older. This study also asked participants to describe their educational preparation in terms of highest degree attained, bachelor’s (33.7%), master’s (59%), specialist (1.8%) doctorate (4.8%), and a single individual (0.6%), “master’s pus 36.” More than 42% had no undergraduate coursework in special education. Ninety-two percent were certified to teach band, 71% general music, 60.5% orchestra/strings, 59.3% choir, and 15.4% were qualified to teach in other areas including elementary education, English, foreign languages, history, mathematics, and technology. The average number of years
teaching experience for responding music educators was 16 years, with an average of nine years teaching at the respondents’ current institution.

The Survey Instrument

Survey Instrument Development

Existing surveys from earlier special education in music research was collected and reviewed by the researcher, including those used by Damer (1979), Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden (1990), Linsenmeier (2004), Sharrock (2007), and Shelfo (2007). Additionally, the researcher requested copies of survey instrument from Cooper (1999), Gilbert & Asmus (1981), and Sideridis & Chandler (1995). The authors of those research endeavors indicated that a digital or paper copy of the survey was no longer available. The researcher could not locate current contact information or received no replies to requests from authors Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys (1994), Shehan (1977), or colleagues of the late Betty W. Atterbury (1986).

After analyzing the format and individual items utilized in these existing questionnaires, an original survey was developed by the researcher (see Appendix G) and launched using Survey Gizmo. Survey Gizmo provides “Enterprise Level” accounts to students engaged in academic research at no cost to the researcher(s) or the institution. Users at the “Enterprise Level” are able to create and launch an unlimited number of surveys using a variety of standard or customizable question formats. The online software also offers secure storage of
responses and allows for the data to be exported in a number of formats for additional analysis. The resulting online survey included 20 items organized into four distinct sections: 1.) music educator demographics, 2.) community and institutional demographics, 3.) music program demographics, and 4.) inclusion.

Survey Instrument Design

Section I: The Music Educator

Questions one through seven asked instrumental music educators to provide basic demographic information concerning their gender, age, level of education, and teaching experience. Subjects identified their gender as either female or male in question one. Question number two limited responses to the age variable within the confines of eight categories: “twenty to twenty-five, twenty-six to thirty, thirty-one to thirty-five, thirty-six to forty, forty-one to forty-five, forty-six to fifty, fifty-one to fifty-five” and, “fifty-six years of age or older.”

Subjects were also asked to indicate their level of education in terms of degree attainment, current area(s) of teaching certification, and whether or not their college education included coursework specific to special education. Question three included choices for respondents to indicate the most advanced degree held as “Bachelor’s Degree,” “Master’s Degree,” “Specialist Degree,” or “Doctorate.” An option of “Other” with request for specification was given for cases where one of the four given degrees did not adequately reflect the respondents’ academic credentials.
Participating music educators indicated if they were certified to teach “Band,” “Choir,” “General Music,” “Orchestra/Strings,” and/or “Other (please specify)” in question four. The fifth question prompted respondents to indicate whether they had at least one undergraduate or graduate general special education course, at least one undergraduate or graduate level special education in music course, or no such courses.

The final two questions of Section I asked responding music educators to record the number of years they have instructed instrumental music as well as the number of years teaching at their current school. Both questions asked that the current academic year be included in the count.

Section II: Community and School Setting

Section II of the survey posed four questions concerning the subjects’ school and community. Respondents were asked to select the state in which their school was located in question eight and characterize the community within which the institution was located in question nine. Choices to describe “community” in question nine were: “Rural,” “Suburban,” or “Urban.” In question 10, respondents were asked to describe their institution as a “Boarding School,” “Charter School,” “Private School,” or “Public School” with an additional open response for “Other (please specify).” The final question of survey Section II required respondents to record the approximate total student population of their school in an open response format.
Section III: The Music Program

The purpose of this section was to gather enrollment data while also differentiating between regular and special education students currently participating in instrumental ensembles. Question 12 asked respondents to identify their primary teaching area as “Band,” “Choir,” “General Music,” “Orchestra/Strings,” or “Other” with request for specification. While this research does not concern inclusion in general music or choir, it may be possible that the respondents’ primary area of teaching was choir or general music with some additional responsibilities teaching instrumental music. An option to select “Other” is made available for those who spent the greater portion of the school day teaching keyboarding, guitar, an instrumental music class, or any other subject.

In question 13, respondents were asked to identify the grade level or levels in which instrumental music instruction was offered at their institution. Grade levels were listed individually rather than in given ranges, i.e. 6th-8th grades, as any combination of grade levels may be housed on a single campus and instrumental music is introduced at varying grade levels. The terms “elementary,” “middle,” and “high” school were deliberately avoided due to inconsistencies in their definitions across various states and school districts.

Questions 14 and 15 requested overall enrollment figures for those instrumental ensembles offered. Respondents were also asked to identify
the number of students with special needs who qualified for an IEP and to further characterize student disabilities within the 13 recognized categories: autism, deaf-blindness, developmental delay, emotional disturbance, hearing impairment, mental retardation, multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, specific learning disability, speech or language impairment, traumatic brain injury, or visual impairment.

Section IV: Inclusion

The final section of the survey required respondents to first illustrate the extent to which instructional and administrative aspects of their teaching position impacted their ability to include students with special needs (question 16). Administrative and instructional considerations presented in question 16 included:

A. Administrative Support
B. Availability of Materials
C. Class Enrollment/Size
D. Classroom/School Physical Layout
E. Funding
F. Group Travel
G. Info. and/or Training to Teach SSN Students
H. Info. for Individual SSN
I. Parental Support
J. Performance Expectations
K. Planning Time
L. School Scheduling
M. Support from SPED Faculty/Paraprofessionals
N. Teaching Load

These fourteen administrative and teaching considerations were present alongside a five-point scale: 1. Always, 2. Often, 3. Sometimes, 4. Rarely, 5. Never.

In Section IV, question 17, responding instrumental music educators were asked to indicate, from their own observations and experiences, the extent to which students with special needs are able to accomplish a variety of musical and nonmusical tasks associated with participation in a performing ensemble. These eleven tasks listed in question 17 were:

A. Acceptable Behavior
B. Acceptable Interactions with Other Students
C. Finger Dexterity/Fingerings
D. Instrument Carriage/Hand Positions
E. Memorization
F. Movement/Marching
G. Non-Musical Responsibilities
H. Public Performance
I. Rhythm Performance/Reading
J. Sight-Reading
K. Tone Production

Survey item 17 utilized a five-point scale similar to that used in the previous question: 1. Never, 2. Rarely, 3. Sometimes, 4. Often, 5. Always. Respondents were asked how likely they would be to administer a given set of customary accommodations, using the following scale: 1. Not at All Likely, 2. Not Very Likely, 3. Neutral, 4. Somewhat Likely, and 5. Very Likely. Conventional accommodations that may be offered to students with special needs in an instrumental musical ensemble, included in question 18 were:

A. Abbreviated/Altered Assessment/Audition
B. Altered/Arranged Music Notation
C. Altered Instrument Carriage/Manipulation
D. Instrument Assignment/Selection Flexibility
E. Longer Playing Time Before Audition/Assessment
F. Mentoring/Peer Partnering with RegEd Student
G. Modify Ensemble Instruction Pace
H. Preferential Seating/Field/Performance Placement
I. Private Lessons
J. SpEd Paraprofessionals During Instruction

Question 19 allowed survey participants to describe any positive or negative experiences with inclusion in an open response format. Respondents who demonstrated an unusually high rate of inclusion in an instrumental ensemble and indicated a willingness to participate in
follow-up questioning were asked to provide contact information including their name, school, phone number, and email address at the conclusion of the survey (item 20).

**Assessment of the Survey Instrument**

A pilot study of the online survey instrument was conducted prior to its implementation. Five professional educators, including one K-12 special educator and an instrumental music educator currently practicing at the elementary, middle, high school, and collegiate levels were asked to evaluate the online survey instrument in terms of clarity, appropriateness, content, and format. Each reviewer was supplied, via email, a Pilot Cover Letter (see Appendix B), an Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form (see Appendix C), and a web link to the online survey. The Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form asked the evaluators to respond to the following five questions using Likert-type scales:

1. Are the online survey directions clear?
2. Is the format of individual questions and items appropriate?
3. Does the order and flow of the online survey seem logical?
4. Does the wording of questions and statements appear to be sensitive to the issue of students with special needs, disabilities, and inclusion?
5. Does the online survey appropriately serve the purpose of describing inclusion in the instrumental musical ensemble?
Additionally, the Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form requested that evaluators provide either “yes” or “no” responses, with editing recommendations, to the following questions:

6. Are there any grammatical errors?

7. Would you add to, delete, or alter any of the administrative and instructional considerations presented in item 16?

8. Would you add to, delete, or alter any of the musical and non-musical tasks presented in item 17?

9. Would you add to, delete, or alter any of the accommodations presented in item 18?

10. Did you experience any technical issues associated with Survey Gizmo or the use of an online survey?

Question eleven asked reviewers to estimate the time needed to complete the online survey. Durations ranged from eleven minutes to twenty-one minutes with the average completion time being sixteen minutes. The final question, question twelve, afforded evaluators the opportunity to present any additional comments, questions, concerns, or suggestions for improvement.

Reliability and Validity of the Survey Instrument

Content validity of the online survey instrument was established by a review of the literature related to inclusion in music and an examination of existing questionnaires. A number of items included in the online survey were modeled after questions and statements utilized
in existing surveys (Damer, 1979; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Linsenmeier, 2004; Sharrock, 2007; Shelfo, 2007). As previously stated, the online survey instrument was reviewed by a panel of experts to further establish content validity and to examine items of face validity, including the clarity, appropriateness, and format of the online survey instrument. The responses for questions one through five of the Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

*Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1. No</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5. Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Directions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Format</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Flow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the responses received for questions one through five of the Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form, the panel of evaluators found the survey instrument to be sufficient for the purposes of this study. The few typographical errors identified in response to question six of the Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form were corrected. Recommendations for the addition, deletion, and/or alteration
of administrative and instructional considerations, musical and non-musical tasks, or accommodations presented in online survey items 16, 17, and 18 were considered by the researcher and modified where appropriate as well. There were no reported technical issues associated with the use of Survey Gizmo. Once the necessary alterations to the online survey instrument were completed, the resulting survey was again submitted to the panel with no further recommendations for improvement.

**Procedure**

The online survey instrument was created by the researcher and evaluated by a panel of expert music educators and special educators. The survey was launched using the online survey software Survey Gizmo. Prior to the distribution of the survey, application to proceed with this study was submitted to and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (see Appendix A).

A link to the online survey was attached to an electronic invitation (see Appendix D) sent to all subjects. The initial invitation was distributed via personal or institutional email on April 1, 2010. On the tenth day of the study, a follow-up e-mail (see Appendix E) was submitted to those who had yet to respond to the original invitation. The final request for participation was submitted via e-mail on April 20, 2010 (see Appendix F). This allowed a full month for requests for participation.
to be fulfilled. Those who did respond by May 1, 2010 were disregarded due to mortality.

The timing of such a survey was considered in order to maximize the number of participants and the accuracy of responses. In the experience of the researcher, music educators are typically engaged in concert, contest, and festival preparations throughout the months of January, February, and March. May and June mark the conclusion of the academic year for a majority of schools as well. It was the desire of the researcher to avoid those times that would limit the likelihood of music educators choosing to participate in this endeavor. An April distribution also ensured that the responding music educators had nearly the entirety of an academic year to assess the students with special needs in their classes and to administer appropriate accommodations.

**Data Analysis**

The resulting data was gathered and securely stored by *Survey Gizmo*. The data was later exported from *Survey Gizmo* in Microsoft Excel for initial analysis. Further analysis utilizing SPSS was conducted with the assistance of the Nebraska Evaluation and Research (NEAR) Center. The data was analyzed in order to describe the current status of students with special needs in instrumental musical ensembles and to examine the effect of selected educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion.
**Research Question One:** What is the rate of inclusion in K-12 instrumental musical ensembles, what types of student disabilities are most prevalent in those ensembles, and is this rate and representation in instrumental music congruent with K-12 education as a whole? The rate of inclusion was determined using enrollment data provided by the participants. Students with special needs were indentified and categorized by qualifying disability as well. The overall rate of inclusion among responding instrumental music educators and the disability data provided was compared to special education data provided by the following entities and studies: the Data Accountability Center (DAC), the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the National Center for Special Education Research (NCSER), the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Disability Statistics and Demographics (StatsRRTC), the Annual Disability Statistics Compendium, the Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Digest of Education Statistics, and the National Longitudinal Transition Study – 2.

**Research Question Two:** Do selected educator or institutional variables have significant effects on the rate of inclusion? In addressing research question two, multiple regression with backward elimination was conducted to determine if educator factors, including gender, age,
level of education, special education coursework, and years of teaching experience had any significant effect on rates of inclusion. The same analysis was performed in order to determine the effect of the institutional variables location, community setting, school type, and school population, on rates of inclusion as well.

**Research Question Three:** What challenges or issues arise when including students with special needs in the instrumental ensemble? Simple descriptive statistics were used to describe the perceived roll of instructional and administrative aspects of teaching in inclusive environments and the musical and non-musical abilities of instrumental music students with special needs.

**Research Question Four:** Are instrumental music educators prepared for inclusion and willing to accommodate students with special needs? Respondents’ coursework in the areas of special education or special education in music were indicators of preparedness to teach student with special needs. A history of providing special education students necessary accommodation or the willingness to do so was also considered. Preparation to include student with special needs and inclusionary provisions were described using descriptive statistics.

**Summary**

In this chapter, an explanation of the design, subjects, survey instrument, procedures, and data analysis of this research was presented. A researcher-developed survey was used to determine the
rate of inclusion in instrumental musical ensembles and to describe the current status of students with special needs in this setting. The survey was informed by a review of the relevant literature and the examination of questionnaires used in previous studies. A panel of expert music teachers and special educators were consulted in order to further establish the validity and reliability of the survey.

A link to the online survey, created and launched using Survey Gizmo, was attached to an email invitation and distributed to 600 practicing K-12 instrumental music educators in six select states. After two follow-up emails, 166 usable responses were received. The resulting data was analyzed using multiple regression analysis with backward elimination or reported in simple descriptive terms. The rate of inclusion and prevalence of specific disabilities reported by the respondents was compared to that of the broader student population.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe the current status of students with special needs in instrumental musical ensembles and to examine the effect of selected educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion. In order to determine how music educators describe inclusion in the K-12 instrumental musical ensemble, four research questions were developed:

(1) What is the rate of inclusion in K-12 instrumental musical ensembles, what types of student disabilities are most prevalent in those ensembles, and is this rate and representation in instrumental music congruent with K-12 education as a whole?

(2) Do elected educator or institutional variables have significant effects on the rate of inclusion?

(3) What challenges or issues arise when including students with special needs in the instrumental ensemble?

(4) Are instrumental music educators prepared for inclusion and willing to accommodate students with special needs?

Demographic information, as reported by responding music educators, is presented first. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to data addressing the four research questions.
Demographic Analysis

Demographic data were collected to obtain information about music educators that participated in the online survey and their current teaching situation. Those educator variables examined in “Section I: The Music Educator” of the online survey included gender, age, level of education, special education coursework, area(s) of teaching certification, and teaching experience. Questions one and two of the online survey asked respondents to identify their gender and age within the specified categories. Frequency and percentage of respondents based on these two variables are reported in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2

Survey Demographics: Educator Variables - Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Respondents</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Respondents</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Survey Demographics: Educator Variables - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25 years of age</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years of age</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 years of age</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 years of age</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 years of age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 years of age</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55 years of age</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and older</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were also asked to identify their level of education, subject area or areas in which teaching certification was held, and the extent to which their college education included coursework pertaining to the education of students with special needs. Question three of the online survey included response options for “Bachelor’s Degree,” “Master’s Degree,” “Specialist Degree,” “Doctorate,” and “Other (which requested specificity).” A single respondent selected “other” and indicated their level of education as “masters + 36.” The 36 graduate hours earned beyond the master’s degree best reflected the additional
coursework requirements in fulfillment of a specialist degree, therefore, this response was included within the “Specialist Degree” category in the analysis. See Table 4 for level of education responses.

Table 4

Survey Demographics: Educator Variables - Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responding music educators were asked to denote the area or areas for which they held teaching certification in online survey question four: band, choir, general music, orchestra/strings, and/or other (which asked for specificity). It was assumed that educators may hold certification in more than one music specialty and even in disciplines outside the field of music, therefore, respondents were able to indicate multiple certifications if applicable. A variety of “other” certifications were held by practicing K-12 music educators, including certifications in the areas of elementary education, English, foreign languages, history,
mathematics, technology, and administration. Table 5 presents frequency and percentage of respondent’s data for area or areas of teaching certification.

Table 5

*Survey Demographics: Educator Variables - Area(s) of Certification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Music</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra/Strings</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a partial measure of respondents’ preparedness to teach students with special needs, online survey question five asked respondents to indicate the type of college coursework completed as a part of an undergraduate or graduate program. Respondents could select one or more of the following given responses: “At least one undergraduate course in music for students with special needs,” “At least one undergraduate special education course for teachers of all subjects,” “At least one graduate course in music for students with special needs,” “At least one graduate special education course for
teachers of all subjects,” and “No undergraduate or graduate course in special education.” Responses for coursework in special education are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Survey Demographics: Educator Variables - Special Education Coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate course in special education in music</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate course in special education in all subjects</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate course in special education in music</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate course in special education in all subjects</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No courses</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section I of the online survey concludes with open response survey items for total years teaching experience (online survey question six), and total years teaching experience in the respondents’ current school (online survey question seven). The average number of years teaching experience for responding music educators was shown to be ($M = 15.82$, $SD = 10.808$). Additionally, the average number of years teaching at the
respondents’ current institution was \((M = 8.86, \ SD = 8.425)\). Table 3 presents descriptive statistics for these variables.

Table 7

Survey Demographics: Educator Variables – Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Experience in Years \((n = 166)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>10.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Current School</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>8.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional variables including geographic location, community setting, school type, and school population were examined in Section II of the online survey entitled, “Community and School Setting.” Question eight asked respondents to identify the state in which the institution is located. Responses to this question are presented according to the targeted states of Idaho, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, and Rhode Island in Table 8. Music educators were also asked to describe their school’s community setting as “Rural,” “Suburban,” or “Urban” in response to survey item number nine (Table 9).
Table 8

*Survey Demographics: Institutional Variables – Geographic Location*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

*Survey Demographics: Institutional Variables – Community Setting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II of the online survey concluded by asking respondents to describe their institution as a “boarding school,” “charter school,” “private school,” “public school,” or “other,” with request for specification, in question 10. Question 11 allowed for respondents to estimate the total student population of their institution with the average student population being 844 students ($M = 843.99$, $SD = 617.565$). Data for this variable were delimited according to the following ranges of total student population: “1-500 students,” “501-1000 students,” “1001-1500 students,” “1501-2000 students,” and “2001 or more students” Responses for online survey questions 10 and 11 are present in Tables 10 and 11.

Table 10

*Survey Demographics: Institutional Variables – Institution Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boarding School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

*Survey Demographics: Institutional Variables – Student Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-500 students</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000 students</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-1500 students</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-2000 students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 or more students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third section of the online survey, entitled “The Music Program,” characterized the instrumental music offerings at the respondents’ institution and the extent to which regular education students and special education students, as identified by having a recognized disability, participated in those instrumental music programs.

Question 12 of the online survey asked respondents to identify the subject area in which they spent the greatest part of the school day teaching. Possible responses included “Band,” “Choir,” “General Music,” or “Orchestra/Strings” with an additional option to select “Other” and
provide specificity. Two respondents indicated that they devoted an equal amount of instructional time to both band and general music, one to strings and general music. Additionally, two respondents spent the greatest part of the school day teaching guitar, one in elementary education, and two serving in administrative capacities. Data for this variable and for instrumental music offerings by grade level (online survey question 13) are shown in Tables 12 and 13.

Table 12

Survey Demographics: Music Program Variables – Subject Area Focus of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Music</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra/Strings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

*Survey Demographics: Music Program Variables – Instrumental Music*

*Offerings by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Kindergarten</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Data Analysis**

**Research Question Number One:** *What is the rate of inclusion in K-12 instrumental musical ensembles, what types of student disabilities are most prevalent in those ensembles, and is this rate and representation in instrumental music congruent with K-12 education as a whole?*

Section III of the online survey also provided the data necessary to address research question number one. Question 14 of the online survey asked respondents to state their music programs’ student enrollment for “Band,” “Orchestra/Strings,” and “Other Instrumental Ensemble(s)” offerings within the student experience levels of “First Year,” “Second-Third Year,” and “Four Years or More.” Respondents were also asked to differentiate students identified as “students with special needs (SSN),” those granted an Individualized Education Program (IEP) by the institution. Data for instrumental music program enrollment are shown in Tables 14 and 15.
Table 14

*Survey Demographics: Music Program Variables – Instrumental Music*

*Student Enrollment by Ensemble and Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>SSN Enrollment</th>
<th>SSN % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Band Enrollment Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>5966</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Third Year</td>
<td>7062</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years or More</td>
<td>6676</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orchestra/Strings Enrollment Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Third Year</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years or More</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Instrumental Ensemble(s) Enrollment Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Third Year</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years or More</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

**Survey Demographics: Music Program Variables – Instrumental Music**

**Student Enrollment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>SSN Enrollment</th>
<th>SSN % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ensemble Enrollment (By Ensemble)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>19704</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra/Strings</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ensemble Enrollment (By Student Experience)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>6999</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Third Year</td>
<td>8078</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years or More</td>
<td>7694</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Ensemble Enrollment (All Experience Levels and Ensembles)**

| TOTAL ENROLLMENT | 22771 | 1546 | 6.8 |

In order to determine the prevalence of specific disabilities among responding instrumental music programs, item 15 of the online survey asked respondents to categorize participating special needs instrumental music students within the thirteen recognized
 classifications of qualifying disabilities. Disability frequency and percentages of the total special needs population reported are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

*Survey Demographics: Music Program Variables - Students with Special Needs in Instrumental Musical Ensembles by Disability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of SSN Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-Blindness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Delay</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Number Two: Do selected educator or institutional variables have significant effects on the rate of inclusion?

Multiple regression analysis with backward elimination was utilized to determine the relationships, if any, between the rate of inclusion (the dependent variable) and five educator variables. Those independent factors included the music educators’ gender, age, level of education, teaching experience, and special education coursework. For the purposes of this analysis, the level of education and special education coursework responses presented in Table 2 were aggregated as follows: bachelor’s vs. master’s or higher and coursework in special education vs. no coursework in special education. Tables 17, 18, and 19 demonstrate that none of the educator variables were an indicator of inclusion.
Table 17

Summary of R Statistics for Educator Demographic Variables Predicting Rate of Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R$ Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.127&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.127&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.120&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.113&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.093&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.1130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE, ED, SPED, GENDER, EXP
<sup>b</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE, ED, SPED, GENDER
<sup>c</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE, ED, SPED
<sup>d</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE, ED
<sup>e</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE
<sup>f</sup> Predictors: (Constant)
Table 18

Summary of R Multiple Regression Statistics for Educator Demographic Variables Predicting Rate of Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1.997</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1.998</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.001</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.013</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE, ED, SPED, GENDER, EXP
<sup>b</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE, ED, SPED, GENDER
<sup>c</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE, ED, SPED
<sup>d</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE, ED
<sup>e</sup> Predictors: (Constant), AGE
<sup>f</sup> Predictors: (Constant)
Table 19

*Multiple Regression with Backward Elimination Models for Predicting Inclusion Rate Using Educator Demographic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple regression analysis with backward elimination was utilized in the same manner to determine the relationships between the rate of inclusion and three institutional variables: geographic location, community setting, and school population. Tables 20 (R² statistics), 21 (ANOVA analyses), and 22 demonstrates that the rate of inclusion can be predicted by the independent variable school population.

Table 20

*Summary of R Statistics for Institutional Demographic Variables Predicting Rate of Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.269ᵃ</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.217ᵇ</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.179ᶜ</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃ Predictors: (Constant), SCHLPOP, SETTING, LOCATION
ᵇ Predictors: (Constant), SCHLPOP, SETTING
ᶜ Predictors: (Constant), SCHLPOP
Table 21

*Summary of R Multiple Regression Statistics for Institutional Demographic Variables Predicting Rate of Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>2.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>5.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1.960</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), SCHLPOP, SETTING, LOCATION
b Predictors: (Constant), SCHLPOP, SETTING
c Predictors: (Constant), SCHLPOP
Table 22

Multiple Regression with Backward Elimination Models for Predicting Inclusion Rate Using Institutional Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.188</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETTING1</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-0.907</td>
<td>0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETTING2</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>-1.562</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHLPOP</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>-1.691</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC1</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>-1.493</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC2</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-0.573</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC3</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.913</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC4</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.938</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETTING1</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>-0.489</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETTING2</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>-1.551</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHLPOP</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>-1.555</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.810</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHLPOP</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>-2.273</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Research Question Number Three:** What challenges or issues arise when including students with special needs in the instrumental musical ensembles ensemble?

Section IV of the online survey examined the extent to which administrative and instructional aspects of instrumental music instruction impacted inclusion. Respondents were also presented an extensive list of common musical and non-musical tasks and asked to characterize the abilities of their students with special needs. Questions 16 and 17 of the online survey addressed research question number three.

Question 16 asked, “To what extent do the following aspects of your teaching situation prevent or inhibit students with special needs from participating in your schools instrumental ensembles?” Fourteen common administrative and instructional considerations were presented, along with a five-point scale to determine the frequency at which these aspects of the individual respondents teaching situation prevents or inhibits the inclusion of students with special needs in instrumental musical ensembles. The scale utilized the following ratings for frequency: 1. Always, 2. Often, 3. Sometimes, 4. Rarely, 5. Never. Table 23 presents descriptive statistics illustrating the extent to which respondents perceive instructional and administrative decisions inhibit inclusion.
Table 23  

**Percentage of Respondents Indicating Inhibitive Aspects of Teaching**  

*Situation (n = 163)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Materials</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Enrollment/Size</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/School Physical Layout</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Travel</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. and/or Training to Teach SSN Students</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. for Individual SSN</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Support</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectations</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Time</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Scheduling</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from SPED Faculty/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL STATISTICS</strong></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 17 provided additional data to address research question three. Utilizing a similar five-point scale as the previous online survey item, respondents were asked to describe the extent to which they observed students with special needs successfully accomplished given musical or non-musical tasks. Responses to online survey item 17 are presented in Table 24.
Table 24

Percentage of Respondents Observing Students with Special Needs

Successfully Accomplishing Tasks (n = 162)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable Behavior</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable Interactions with Other Students</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Dexterity/ Fingerings</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Carriage/ Hand Positions</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorization</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement/Marching</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Musical Responsibilities</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Performance</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm Performance/ Reading</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight-Reading</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone Production</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL STATISTICS</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Number Four: Are instrumental music educators prepared for inclusion and willing to accommodate students with special needs?

As a measure of instrumental music educators’ preparedness to include students with special needs, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which their college education included coursework in special education. Possible coursework includes both undergraduate and graduate level classes, either specific to inclusionary music education or the education of students with special needs across a variety of subject areas. These responses to question five of the online survey are presented in Table 5 of this chapter.

To further address research question number four, instrumental music educators were asked to indicate their willingness to or a history of administering instructional accommodations for special needs instrumental music students. Section IV, question 18 of the online survey instrument presented respondents with ten music-specific accommodations aside a five-point scale utilizing the following descriptors: 1. Not at All Likely, 2. Not Very Likely, 3. Neutral, 4. Somewhat Likely, and 5. Very Likely.
Table 25

*Percentage of Respondents Indicating a Willingness to Administer*

*Accommodations (n = 162)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altered/Abbreviated Audition/Assessment</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered/Arranged Music Notation</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered Instrument Carriage/Manipulation</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Assignment/Selection Flexibility</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer Playing Time Before Audition/Assessment</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring/Peer Partnering with RegEd Student</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify Ensemble Instruction Pace</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential Seating/Field/Performance Placement</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Lessons</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd Paraprofessionals During Instruction</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL STATISTICS</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The purpose of this study was to describe the current status of students with special needs in the instrumental musical ensemble and to examine the effect of selected educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion. A survey of practicing instrumental music educators was conducted to determine how they describe inclusion in K-12 instrumental music. Music educator demographics, including gender, age, level of education, special education coursework, and teaching experience, as well as the institutional demographics, geographic location, community setting, school type, and student population were reported using frequencies and percentages.

Research question number one was addressed using descriptive statistics. The overall rate of inclusion in all instrumental ensemble and grade levels in this study was found to be 6.8%, while 13.6% of all students nationwide received special education services. The majority of reported students with special needs in this study qualified for special education services due to a specific learning disability, a speech or language impairment, or other health impairment(s).

In analyzing research question number two, multiple regression with backward elimination was utilized to determine the relationship between the rate of inclusion and educator and institutional available. The institutional variable student population was identified as
statistically significant in predicting the rate of inclusion. No educator variables were found to be significant.

Research question three was answered using simple descriptive statistics. Responding music educators identified performance expectations, lack of information for specific students with special needs, and funding among the most inhibitive teaching and administrative aspects of include theses students. Based on the experiences and observations of the participants, students with special needs were most successful in performance. The ability to sight-read was identified as the most problematic.

The final research question explored the educators’ preparedness, ability, and/or willingness to include students with special needs. The majority of respondents, 66.2%, held at least a master’s degree although 42% had no coursework specific to special education. Most instrumental music educators had provided or were willing to provide students with special needs necessary accommodations.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the current status of students with special needs in instrumental musical ensembles and to examine the effect of selected educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion.

Review of the Literature

The result of 35 years of special education litigation and legislation is a comprehensive system of policies and procedures ensuring the rights of students with special needs. Among those principles governing the education of students with special needs: (1) zero reject, (2) non-discriminatory evaluation, (3) free and appropriate education, (4) least restrictive environment, (5) due process, and (6) parental and student participation (Hammel & Hourigan, 2011). These six standards, working concurrently, ensure that all students are afforded a fair evaluation, receive educational and related services designed to meet his or her specific needs, and that these services are provided, to the maximum extent possible, in the regular school and classroom at no cost to students or parents. Furthermore, parents and students are able to collaborate in the process determining placements, accommodations, and services or challenge those decisions in formal or informal hearings.
A review of the relevant data reveals that approximately 6.7 million school-aged children receive special education services. This constitutes almost 14% of the current student population, an increase of 81% in the number of students participating in special education programs since the passage of The Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975. The vast majority of the nation’s special education students, some 95%, receive these educational and related services in the regular public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). Moreover, students with special needs are being included in the regular classroom for larger and larger portions of the school day (Data Accountability Center, 2010).

While there has been significant growth in the number of students qualifying for special education services and in the amount of time those services are provided in the regular classroom, research indicates that some music educators still have little or no contact with specific disabilities or with the special needs population as a whole (Cooper, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphrey, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Gilbert and Asmus, 1981; Shehan, 1977; Sideridis & Chandler, 1995). Inequities may also exist within the music curriculum itself as instrumental, choral, and secondary music educators reported less contact with special education students than did elementary and general music teachers (Cooper, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphrey, 1994; Gilbert and Asmus, 1981). Students with certain disabilities may be less
frequently included in regular music classes as well (Atterbury, 1986; Cooper, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphrey, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Shehan, 1977; White, 1981).

These disparities may be attributed to a variety of factors explored in other studies. Many music educators simply lack the training necessary to include students with special needs (Cooper, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphrey, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Shehan, 1977; Sideridis & Chandler, 1995). Other educators indicated that they did not participate in placement decisions, lacked administrative or instructional support, or required additional funds, materials, and time to prepare for these students (Atterbury, 1986; Cooper, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphrey, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Sideridis & Chandler, 1995). The attitude of the music teacher may also play a role in the decision to include students with specific disabilities or the broader population (Cooper, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphrey, 1994; Sideridis & Chandler, 1995; White, 1981). Overall, elementary and general music teachers appear more willing to include students with special needs or are less concerned about the challenges of inclusion than are secondary, instrumental, or choral music educators (Cooper, 1999; Gilbert and Asmus, 1981; White, 1981).

**Procedure**

The data for this nonexperimental, quantitative study were obtained through an original online survey instrument developed by the
researcher. Content of the survey was informed by a review of the existing literature and available questionnaires utilized in previous studies. Additionally, a panel of expert music and special educators provided suggestions for improvement in the online surveys wording, format, and content prior to its distribution. The resulting survey included 20 items organized in four sections: (1) music educator demographics, (2) community and school demographics, (3) music program demographics, and (4) inclusion.

Section I of the online survey required participants to state their gender, age, level of education, and years teaching experience. Respondents provided information concerning their institutions student population, school type, community setting, and location by state in questions eight through 11. Section III, questions 12 through 15, asked respondents to describe their institutions music offerings by course type and grade level. Enrollment statistics were also gathered with specific attention given to those students receiving special education services. The final section of the online survey asked responding music educators to evaluate a set of potential challenges associated with inclusion and their willingness to implement proposed accommodations. Items 19 and 20 allowed participants to share their experiences in inclusive settings and provide contact information for possible follow-up questioning.

The online survey, email invitations, and research methodology were approved by University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review
Board. Once approved and piloted, the survey was launched using Survey Gizmo online survey software. A link to the survey was electronically distributed to 600 instrumental music educators in the states of Idaho, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, and Rhode Island. State associations of music educators, including those affiliated with MENC: The National Association for Music Education (MENC), the National Band Association (NBA), the National Symphony Orchestra Association (NSOA), and/or the American String Teachers Association (ASTA) provided institutional or personal emails for the purposes of contacting possible participants. Music educators who failed to respond to the initial invitation were contacted after 10 days, and again after 20 days if still unresponsive. Those who did not complete the online survey within 30 days of the initial email invitation were disregarded due to mortality.

Responses were compiled and securely stored on Survey Gizmo servers. Data was then exported from Survey Gizmo to the researcher’s personal computer and saved in Microsoft Excel for further manipulation. Quantitative experts at the Nebraska Evaluation and Research (NEAR) Center on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus assisted in further analysis using SPSS.

**Design and Results of the Study**

In designing the study, the following research questions were developed:
(1) What is the rate of inclusion in K-12 instrumental musical ensembles, what types of student disabilities are most prevalent in those ensembles, and is this rate and representation in instrumental music congruent with K-12 education as a whole?

(2) Do selected educator or institutional variables have significant effects on the rate of inclusion?

(3) What challenges or issues arise when including students with special needs in the instrumental musical ensemble?

(4) Are instrumental music educators prepared for inclusion and willing to accommodate students with special needs?

The online survey instrument collected the demographic data necessary to describe the participants, their institution, their students with special needs, and the music program. Female music educators accounted for 36.4% of all participants while the remaining 63.6% reported their gender as male. Responses to age included: 6.1% between the ages of 20 and 25, 13.3% were 26-30, 10.3% were 31-35, 8.5% were 36-40, 10.9% were 41-45, 17% were 46-50, 15.2% were 51-55, and 18.8% were aged 56 or older. The most advanced degree earned by participants was the doctorate at 4.8%, specialist at 1.8%, master’s at 59%, and 33.7% held a bachelor’s degree. Additionally, a single respondent (0.6%) indicated their level of education as “master’s + 36.”

The majority of participants were certified to teach band (92%), 60.5% were certified in orchestra/strings, 59.3% in vocal music, and
71% held teaching certificates or endorsements in general music education. Respondents were qualified to work in other areas including: elementary education, English, foreign languages, history, mathematics, technology, and administration. The average number of years total teaching experience was 16 years ($M = 15.82$), with an average of nine years ($M = 8.86$) at the participants current school.

**Research Question Number One:** What is the rate of inclusion in K-12 instrumental musical ensembles, what types of student disabilities are most prevalent in those ensembles, and is this rate and representation in instrumental music congruent with K-12 education as a whole?

Student enrollment in instrumental ensembles and within specific experience levels was provided by respondents. In this study, students with special needs accounted for 6.8% of all instrumental music students. Further analysis revealed that inclusion rates varied according to the type of ensemble, 8.1% for orchestra/strings, 6.7% for band, and 4.7% in other instrumental ensembles. In general, students with special needs were most often included in first year instrumental music classes (7.8%), followed by second and third year classes (7.2%), and lastly, among groups with players having four or more years experience (5.5%). Inclusion rates by ensemble setting and experience level are shown in Table 26.
### Table 26

**Survey Demographics: Music Program Variables – Instrumental Music**

**Student Enrollment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>SSN Enrollment</th>
<th>SSN % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ensemble Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By Ensemble)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>19704</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra/Strings</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ensemble Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By Student Experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>6999</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Third Year</td>
<td>8078</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years or More</td>
<td>7694</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ensemble Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All Experience Levels and Ensembles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>22771</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responding music educators were also asked to identify their students with special needs according to disability. Results indicated that the majority of all special education students in instrumental ensembles qualified for services due to other health impairments (33.7%),
a specific learning disability (26.6%), or a speech or language impairment (8.5%). There were fewer encounters with students identified as deaf-blind (0.3%), having traumatic brain injury (0.3%), or developmental delays (0.8%).

Table 27

Survey Demographics: Music Program Variables - Students with Special Needs in Instrumental Musical Ensembles by Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of SSN Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-Blindness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Delay</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairments</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairments</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairments</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Impairments</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairments</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collected and made publicly available by the United States Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics and the Data Accountability Center was consulted to determine if the
demographic information collected in this research resembled or differed from that of broader national studies. While 6.8% of the instrumental music students reported in this study were identified as having special needs, 13.6% of the nation’s total school-aged student population received special education and/or related services. The frequency of students with specific disabilities in this study closely resembled that of the national landscape. NCES (2008) found that that 39.9% of all special education students nationwide had learning disabilities, speech or language impairments (22.1%), or other health impairments (9.1%). Similarly, less than 0.05% of all students with special needs were served due to deaf-blindness and 0.4% for traumatic brain injury on a national scale.

**Research Question Number Two:** *Do selected educator or institutional variables have significant effects on the rate of inclusion?*

Separate multiple regression with backward elimination analyses were conducted to determine if either educator of institutional variables were significant predictors of inclusion rates. Educator variables examined were the responding music educators’ gender, age, level of education, years teaching experience, and their completion of any undergraduate and graduate level special education coursework. The institutional variables selected for analysis were geographic location (state), community setting (rural, suburban, or urban), and school population.
Of the institutional variables examined, the schools total student population was determined to be the best indicator of inclusion. The regression coefficient \(-0.018\) (see Table 14) implied that for every 500 students enrolled, the rate of inclusion for that institution decreased by \(.018\). Educator variables were not found to be a significant predictor of the rate of inclusion.

**Research Question Number Three:** *What challenges or issues arise when including students with special needs in the instrumental ensemble?*

Participants indicated the extent to which instructional or administrative aspects of teaching affected their ability to include students with special needs in instrumental ensembles. Music educators listed performance expectations as “always (4.3%),” “often (18.4%),” or “sometimes (22.1%)” inhibiting their ability to include special education students. Teachers may have also required additional information to better include students, with 2.5%, 16.5%, and 22.8% stating that lack of information on individuals with special needs “always,” “often,” or “sometimes” impeded inclusion. The physical layout of the music classroom and school facilities presented little concern, with 61.1% of respondents stating this was “never” an issue and was “rarely” a problem for another 22.8%. On average, the response “always” was selected at a rate of 2%, “often” 9.9%, “sometimes” 15.3%, “rarely” 24.7%, and “never” 48%. The overall indication was that the inclusion of students with special needs was impacted little by the instructional or administrative issues presented here. As Table 28 demonstrates, music educators felt
that the teaching considerations presented “never (48%)” or “rarely (25%)” inhibited inclusion in instrumental music.

Table 28

**Percentage of Respondents Indicating Extent of Instructional and Administrative Considerations Inhibiting Inclusion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were also presented a set of 11 musical and non-musical tasks and asked, “In your observations and experiences, how often do students with special needs successfully accomplish the following tasks?” Based on their observations and experiences, 21.3% of instrumental music educators described special education students as “always” successful in public performance, with an additional 31.9% and 30% selecting the response “often” and “sometimes.” Sight-reading was perhaps the most problematic, with only 4.9% of music educators indicating students with special needs “always” accomplished this task, 21.5% stated “never,” and 45.5%, “rarely.” As Table 29 shows, responding music educators indicated that, overall, students with special needs were only moderately successful in the execution of musical and non-musical tasks associated with instrumental music study.
Table 29

*Percentage of Respondents Observing Students with Special Needs Successfully Accomplishing Tasks (n = 162)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question Number Four:** Are instrumental music educators prepared for inclusion and willing to accommodate students with special needs?

College coursework was considered an initial measure of a respondent’s preparedness and ability to include special education students. More than half completed at least a single college level course in special education or special education in music. Some 36.7% completed an undergraduate course in special education, 13.9% a graduate course in special education, 19.3% completed an undergraduate course specific to special education in music, and 13.9% completed a graduate level course in music for students with special needs. More than 40% reported no such undergraduate or graduate coursework.
Table 30

_Survey Demographics: Educator Variables - Special Education Coursework_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate course in special education in music</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate course in special education in all subjects</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate course in special education in music</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate course in special education in all subjects</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No courses</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine if participants had provided or were willing to provide accommodations for students with special needs, ten common musical adaptations were present alongside a five-point scale. The scale utilized the following descriptors: 1. Not at All Likely, 2. Not Very Likely, 3. Neutral, 4. Somewhat Likely, and 5. Very Likely. The accommodation “instrument assignment/selection flexibility” was most often considered with 64.8% stating they were “very likely” and an additional 19.8% selecting “somewhat likely.” Participants were “not at all likely (11.3%)” or “not very likely (25.6%)” to modify the pace of instruction for the entire ensemble. On average, 44.34% of respondents were “very likely” to implement the given accommodations, 30.55% were “somewhat likely,”
13.61% were neutral, 8.23% were “not very likely,” and 3.3% were “not at all likely.” Table 31 shows that responding instrumental music educators had a history of providing accommodations or would consider doing so.

Table 31

Percentage of Respondents Indicating a Willingness to Administer Accommodations (n = 162)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

This study was initiated to describe the current status of inclusion within the instrumental musical ensemble. Of primary importance, was determining the rate at which students with special needs were participating in bands, orchestras, and other instrumental music classes. In this study, the overall rate of inclusion was determined to be 6.8%; meanwhile, 13.6% of the nation’s total school-aged student population received special education and/or related services (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). This discrepancy may indicate that students with special needs are not participating in instrumental
ensembles at rates congruent with the overall special education population in K-12 schools.

Rates of inclusion varied among the three ensemble types (band, orchestra/strings, and other instrumental ensembles) and experience levels (first year, second or third year, and four years of more). Orchestra teachers reported a larger portion of special education participants (8.1% of all reported orchestra/strings students) compared to teachers of band (6.7%), and teachers of other instrumental ensembles (4.7%). In terms of instrumental music experience, 7.8% of all first year students were identified as special needs, while the inclusion rate among second and third year students was 7.2%, and 5.5% among students with four or more years experience. Fewer special education students may be participating in high school instrumental music (where students typically have four or more years prior playing experience) than in elementary or middle school instrumental ensembles (where students typically have one to three years experiences) due to the demanding performance schedule and higher order tasks associated with most secondary music programs.

The effect of selected educator variables (gender, age, level of education, special education coursework, primary teaching area, and teaching experience in years) and institutional variables (geographic location, community setting, institution type, and student population) on rates of inclusion was also examined. While the educator variables were
not found to be significant predictors of inclusion, the overall student population of the institution was significant. Schools with larger student enrollments were found to include students with special needs at lower rates. Music programs at these larger institutions may have been more selective and/or had more rigorous audition requirements thereby preventing some special education students from participating. Instrumental music educators at schools with smaller student populations may not be in a position to deny or limit access to any student, regardless of ability or disability.

The third research question was concerned with the impact of administrative and instructional decisions on inclusion. When presented a list of 14 common teaching considerations, responding instrumental music educators most often indicated that inclusion was “rarely (24.7%)” or “never (48.3%)” negatively impacted. Among the most inhibitive aspects of teaching students with special needs, those perceived by respondents as “always” or “often” hampering inclusion, were: performance expectations, the amount or lack of information available for individuals qualifying for special education services, and school scheduling. These findings are somewhat similar to those of previous studies where music educators lacked specific information about individuals with special needs (Atterbury 1986, Gilbert and Asmus, 1981). In this research, the physical layout of the music classroom and school, amount of time granted for planning and preparation purposes,
and level of administrative support was less of a concern. This differed somewhat from earlier research by Frisque, Niebur, and Humphrey (1994) and Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) who found music educators had insufficient time to formulate specific accommodations for included students.

When asked to characterize the abilities of students with special needs in instrumental music, respondents were less positive. Based on their observations of and in their experiences working with these students, instrumental music educators, on average, reported that students with special needs “never (7.1%),” “rarely (30%),” or “sometimes (34.8%)” executed the 11 musical and non-musical tasks presented. Sight-reading ability, facility when reading musical rhythms, and memorization where among those skills identified as most challenging. Responding instrumental music educators indicated students with special needs were most successful in functions associated with public performance, behavior, and instrument carriage and hand position. The identification of public performance as an area of success was inconsistent with responses to survey item 16, where participants named performance expectations among the most inhibitive aspects of including students with special needs in instrumental music. Atterbury (1986) also found that music educators perceived students with special needs as only moderately successful in music.
In terms of teacher preparation, the results of this study corroborated those of existing research; music teachers, by in large, lacked the training necessary to teach students with special needs (Atterbury, 1986; Cooper, 1999; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Gilbert and Asmus, 1981; Shehan, 1977; Sideridis and Chandler, 1995).

Although 66.2% of all respondents held an advanced college degree, most lacked coursework necessary to teach students with special needs. More than 42% of respondents had no undergraduate or graduate level coursework in special education or special education in music.

While a significant number of instrumental music teachers were ill-prepared to include individuals with special needs, 97% of all participants in the current study were providing instruction for special education students. Furthermore, music educators indicated that they had or were willing to provide accommodations in spite of their beliefs that students with special needs were only moderately successful in instrumental ensembles.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Research concerning the inclusion of students with special needs in music has been relatively sparse. Studies specific to inclusion in the secondary grade levels and in performance-based ensembles are virtually nonexistent. This research was intended to describe the inclusion of special education students within this setting and to, in part, provide a foundation for future studies. Now that inclusionary practices within
instrumental musical ensembles have been established, there are two recommendations for additional research in inclusionary instrumental music education: 1) teacher training, and 2) accommodations.

Regarding teacher preparation, this study confirmed the findings of existing research. While the majority of music educators were responsible for teaching students with special needs, most had little or no relevant training (Atterbury, 1986; Cooper, 1999; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Gilbert and Asmus, 1981; Shehan, 1977; Sideridis and Chandler, 1995). New lines of research assessing the availability, content, and effectiveness of collegiate coursework and in-service training on the topic of special education in music may be warranted. Additionally, teacher training programs incorporating pre-service or fieldwork experiences in inclusive settings should be investigated.

Coursework and exposure in an inclusive setting may not necessarily provide instrumental music educators with all the tools necessary to teach individuals with special needs. Experimental studies should be conducted to determine what accommodations or adaptations are best suited to address the needs of students with specific disabilities. Furthermore, steps should be taken to identify, analyze, and document positive models of inclusion.

As the special education population continues to evolve, the replication of this or the development of similar studies will be necessary to provide the music education community an accurate portrayal of
inclusion in music. Descriptive studies, along with experimental and qualitative research in teacher preparation and student adaptations, will better inform current and future generations of instrumental music educators in our efforts to ensure that music for all becomes a reality.
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   Could any disclosure of the human subjects’ responses outside the research reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, or reputation?
   No

4. Does the research involve only the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens?
   No

5. Does the research involve only studying, evaluating or examining public benefit or service programs?
   No
8. Does the research involve only a taste and food quality evaluation or food consumer acceptance study?

No

**Description of Subjects:**
Total number of participants (include 'controls'): 1000

Will participants of both sexes/genders be recruited? Yes
Will participation be limited to certain racial or ethnic groups? No
What are the participants' characteristics?
K-12 practicing instrumental music educators in public and private schools.

**Type of Participant:** (check all appropriate blanks for participant population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adults, Non Students</th>
<th>Pregnant Women</th>
<th>Persons with Psychological Impairment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNL Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fetuses</td>
<td>Persons with Neurological Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors (under age 19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Persons with Limited Civil Freedom</td>
<td>Persons with Mental Retardation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Legal Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Persons with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (Explain):

**Unique Research Methodology or Data Sources**
Will your project involve audio taping? Yes

How long will tapes be kept? Where will they be stored? Who will have access to the tapes? If transcriptions are required, how will transcriptions be handled? Who is doing the transcriptions? Please attach a copy of the confidentiality agreement that transcriptionists will sign.

The audio recordings will be stored digitally in the home office computer of the researcher. Once the interviewee verifies the accuracy of the transcripts the tapes will be destroyed/erased. Only the PI will have access to the tapes. The transcripts will be done professionally and will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the home of the PI. The transcriptionist service will sign an agreement of confidentiality.

Is this project web-based research? Yes

For web-based studies, how will the data be handled? Will the data be sent to a secure server? Will the data be encrypted while in transit? Will you be collecting IP addresses?

Data will be collected via the web-based survey tool Survey Monkey and inputted into the PI's
computer for analysis. Data will be sent to secure server and will not be encrypted will in transit. No attempt will be made to collect IP addresses.

Is this study utilizing Protected Health Information (PHI; e.g., information obtained from a hospital, clinic, or treatment facility)? No

Does this project involve genetic data/sampling/analysis, illegal drug use, or criminal activity that places the participant at risk for legal action? No

Does this project involve photography? No

Does this project involve videotaping? No

Does this project involve archival or secondary data analysis? Yes

What are the sources of your data? What is the data?

The data will be comprised of public documents, such as school enrollment statistics provided by the subjects or available online.

Does this project involve biological samples? No

Project Personnel List:
Please list the names of all personnel working on this project, starting with the principal investigator and the secondary investigator/project advisor. Research assistants, students, data entry staff and other research project staff should also be included. For a complete explanation of training and project staff please go to http://www.unl.edu/research/om/index.shtml.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>UNL Status</th>
<th>Is Involved In Design/Supervision</th>
<th>Is Involved In Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Project Description
1. Describe the research purpose of the project.

What is the purpose of the study? (Please provide a brief 1-2 paragraph explanation in lay terms, to include a brief literature justification.)

Institutions receiving public funding are required by law to educate students in the least restrictive environment, that environment being the regular classroom, or in the case of most music education programs, performing ensembles. Yet many music educators are hesitant to include special needs students in ensemble courses because they feel ill prepared to accommodate this diverse population and receive little assistance from school site special educators. This is further complicated by the special nature of music courses and the schedule, course load, and pupil to teacher ratio in the typical instrumental music program.

The purpose of this study is to: (1), determine the rate at which special needs students are participating...
in instrumental ensembles in comparison to that of the regular education population, (2), characterize
the disabilities of special education students participating in instrumental ensembles, (3), to chronicle
successful accounts of inclusion in instrumental music, and (4), to document the accommodations and
instructional strategies utilized in those situations.

2. Description of the Methods and Procedures.

Describe the data collection procedures and what participants will have to do.
A mixed methods approach was designed using three strategies for data collection: an electronic
survey, semi-structured one-on-one interviews, and the review of public documents.
In Phase I, a web-based survey instrument will be created using Survey Monkey. A link to this survey
will be attached to an email invitation sent to all potential subjects electronically. The initial invitation will
distributed via email on or about April 1, 2010.
As a part of Phase II, those subjects who voluntarily self-identified in Phase I and who indicate a
relatively high level of special needs student participation or who describe a unique case of successful
inclusion will be contacted for subsequent interviews by phone or email. The semi-structured in-person
interviews will be recorded on digital audiotapes using high resolution tape recorders. The interview
questions will be worded in an open-ended format to maximize participant response. Interviews will be
scheduled with participants during the month of May 2010.

How long will this take participants to complete?
The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Interviews will last approximately 60-90
minutes.

Will follow-ups or reminders be sent?
Yes

If so, explain.
On the fifteenth day, a follow-up e-mail will be submitted to those who have yet to respond to the original
invitation. The final request for participation will be submitted via e-mail on or about April 30, 2010. This
allows a full month for requests for participation to be fulfilled. Those who do not respond by May 10,
2010 will be disregarded due to mortality.

3. Description of Recruiting Procedures

How will the names and contact information for participants be obtained?
Contact information for potential subjects will be collected via their respective state band and orchestra
associations and though the national registries of MENC, NBA, and ASTA.

How will participants be approached about participating in the study?
An email invitation will be sent to all potential subjects electronically. Subjects who complete the initial
electronic survey and indicate willingness to participate in follow-up interviews will be contacted via
phone or email.

4. Description of Benefits and Risks

Explain the benefits to participants or to others.
Researchers have found that when people are given the opportunity to talk about their experiences, they
often develop new insights related to those experiences that are personally or professionally meaningful.
Therefore, participants may benefit from these insights.

Explain the risks to participants. What will be done to minimize the risks? If there are no known risks, this should be stated.

There are no known risks.

5. Description of Compensation
Will compensation (including money, gift certificates, extra credit, etc.) be provided to participants?
No

6. Informed Consent Process
In certain cases for children over the age of 14, such as UNL students who are 17 or 18, waivers of informed consent can be granted.

Would you like to request a waiver of consent?
No

How will informed consent/assent be obtained?
Subjects are free to choose whether or not to participate in the survey portion of this study. Those subjects who agree to participate in the interview portion of the study will be faxed or mailed, at the discretion of the interviewee, an informed consent form. Once the informed consent form is signed and returned, the researcher will contact the interviewee via email or phone the to arrange an interview time and location.

7. Description of How Confidentiality will be Maintained
How will confidentiality of records be maintained?
Surveys do not require any information that could make subjects identifiable.
The transcripts of the interviews and all observational notes will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the home of the researcher and audio tapes will be destroyed after the transcripts are verified by the interviewees. Interviewees and any institution or students mentioned during questioning will be provided pseudonyms and remain anonymous. Pseudonyms will be assigned to interviewees following a numbered code. A separate code list with assigned codes to interview participants will be kept only by the principal student investigator in a locked filing cabinet. All materials will be kept for one year and then destroyed post-study conclusion. The data will only be seen by the researcher during the study.
The information obtained in this study will be published in the primary researcher’s dissertation, and may be published in scientific journals or presented at conferences and professional meetings. The data in all publications and presentations will be reported anonymously.

Will individuals be identified?
No

How long will records be kept?
1 year and/or post study conclusion

Where will records be stored?
Locked filing cabinet in the private home of the PI researcher
Who has access to the records/data?
The primary investigator/researcher.

How will data be reported?
In Hoffman's dissertation and possible related articles.

8. Copies of Questionnaires, Survey, or Testing Instruments
Please list all questionnaires, surveys, and/or assessment instruments/measures used in the project.
Online Survey
Interview Protocol

9. Uploaded Attachments
Email Survey Invite 1.pdf - 5005 Bytes - application/pdf
Email Survey Invite 2.pdf - 5490 Bytes - application/pdf
Email Survey Invite 3.pdf - 5509 Bytes - application/pdf
Online Survey 1.pdf - 8512 Bytes - application/pdf
Invitation to Interview.pdf - 22994 Bytes - application/pdf
Interview Protocol.pdf - 50828 Bytes - application/pdf
Confidentiality Agreement Transcriptionist.pdf - 25669 Bytes - application/pdf
Hoffman Informed Consent Form-Approved.pdf - 31556 Bytes - application/pdf
Extension Email.pdf - 25272 Bytes - application/pdf

Comments:
PI Comments

URC Comments

ORR Comments
April 1, 2010

Edward Hoffman & Brian Moore
School of Music
352 WML, UNL, 06585-0100

IRB Numbers: 201100010772 EX
Project ID: 19772
Project Title: Inclusion in the Instrumental Ensemble

Dear Edward:

This letter is to officially notify you of the approval of your project by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects. It is the Board's opinion that you have provided adequate safeguards for the rights and welfare of the participants in this study based on the information provided. Your proposal is in compliance with the institution's Federal Wide Assurance 00002358 and the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46) and has been classified as Exempt Category 2.

You are authorized to implement this study as of the Date of Final Approval 04/01/2010. This approval is Valid Until 07/01/2010.

1. The approved informed consent form has been uploaded to NUgrant (Approved pdf file). Please use this form to distribute to participants. If you need to make changes to the informed consent form, please submit the revised form to the IRB for review and approval prior to using it.

2. Please include the IRB approval number in the email messages. Please email a copy of the messages, with the number included, to irb@unl.edu for our records. Your approval number is IRB#:201100010772 EX. If you need to make changes to the message please submit the revised message to the IRB for review and approval prior to using it.

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of the following events within 48 hours of the event:

* An adverse event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, side effects, deaths, or other problems) which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to subjects or others, and was possibly related to the research procedures;

* Any serious, accidental, or unanticipated change to the IRB-approved protocol that involved risk or had the potential to occur

* Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim report, or other finding that indicates an unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research

* Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or other person

* Any complaints of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the research staff.

This project should be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines and you should notify the IRB immediately of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project. You should report any unanticipated problems involving risks to the participants or others to the Board.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 472-6565.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bucky R. Freeman
To: (e-mail address)
Fr: Edward Hoffman
Re: Survey Evaluation: Inclusion in the Instrumental Ensemble

Greetings:

I would appreciate your assistance evaluating the online survey *Inclusion in the Instrumental Ensemble*. This instrument serves as the primary data collection tool for my doctoral research project at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln. The purpose of this study is to describe the current status of students with special needs in the instrumental musical ensemble and to examine the effect of selected educator and institutional variables on rates of inclusion. Research questions for this study are:

(1) What is the rate of inclusion in K-12 instrumental musical ensembles, what types of student disabilities are most prevalent in those ensembles, and is this congruent with the entirety of K-12 education?
(2) Do educator or institutional variables have significant effects on the rate of inclusion?
(3) What challenges or issues arise when including students with special needs in the instrumental ensemble?
(4) How are instrumental music educators including students with special needs?

Using the attached *Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form*, please evaluate the survey and provide your suggestions for improvement. A link to the online survey is included at the bottom of this message.

Please attach your completed *Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form* to an email directed to edwardhoffman@hotmail.com. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Edward C. “Ted” Hoffman, III
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
School of Music

Please click on the link below to access the survey:

*(survey link here)*
APPENDIX C

Online Survey Instrument Assessment Form

Please mark an “X” on the line provided to indicate your response:

1. Are the online survey directions clear?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Unclear  Very Clear

2. Is the format of individual questions and items appropriate?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Inappropriate  Very Appropriate

3. Does the order and flow of the online survey seem logical?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Illogical  Very Logical

4. Does the wording of questions and statements appear to be sensitive to the issue of students with special needs, disabilities, and inclusion?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Insensitive  Highly Sensitive

5. Does the online survey appropriately serve the purpose of describing inclusion in the instrumental musical ensemble?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Inappropriate  Very Appropriate
Please respond in the spaces provided:

6. Are there any grammatical errors?
   □ No  □ Yes  If yes, please explain where:

7. Would you add to, delete, or alter any of the administrative and instructional considerations presented in item 16?
   □ No  □ Yes  If yes, please explain:

8. Would you add to, delete, or alter any of the musical and non-musical tasks presented in item 17?
   □ No  □ Yes  If yes, please explain:

9. Would you add to, delete, or alter any of the accommodations presented in item 18?
   □ No  □ Yes  If yes, please explain:

10. Did you experience any technical issues associated with *Survey Gizmo* or the use of an online survey?
    □ No  □ Yes  If yes, please explain:

11. Approximately how long did the online survey take to complete?
    Minutes

12. Do you have any additional comments, suggestions, questions, or concerns regarding the online survey?
APPENDIX D

Electronic Cover Letter

To: (e-mail address)
Fr: Edward Hoffman, Brian Moore
Re: Survey: Inclusion in the Instrumental Ensemble

Greetings Fellow Music Educator:

We would like your help examining the inclusion of students with special needs in the instrumental music programs of (enter state here). You were selected for participation in this study because you are a practicing K-12 instrumental music educator. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes and your responses are of value whether or not you actually have special education students participating in your music classes. You are being asked to complete this survey for research purposes and your responses to this survey will remain anonymous.

You are free to decide not to participate in this study without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled and there are no know risks involved in participating in this study. Your decision to complete and submit this survey indicates your decision to voluntarily participate in this research.

If you have any questions or concerns, you may phone the investigator at any time at (601) 896-2901 or through email at edwardhoffman@hotmail.com. You may also contact Dr. Brian Moore at (402) 472-2537 or email bmoore1@unl.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research project subject that have not been answered by the investigators, or to report any concerns about the project, you may contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board by phone at (402) 472-6965.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation in this research project and look forward to receiving your completed survey.

Edward C. “Ted” Hoffman, III  Dr. Brian Moore
Ph.D. Candidate  Associate Professor of Music Education
University of Nebraska-Lincoln  University of Nebraska-Lincoln
School of Music  School of Music

Please click on the link below to access the survey:

(survey link here)
APPENDIX E

Follow-up Letter 1

To:   (e-mail address)
Fr:   Ted Hoffman, Brian Moore
Re:  Survey: Inclusion in the Instrumental Ensemble

Greetings Fellow Music Educator:

Approximately ten days ago, you were emailed an invitation to participate in research concerning the status of special education students in instrumental music. As of the date of this email message, your responses to the survey have not been received or are incomplete. Rest assured your data will be reported anonymously and this survey requires only a few minutes of your time. Your input may provide fellow music educators with valuable data that will allow them to better include students with special needs in instrumental music.

We would like your help examining the inclusion of students with special needs in instrumental music ensembles. You were selected for participation in this study because you are a practicing K-12 instrumental music educator and all instrumental ensemble directors in your state are being sent this e-mail letter and link to a survey. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes and your responses are of value whether or not you actually have special education students participating in your music classes. You are being asked to complete this survey for research purposes and your responses to this survey will remain anonymous.

You are free to decide not to participate in this study without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled and there are no know risks involved in participating in this study. Your decision to complete and submit this survey indicates your decision to voluntarily participate in this research.

If you have any questions or concerns, you may phone the investigator at any time at (601) 896-2901 or through email at edwardhoffman@hotmail.com. You may also contact Dr. Brian Moore at (402) 472-2537 or email bmoore1@unl.edu. If you have any question regarding your rights as a research project subject that have not been answered by the investigators, or to report any concerns about the project, you may contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board by phone at (402) 472-6965.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation in this research project and look forward to receiving your completed survey.

Edward C. “Ted” Hoffman, III
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
School of Music

Dr. Brian Moore
Music Education
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
School of Music

Please click on the link below to access the survey:

(survey link here)
APPENDIX F

Follow-up Letter 2

To:  (e-mail address)
Fr:   Edward Hoffman, Brian Moore
Re:   Survey: Inclusion in the Instrumental Ensemble

Greetings Fellow Music Educator:

In ten days, the electronic link to the survey “Inclusion in the Instrumental Ensemble” will close. Your input may provide fellow music educators with valuable data that will allow them to better include students with special needs in instrumental music. Rest assured, your responses to the survey will be reported anonymously and this survey requires only a few minutes of your time. Your responses to this survey help ensure that “music for all” becomes a reality.

We would like your help examining the inclusion of students with special needs in instrumental music ensembles. You were selected for participation in this study because you are a practicing K-12 instrumental music educator and all instrumental ensemble directors in your state are being sent this e-mail letter and link to a survey. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes and your responses are of value whether or not you actually have special education students participating in your music classes. You are being asked to complete this survey for research purposes and your responses to this survey will remain anonymous.

You are free to decide not to participate in this study without adversely affecting your relationship with the invigorators or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled and there are no known risks involved in participating in this study. Your decision to complete and submit this survey indicates your decision to voluntarily participate in this research.

If you have any question or concerns, you may phone the investigator at any time at (601) 896-2901 or through email at edwardhoffman@hotmail.com. You may also contact Dr. Brian Moore at (402) 472-2537 or email bmoore1@unl.edu. If you have any question regarding your rights as a research project subject that have not been answered by the investigators, or to report any concerns about the project, you may contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board by phone at (402) 472-6965.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation in this research project and look forward to receiving your completed survey.

Edward C. “Ted” Hoffman, III
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
School of Music

Dr. Brian Moore
Associate Professor of Music Education
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
School of Music

Please click on the link below to access the survey:

(survey link here)
Introduction

The purpose of this study is to describe how you, the instrumental music educator, describe and facilitate the participation of students with special needs in the instrumental musical ensemble. For the purposes of this research, a "student with special needs" is any student who receives special education services for all or part of the school day.

Your identity, the identity of your students, and the identity of your institution will be kept confidential. There are no known risks associated with participation in this study.

The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Should you be interrupted during this survey, you may click the "save and continue survey later" text at the top of the page and return to your survey at your convenience. Thank you in advance for your participation.

I agree to participate in this study:

( ) Yes
( ) No
I. The Music Educator

1.) Please identify your gender:

( ) Female
( ) Male

2.) Please identify your age within the specified category:

( ) 20-25
( ) 26-30
( ) 31-35
( ) 36-40
( ) 41-45
( ) 46-50
( ) 51-55
( ) 56 and older

3.) Please identify the most advanced academic degree held:

( ) Bachelor's Degree
( ) Master's Degree
( ) Specialist Degree
( ) Doctorate
( ) Other (please specify)

4.) In what area(s) are you CERTIFIED to teach?:

[ ] Band
[ ] Choir
[ ] General Music
[ ] Orchestra/Strings
[ ] Other (please specify)
5.) How has your college education prepared you to teach students with special needs (a.k.a., special learners or special education students)?:
   (check all that apply)

[ ] At least one undergraduate course in music for students with special needs
[ ] At least one undergraduate special education course for teachers of all subjects
[ ] At least one graduate course in music for students with special needs
[ ] At least one graduate special education course for teachers of all subjects
[ ] No undergraduate or graduate course in special education

6.) Please state the total number of years you have taught K-12 instrumental music, including this year:

______

7.) Please state the number of years you have taught in your current school, including this year:

_____
II. Community and School Setting

8.) In which state do you currently teach?

( ) Alabama
( ) Alaska
( ) American Samoa
( ) Arizona
( ) Arkansas
( ) California
( ) Colorado
( ) Connecticut
( ) Delaware
( ) District of Columbia
( ) Federated States of Micronesia
( ) Florida
( ) Georgia
( ) Guam
( ) Hawaii
( ) Idaho
( ) Illinois
( ) Indiana
( ) Iowa
( ) Kansas
( ) Kentucky
( ) Louisiana
( ) Maine
( ) Marshall Islands
( ) Maryland
( ) Massachusetts
( ) Michigan
9.) Please identify the item that best describes the community in which your school is located:
   ( ) Rural
   ( ) Suburban
   ( ) Urban

10.) Please identify the item that best describes your school:
   ( ) Boarding School
   ( ) Charter School
   ( ) Private School
   ( ) Public School
   ( ) Other (please specify)

11.) Please state the approximate total student population of your SCHOOL:

       ____
III. The Music Program

12.) Which subject do you spend the greatest part of the school day teaching?:

( ) Band  
( ) Choir  
( ) General Music  
( ) Orchestra/Strings  
( ) Other (please specify)

13.) In which grade level(s) is instrumental music offered at your school?:
(check all that apply)

[ ] PreK  
[ ] K  
[ ] 1st  
[ ] 2nd  
[ ] 3rd  
[ ] 4th  
[ ] 5th  
[ ] 6th  
[ ] 7th  
[ ] 8th  
[ ] 9th  
[ ] 10th  
[ ] 11th  
[ ] 12th
14.) Please enter student enrollment figures for any instrumental music course(s) you teach:  *SSN = students with special needs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Students Enrolled (including SSN)</th>
<th>Number of Strictly SSN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band, First Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band, Second-Third Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band, Four Years or More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra/Strings, First Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra/Strings, Second-Third Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra/Strings, Four Years or More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Instrumental Ensemble, First Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Instrumental Ensemble, Second-Third Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Instrumental Ensemble, Four Years or More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.) Please categorize, by disability(ies), those students with special needs identified in question 14:

| Number of SSN in Instrumental Music by Disability |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Autism                          |                               |
| Deaf-Blindness (both simultaneously) |                               |
| Developmental Delay (only students age 3-9 qualify) |         |
| Emotional Disturbance           |                               |
| Hearing Impairment              |                               |
| Mental Retardation              |                               |
| Multiple Disabilities (two or more disabilities listed here) |             |
| Orthopedic Impairment (i.e., tuberculosis, cerebral palsy, amputations) | |
| Other Health Impairment (i.e., asthma, ADD, AD/HD, diabetes, epilepsy, leukemia, sickle cell, Tourettes) | |
| Specific Learning Disability (i.e., dyslexia) |                      |
| Speech or Language Impairment   |                               |
| Traumatic Brain Injury          |                               |
| Visual Impairment               |                               |
### IV. Inclusion

16.) How often do the following aspects of your teaching situation INHIBIT or PREVENT your ability to include students with special needs in your schools instrumental ensembles?:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Materials</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Enrollment/ Size</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom School Physical Layout</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Travel</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. and/or Training to Teach SSN</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. for Individual SSN</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Support</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectations</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Time</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Scheduling</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from SPED Faculty and/or Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17.) In your observations and experiences, how often do students with special needs SUCCESSFULLY accomplish the following tasks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable Behavior</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable Interactions with Other Students</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Dexterity/ Fingerings</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Carriage/ Hand Positions</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorization</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement/ Marching</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Musical Responsibilities (i.e., remembering materials)</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Performance</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm Performance/ Reading</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight-Reading</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone Production</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18.) How likely would you be to administer the following accommodations?:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altered/Abbreviated Audition/Assessment</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered/Arranged Music Notation</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered Instrument Carriage/Manipulation</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Assignment/Selection Flexibility</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer Playing Time Before Audition/Assessment</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring/Peer Partnering with RegEd Student</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify Ensemble Instruction Pace</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential Seating/Field/Performance Placement</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Lessons</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd Paraprofessionals During Instruction</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19.) Please describe any positive or negative experiences with inclusion in your ensemble (optional):

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

20.) May the researcher contact you for follow-up questions or interviews? If so, please complete (optional):

  First Name: __________________________________________
  Last Name: __________________________________________
  Title: ________________________________________________
  School Name: _________________________________________
  Street Address: _______________________________________
  City: _________________________________________________
  State: ________________________________________________
  Zip: _________________________________________________
  Email Address: _______________________________________
  Phone Number: ________________________________________
Thank You!

Thank you for participating in this survey.