

This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL STANDARDS
FOR MUSIC EDUCATION WITHIN SECONDARY
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC PROGRAMS
IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN
presented by

JASON THOMAS SKUBE

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

MASTERS degree in MUSIC EDUCATION

Cynthia Taggart
Major professor

Date December 4, 2002



PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
MAR 20 2005		
MAR 27 2006		
DEC 15 2009		
121609		

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR MUSIC
EDUCATION WITHIN SECONDARY INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC PROGRAMS IN
THE STATE OF MICHIGAN**

By

Jason Thomas Skube

A THESIS

**Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of**

MASTER OF MUSIC EDUCATION

Department of Music

2002

ABSTRACT

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR MUSIC EDUCATION WITHIN SECONDARY INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC PROGRAMS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

By

Jason Thomas Skube

The purpose of this research was to gather information on the implementation of the National Standards for Music Education within secondary instrumental music programs in Michigan. A teacher survey was constructed and sent to a random sample of secondary public school band directors throughout Michigan. The survey was designed to answer the following research questions: 1. Are the National Standards being taught within secondary instrumental music programs in Michigan, 2. Do secondary instrumental music teachers in Michigan feel competent teaching all core areas included in the National Standards, 3. What factors hinder or facilitate the implementation of the National Standards in secondary instrumental music settings in Michigan, and 4. What types of activities do secondary instrumental music teachers use to help them achieve the National Standards? Additionally, eleven band programs deemed exemplary by college band conductors, graduate conducting students, and music educators, curricula were obtained, if available, to determine if the Standards were included in their band program; comparisons were also drawn from the exemplary band directors surveys. Results suggest that Standards 2, 7, 8, and 9 are being fully included at least occasionally in Michigan's secondary band programs, Standards 5 and 6 are being partially included at least occasionally in Michigan's secondary band programs, and Standards 3 and 4 are not being taught in Michigan's secondary band programs. A large percentage of band directors indicated that Standard 1 was also included in their band programs. The majority of band directors indicated that they feel moderately to very competent teaching the Standards.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the following persons for their guidance, assistance, inspiration, patience, support, and prayers throughout this project.

Dr. Cynthia Taggart

Dr. Al LeBlanc

Mr. John Madden

Dr. Colleen Conway

Mr. John Whitwell

Those who participated in this study

My family, Thomas and Geraldine Skube, and Vikki, Lance, and Hannah Richey

Kristin Trpezanovich

Angela Psaros

Kristine Dowell

Sue Palin

Special thanks to my family and friends who pushed me with love to accomplish this project as well as my life goals. Thank you and I love you all. Special thanks also to Dr. Cynthia Taggart, whose will and determination to inspire learning and facilitate personal success is greater than any professional educator I have encountered in my educational experience. Without you, this project would not be. Thank you, Cindy... a million times over again!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of tables.....	iv
Chapter One	1
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	2
Chapter Two.....	9
Related Research.....	9
Standards in Teacher Education.....	9
Standards in Elementary and Secondary Education	12
Chapter Three.....	20
Design and Procedures.....	20
Criterion Measure	21
Analysis.....	22
Chapter Four	24
Results.....	24
Exemplary Schools Survey and Curricula	24
Summary.....	28
Surveys.....	30
Survey Results, Question “a”	30
Survey Results, Question “b”	32
Survey Results, Question “c” and Section 15.....	34
Summary43	
Survey Results, Sections 16 and 17	45
Summary	48
Chapter Five.....	49
Summary	49
Conclusions.....	51
Implications and Suggestions for Future Research.....	52
References.....	55
Appendix A: Content and Achievement Standards for Grades Nine Through Twelve.....	58
Appendix B: UCRIHS Approval	63
Appendix C: Consent Form: Exemplary Schools.....	64

Appendix D: Secondary Instrumental Music Educator Survey	65
Appendix E: Consent Form: Survey Participation.....	74
Appendix F: Survey Cover Letter	75
Appendix G: Follow Up Letter	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Exemplary Schools' Band Directors' Participation in Study	25
Table 2: Mean Scores for Survey Questions One Through Fourteen, Question "a:" How Often Students Are Engaged in the Activities Delineated by the Standards	31
Table 3: Mean Scores for Survey Questions One Through Fourteen, Question "b:" How Competent Band Directors Feel in Teaching the Activities Delineated by the Standards.....	33

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

High school instrumental programs are often defined as exemplary and/or successful by the number of first-division contest ratings and trophies they have received at various competitions and festivals in the recent past. Some secondary instrumental programs have had opportunities, such as performing at important musical conferences, and consequently are deemed exemplary. A program may also be considered exemplary simply by having a reputation of delivering quality performances on a regular basis. Undoubtedly, the students that make up these programs have received excellent instruction on how to play their musical instruments; their performances speak for themselves. Upon hearing a superb performance from an individual or ensemble, band directors are credited appropriately with having outstanding musical skills and the ability to use those skills to the benefit of their students. However, other than delivering outstanding performances, what else can the students that make up an exemplary program communicate musically? Do these students have a historical knowledge base of the music that they have performed or music in general? Do they feel competent in engaging in a musical discussion about a piece that they are preparing for performance? Can they draw comparisons between a piece that they have performed and world musics? Do they have compositional skills? Do they have theoretical knowledge beyond the bare minimum that is necessary for performing a piece of music?

Are students of exemplary secondary instrumental programs receiving a comprehensive music education beyond acquiring performance-oriented skills? Bell (1986) found that band directors view instructional tasks that are designed to prepare

students to make a positive contribution to the performance level of the ensemble to be of primary importance in band class. Furthermore, Bell reports that directors place low levels of importance on instructional tasks designed to impart general knowledge about music, and that directors' concerns are limited to knowledge about compositions under rehearsal. Austin (1998) reported that most music teachers devote their time to attaining traditional performance objectives rather than implementing teaching strategies that result in their students receiving a comprehensive music education. Furthermore, he found that many ensemble directors might not value long-term outcomes associated with Comprehensive Musicianship, which overlap considerably with the objectives stated in the National Standards. The National Standards for Music Education have been designed so that students are given the opportunity to have a complete music education that focuses on acquiring broad-based musical skills rather than only skills that will ensure a good performance. The following Content Standards were developed for secondary instrumental music education:

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

Literature Review

Voluntary National Content and Achievement Standards for the arts were developed by the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations and adopted by the National Committee for Standards in the Arts in January 1994 (MENC, 1994a). The

Consortium comprised the following organizations: the American Alliance for Theater and Education, the Music Educators National Conference, the National Art Education Association, and the National Dance Association. The National Standards for Arts Education received development support from the Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities (MENC, 1994a). Adherence to the National Standards would result in an opportunity for every student in America to receive a balanced, comprehensive, and sequential program of instruction in school arts classes, including dance, music, theater, and visual arts, taught by qualified teachers (MENC, 1994a; MENC, 1994b). The National Standards were designed to define in clear terms what every student should know and be able to do in the arts upon exiting grades four, eight, and twelve (MENC, 1994b). The Consortium asserted that students should know and be able to do the following (MENC, 1994c):

- Communicate at a basic level in the four arts disciplines of dance, music, theater, and visual arts, which includes knowledge and skills in the use of basic vocabularies, materials, tools, techniques, and intellectual methods of each arts discipline.
- Communicate proficiently in at least one art form, including the ability to define and solve artistic problems with insight, reason, and technical proficiency.
- Develop and present basic analyses of art from structural, historical, and cultural perspectives, and from combinations of those perspectives, including the ability to understand and evaluate work in various arts disciplines.
- Have an informed acquaintance with exemplary works of art from a variety of cultures and historical periods, and a basic understanding of historical development in the arts disciplines, across the arts as a whole, and within cultures.
- Relate various types of arts knowledge and skills within and across the arts disciplines, including mixing and matching competencies and understandings in art making, history and culture, and analysis in any arts related project.

The Consortium stated that students who develop these capabilities would possess the knowledge, beliefs, and values for making personal and artistic decisions (MENC, 1994c).

The Consortium developed two types of Standards to guide student assessment from kindergarten to twelfth grade: 1) Content Standards, which specify what students should know and be able to do in the arts disciplines (competencies), and 2) Achievement Standards, which specify the understandings and levels of achievement that students are expected to attain in the competencies for all of the arts upon the completion of grades four, eight, and twelve (MENC, 1994c). All Content Standards, for kindergarten through twelfth grade, have associated Achievement Standards. In addition, grades nine through twelve have two levels of Achievement Standards linked to the Content Standards: Proficient and Advanced. MENC (1994b) states that the proficient level is designed to apply to the student who has elected music courses involving relevant skills or knowledge for one to two years beyond grade eight, and the advanced level is designed to apply to the student who has elected music courses involving relevant skills or knowledge for three to four years beyond grade eight. The Achievement Standards (as they relate to the Content Standards) for grades nine through twelve can be found in Appendix A.

The National Standards do not constitute a curriculum, although they provide the basis for one (MENC, 1994b). The National Standards were designed to provide specific guidance for curriculum development, allowing alternative interpretations for implementation (MENC, 1994b). Wells (1997) stated that the Standards provide a valuable resource to guide curriculum development. However, there is no specific

procedure for turning the Standards into a grade-by-grade curriculum. Wells presented a plan on how to guide music educators in using the National Standards to design a comprehensive music curriculum. Additionally, MENC has published documents that can assist arts educators in efficiently implementing the National Standards within their classrooms (MENC 1994a, 1994b, and 1994c).

The reason for having standards and goals for education is to focus the efforts of the country on improving schools (Jennings, 1998). Lockwood (1998) found, in a review of literature, that overall student achievement in the United States school systems lags behind that of other nations and expressed concern that American students fall far short of the mark. This may hold serious consequences for future economic productivity (Lockwood, 1998). The individuals and organizations that Lockwood reviewed for her book view educational standards as a type of powerful organizer that will help significantly affect educational reform. They state that standards are a catalyst for change that will align different educational components, such as curriculum materials, assessments, textbooks, teacher professional development, teacher preservice, and the actual content of what students learn (Lockwood, 1998). Lockwood believes that it is not only possible, but also desirable, to reach a common core of valued knowledge that teachers should teach and students should learn.

Standards must be established to make clear what students ought to know (Jennings, 1998). However, it is unfair to expect students to achieve the National Standards in schools if they lack access to the opportunities and resources to attain them (Fehrs-Rompolla, 1994). If educators are going to be held accountable for student attainment of the Standards, decision makers must provide the necessary resources

(Fehrs-Rompolla, 1994). Due to the lack of uniformity in education, students moving from state to state or district to district in the midst of their education end up receiving and participating in an education of different content and quality (Lockwood, 1998). Teachers also experience the same problems when changing teaching locations (Lockwood, 1998). The vision of reformers who believe in Standards-based education is that curriculum will be arranged with a consensually agreed-upon core body of knowledge that is determined by the states and local communities that will transpire into the consistent preparation of students nationwide (Lockwood, 1998).

Implementing the National Standards can be a significant challenge for music educators. In 1995, Lehman wrote an article describing some of the challenges faced by teachers implementing the National Standards. He categorized some of the more difficult challenges teachers encounter into three general areas: assessment, resources, and professional development. Lehman (1995) stated that, although music teachers have used performance-based assessment and other forms authentic assessments in the past, they have never been comfortable in engaging formal assessment of the non-performance aspects of music learning. The second set of challenges teachers face typically takes the form of an inadequate curriculum, insufficient time, poor scheduling practices, inadequate staff, inadequate materials and equipment, and poor facilities (Lehman, 1995). The third set of challenges concerns the need for in-service professional development (Lehman, 1995). Lehman states that some teachers clearly are uncomfortable with the thought of being asked to teach certain skills and knowledge that they have never before taught and perhaps never learned. Despite these challenges, Lehman believes that music

educators should continue to push for adoption of the Standards at the state and local levels or for the adoption of state and local standards based on the Standards.

Shuler (1995) also studied the impact of the National Standards on the preparation, professional development, and assessment of music teachers. Shuler (1995) stated that simply changing state and local curricular frameworks to incorporate the Standards is not sufficient to improve music education. Institutions that prepare, license, and employ music teachers must use the Standards to focus their efforts (Shuler, 1995). Like Lehman, Shuler (1995) asserted that reforms within these areas play a critical role in preparing the arts education profession to produce high student achievement in the scope of learning emphasized in the Standards.

Fallis (1999) proposed an approach to teaching large ensemble courses that can lead to implementation of all the Standards without stretching the director, students, instructional time, and resources. Fallis (1999) stated that his approach takes little time to achieve and can improve the quality of ensembles performances by contributing to students' musicianship without taking away from rehearsal time. Fallis' approach has been successfully implemented in over 20 junior high and high school band programs in Utah, Wyoming, and Idaho, as well as in preparation for honors band performances and performances at state music educators association conferences. Also, it has been incorporated successfully into college method courses. Fallis recommended that, rather than students learning their own individual parts and then putting them together in performance, together they should learn the work's melody, rhythm patterns, and underlying chord progression. Fallis continued by emphasizing that, under the instructor's guidance, students could arrange the piece as a class, producing a version of

the composition that is unique to them. Fallis provided a sample lesson plan based on a musical composition and indicated where each Standard was covered in the lesson. Fallis stated that by the time each of the exercises was completed, all of the Standards would be addressed.

The Standards are not perfect (Lehman, 1995). However, they present a reasonable approach to making arts education, specifically music education, a comprehensive music education rather than a basic “learn how to play your instrument and perform concerts” education. Teachers face significant challenges as they seek to implement the Standards (Lehman, 1995). Although the task is not easy, it may be necessary if music programs are to survive and flourish (Lehman, 1995). The music Standards provide an unprecedented opportunity to rebuild and expand music programs (Lehman, 1995).

The purpose of this research is to gather information on the implementation of the National Standards for Music Education within secondary instrumental music programs in Michigan. Following are the specific research questions for this study:

1. Do curricula obtained from selected exemplary secondary instrumental music programs in Michigan meet the National Standards?
2. Are the National Standards being taught within secondary instrumental music programs in Michigan?
3. Do secondary instrumental music teachers in Michigan feel competent teaching all core areas included in the National Standards?
4. What factors hinder or facilitate the implementation of the National Standards in secondary instrumental music settings in Michigan?
5. What types of activities do secondary instrumental music teachers use to help them achieve the National Standards?

CHAPTER TWO

Related Research

Many researchers have investigated the applications of the National Standards for Music Education in a variety of settings. Studies focusing on the Standards have been completed at all grade and educational levels, including college, to gain an understanding of their implementation.

Standards in Teacher Education

The following studies on the National Standards for Music Education were completed to assess the implementation of the Standards in collegiate music teacher education programs.

The purpose of McCaskill's (1998) study was to determine knowledge, attitudes, and professional practices of general music methods professors in relation to the National Standards for Music Education. McCaskill sent questionnaires to 435 schools that awarded baccalaureate degrees in music teacher education during 1994 to 1995. The questionnaire that was sent to general music methods professors requested information in the following categories: demographics, personal knowledge regarding the National Standards for Music Education, personal attitudes about the Standards, and professional practices relating to the Standards; 273 questionnaires were completed and returned. McCaskill found that an overwhelming majority (97%) of the respondents were aware of the Standards and had read a portion of the document, as well as other Standards publications. Many of the respondents agreed that the Standards could improve the quality of the music education profession, that they could elevate the status of music in education, that college music education students should be prepared to teach to the

Standards, and that the Standards should be addressed in all areas of the college music curriculum (McCaskill, 1998).

McCaskill reported that nearly all professors indicated that they included the Standards in their methods courses as a topic of class discussion, as a curricular framework, and as a basis for lesson planning. McCaskill stated that 70% of professors required Standards-related readings, 60% required students to reference the Standards in their class projects and presentations, and approximately 40% included assessment activities related to the Standards. Additionally, McCaskill found that nearly 70% of the respondents had attended conferences, workshops, and symposia regarding the Standards. However, fewer than half of the respondents (41.5%) indicated that the Standards had been discussed in a music faculty meeting (McCaskill, 1998). Additionally, 17.6 % indicated their college/university had sponsored a conference, workshop, or symposium regarding the Standards, 8% reported that the Standards had been discussed in music courses other than music education, 35% indicated that they had held Standards-related leadership roles at their institution, 28.2% indicated that they held Standards-related leadership roles within their state.

McCaskill drew the following conclusions from her study: general music methods professors are aware of and knowledgeable about the National Standards for Music Education; professors attitudes toward the Standards are clearly positive; the Standards appear to be impacting teaching practices and professional behaviors of music methods professors; relationships exist among professors' knowledge, attitudes, teaching/professional behaviors and institutional and/or individual demographic variables.

Adderly (1999) sought to determine if instrumental music education faculty at higher education institutions in South Carolina believed that relevant preparation for implementing the Standards was being given to future band directors during their undergraduate studies. He devised separate surveys to be completed by music educators at each college/university concerning the education of undergraduate music students preparing to teach in fifth to eighth grade instrumental classes and preparing to teach ninth to twelfth grade instrumental classes. Sixteen out of eighteen respondents returned their surveys and rated the Content Standards and their respective subsets using a five-point Likert scale (five being superior) to indicate the quality of education provided to their undergraduate music education students for each Standard.

Adderly drew comparisons among the responses received from his survey for the fifth to eighth grade instrumental methods faculty. The mean response for all the Standards, excluding Standard 1 (Adderly stated that Standard 1, which focuses on singing, was non-applicable for instrumental music) was 3.87. Adderly conducted an analysis of variance to determine if the differences in rankings were significantly different. He found that the quality of instruction for Standards that relate to history, disciplines outside the arts, and improvisation was significantly lower than for those Standards that specify goals for reading music and performing on instruments.

Adderly also drew comparisons among the responses received from his survey from the ninth to twelfth grade instrumental methods faculty. The average mean response for all the Standards, excluding Standard 1, was 3.77. Adderly conducted an analysis of variance to determine if the ranking of the Standards was significantly different. Adderly

reported that the Standard for performing on instruments was rated statistically higher than the Standards for disciplines outside the arts, as well as for improvisation.

Adderly also used his survey to determine if students enrolled in these instrumental methods classes were receiving instruction on the Achievement Standards, which are subheadings of the Content Standards. Adderly reported that college/university instrumental music faculty believe that they are adequately preparing future band directors to implement the various Content and/or Achievement Standards. However, Adderly concluded that teacher preparation regarding the implementing of the Content Standards needs serious consideration, specifically as it relates to Content Standard 3 (improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments), Content Standard 4 (composing and arranging music within specified guidelines), and Content Standard 8 (understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts) in both the fifth to eighth grade and the ninth to twelfth grade instrumental methods classes. Preparation to teach Content Standard 9 (understanding music in relation to history and culture) also needs additional consideration in the fifth to eighth grade instrumental methods classes. Finally, Adderly recommended that curricula of instrumental music teachers be designed to provide future teachers with appropriate musical experiences to enable them to successfully teach to these specific Content and/or Achievement Standards.

Standards in Elementary and Secondary Education

The following studies on the National Standards for Music Education were completed to assess the implementation of the Standards in elementary and secondary music programs.

Byo (1999) examined seven professional resources that influenced effective implementation of the Standards in the music classroom. These resources included teacher training, interest, ability, sense of responsibility, resources, assistance, and perception of available time. Furthermore, Byo made several curricular recommendations for curriculum planners, teachers, and decision makers when they engage in designing music curricula that adhere to the Standards.

Byo used a random sample of elementary music teachers, referred to as specialists, (N = 122) and fourth-grade classroom teachers, referred to as generalists (N = 122). She designed a survey with a total of 63 questions that asked seven questions regarding each of the nine National Standards for Music Education at the elementary level. The seven questions were identical for each Standard and asked the participants to evaluate their ability to address each Standard relative to the seven professional resources. Byo used a five-point Likert scale, which included strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, and strongly disagree. Although Byo does not provide the survey questions in her study, she does provide an example. For Standard 1, teachers were asked if they agreed that they were trained, interested, and able to teach the Standard; if they agreed that they felt professionally responsible to teach it; if they agreed that they had the resources to teach it; if they agreed that they would feel more able to teach it well with assistance of the other teacher; and if they agreed that they had the time to teach it.

Byo found that music teachers' responses were significantly more positive for all of the Standards than were those of the generalists. Overall, improvising and composing received the least favorable ratings, and understanding music in relation to history and culture received the highest ratings. The generalists indicated that they were less

comfortable than the specialists in teaching all of the Standards. Specialists indicated the most favorable ratings for singing, listening and analyzing, and evaluating, and were slightly more comfortable teaching evaluating than listening and analyzing. The generalists indicated the most favorable ratings for understanding relationships between music and other subjects and understanding music in relation to history and culture. Additionally, the specialists and generalists also rated the Standards in terms of their interest in teaching the Standards, the level of responsibility for teaching the Standards, their ability to teach the Standards, and their training for teaching the Standards. Specialists rated the singing and notating Standards the highest in relation to interest, responsibility, ability, and training. Both specialists and generalists rated the composing and improvising Standards as the most difficult Standards to implement. Specialists indicated that playing instruments and composing were potentially difficult. Specialists did not believe that they had time to teach effectively any of the Standards; the generalists tended to concur with the specialists, with their answers to that question ranging from disagreement to strong disagreement. Specialists indicated that there were few resources available for teaching improvisation and music as it relates to other subjects; however they felt they were sufficiently equipped to implement the Standards that include singing, reading and notating music, and evaluating music. Generalists rated resources at the lowest level for the majority of the Standards. Finally, for six of the nine Standards, specialists indicated that their educational training had not prepared them to implement the Standards effectively in their classrooms. Generalists indicated that they were able to implement the Standards in their classrooms beyond what their educational training had prepared them to do.

Byo drew the following conclusions from her data: 1) there is a shortage of instructional time reported by music teachers and generalists, 2) the generalists expressed higher levels of comfort with the Standards concerning understanding music in relation to other subjects and understanding music in relation to history and culture, 3) overall, music specialists are comfortable with the Standards, and 4) music specialists felt qualified to teach all but the two integrated Standards (understanding music in relation to other subjects, and understanding music in relation to history and culture) by themselves. Byo stated that the results of her study delineate the limitations that the educational system has regarding curricular organization, delivery, and teacher training in music education.

Austin (1998) conducted a meta-analysis that focused on the implementation of Comprehensive Musicianship in the music classroom. He investigated research pertaining to: 1) students achievement and attitudes, 2) teaching practices, and 3) teaching materials, teacher beliefs, and teacher training.

Austin stated that the Standards elevate the level of instrumental music teaching, which is narrow in scope and emphasizes commonplace activities, and believes that the National Standards for Music Education may be viewed as a “repackaging” of Comprehensive Musicianship principles. He illustrated the close relationship between the National Standards and Comprehensive Musicianship, noting considerable overlap in objectives, with the exception of the Standards that address understanding relationships among music, the other arts, and disciplines outside of the arts. Through the implementation of Comprehensive Musicianship in the music classroom, students might be able to “perform with understanding” (Austin, 1998).

Austin analyzed research on student achievement and attitudes and found that, regardless of the manner in which Comprehensive Musicianship approaches were implemented, results were positive. He stated that many researchers found that music achievement scores were consistently higher or significantly improved over time for students who were taught using the comprehensive approach. Furthermore, Austin found that researchers revealed that performances of students taught comprehensively were equal or superior to those of students trained traditionally.

The research Austin (1998) analyzed for the teaching practices portion of his study showed that instrumental and choral ensemble directors do not typically employ strategies that result in a comprehensive music education for their students. Austin stated that a majority of music teachers devote their time to traditional performance objectives that may or may not be compatible with the development of a comprehensive music education.

Austin also found that many ensemble directors might not value long-term outcomes associated with Comprehensive Musicianship. It is possible that, due to the manner in which society interprets and defines successful music teaching, directors prefer to emphasize music instruction that immediately improves student performance (Austin, 1998). Additionally, Austin communicated that music teachers' unfamiliarity with published materials and effective teaching strategies can alter their beliefs, awareness of materials, and instructional practices.

To conclude, Austin stated that many ensemble directors favor a more traditional, performance-based methodology, which unfortunately does not comply with the National Standards. However, Austin asserted that studies have demonstrated that ensemble

instructor's confidence in the implementation of Comprehensive Musicianship can be increased through professional development training. Education may alter teachers' perceptions of the Music Standards, resulting in their being more widely implemented in the music classroom. Austin made the following recommendations for implementing National and State Music Standards in music classes: 1) establishing realistic implementation goals and adopting a "phase in" process, 2) promoting research-based decision making, and 3) supporting and empowering teachers. Austin emphasized that efforts should be made to ensure that materials designated to help teachers implement Standards-based instruction are accessible, affordable, and teacher friendly. Austin believes that, by providing aspiring music teachers with knowledge regarding the National Standards, the need for in-service training at a later date may be minimized.

Baraiolo (1997) conducted a study concerning the awareness and implementation of the National Standards involving superintendents, principals, and music staff within selected Massachusetts school systems. Baraiolo found that, while the results showed a consistent awareness of the National Standards as well as strong philosophical support for them, little has changed in Massachusetts regarding the implementation of the Standards for music.

Kirkland (1996) evaluated kindergarten to twelfth grade choral, instrumental, and general music programs in South Carolina to determine at what proficiency levels the Standards were being met. She further examined what ratings South Carolina music teachers gave the Standards as goals for student achievement for kindergarten to twelfth grade students. Kirkland devised a questionnaire and sent it to the kindergarten to twelfth grade music teacher membership of the South Carolina Music Educators Association,

which is affiliated with the Music Educators National Conference. Her response rate was 71%.

Kirkland found that students were meeting the performance-oriented Standards, which included Standard 1 (singing, along and with others, a varied repertoire of music), and Standard 2 (performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music). These two Standards were at the highest proficiency levels out of the nine Standards. Kirkland stated that teachers also rated the content of Standards 1 and 2 as the most important goals for student achievement. Students' proficiency levels ranked lowest in Standard 3 (improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments) and Standard 4 (composing and arranging music within specified guidelines). Kirkland stated that teachers also rated Standards 3 and 4 as the least important goals for student achievement.

Kirkland concluded that South Carolina students are not meeting all nine Standards at high proficiency levels. She asserted that their adoption as goals for student achievement in South Carolina could result in the state's colleges and universities providing additional Standards training for their students in music education programs. Additionally, Kirkland emphasized that, through the adoption of the National Standards for Music Education, South Carolina music teachers could have the opportunity to ensure that music education is not only retained in school curriculums but also expanded and given equal status to other core subjects.

The purpose of Van Patten's (1997) study was to develop a model curriculum for implementation of the National Standards for Arts Education in high school instrumental music programs. Van Patten developed two California high school music programs'

curricula that emphasized comprehensive and creative musicianship and supported the intent of the National Standards. Van Patten stated that his results indicate that the Standards can be successfully incorporated in performance and non-performance-based instrumental music classes at the high school level with effective assessment of student competence.

It is clear that music educators need further training concerning the National Standards for Music Education. The studies discussed here present an indication that the National Standards have not completely found their place within kindergarten through twelfth grade music curriculum, nor fully into the college music curriculum. Although controversy might exist regarding the implementation of the National Standards, their implementation would undisputedly expand the musical knowledge base of students, thus assisting them in becoming more comprehensive musicians. The National Standards for Music Education were designed to encourage better learning in music as well as provide a foundation for music education, which would allow it to stand alongside other core subjects.

CHAPTER THREE

Design and Procedures

This study is designed in the following manner to answer each of the specific problem questions. After receiving UCRIHS approval (see Appendix B), University-level band conductors, graduate conducting students, and music educators were asked to provide a list of outstanding secondary instrumental programs in Michigan. Specifically, these professionals were asked to provide a list of approximately fifteen secondary instrumental music programs that they personally considered exemplary. From these lists, the eleven specific instrumental programs listed most frequently were chosen for participation in question one of this study. Band directors from each exemplary school were contacted via telephone and asked to voluntarily participate in the study; a consent letter was sent to those directors who agreed to participate in the study (see Appendix C).

Copies of music curriculum for each of the eleven exemplary programs were requested, if available, in order to analyze their contents and compare them to the National Standards for Music Education, grades nine to twelve. Comparisons were drawn for each Content Standard to determine if the curricula were designed to meet the National Standards for Music Education.

To investigate further what is being taught relative to the National Standards in secondary instrumental programs in Michigan, and answer the four remaining questions, a teacher survey was constructed (see Appendix D) and sent to secondary instrumental music teachers throughout Michigan. There are approximately 800 high schools in Michigan. A mailing list of 586 schools with instrumental music programs was purchased from the Michigan State Band and Orchestra Association (of the 800 high schools in

Michigan, not all schools belong to the Michigan State Band and Orchestra Association nor do all of the schools have instrumental music programs). From this list, 202 were randomly selected and represented a sample of high school band programs in Michigan. All private and religious based schools were eliminated as well as all schools that were the elementary or junior high level. Surveys and self-addressed, stamped, return envelopes were sent to the 202 randomly selected secondary schools band directors throughout Michigan. If the band directors were willing to participate in the study, then they were asked to sign and return the included consent letter (see Appendix E) along with their survey by the specified date communicated on the survey cover letter (See Appendix F). A follow-up letter was sent to directors who had not returned the survey within one week following the specified date (see Appendix G).

Criterion Measure

Survey questions were based on all Standards. The survey was designed to determine if secondary music teachers are teaching the National Standards in their music classrooms and if they feel competent teaching all core areas of the National Standards. The survey also asked the teachers to respond regarding the factors that hinder or facilitate the implementation of the National Standards in their classrooms. The survey consists of seventeen sections of questions. Sections 1 through 14 each focus on an individual Standard (Standards 2 – 9) and had three components (i.e., 1a, 1b, and 1c). The first component asked teachers how often they asked their students to engage in the activity or activities specified by the Standard. The second component asked teachers how competent they felt in teaching their students the activity or activities specified by the Standard. The third component allowed teachers to list the activity or activities they

implemented to allow their students to engage in the specified Standard. Responses for the first question (question a) of Sections 1 through 14 were indicated on a five-point scale: not at all, seldom, occasionally, frequently, and every rehearsal. A four-point scale was used for the responses to the second question (question b) of Sections 1 through 14: not at all, somewhat, moderately so, and very much so. The third question of Sections 1 through 14 was open-ended. Sections 15, 16, and 17 were open-ended questions that had a single component. Section 15 asked band directors to list activities that they use to implement Standard 1. Although Adderly (1999) stated that Standard 1 was not applicable for the instrumental setting due to its emphasis on singing, Section 15 does reflect this Standard, given that the Standards were designed for music education as a whole rather than exclusively for an instrumental or choral setting. Section 16 asked band directors to list the factors that hinder the implementation of the Standards within their music classrooms. Conversely, Section 17 asked band directors to list the factors that facilitate the implementation of the Standards within their music classrooms.

Analysis

The results of the statewide teacher survey were analyzed by calculating the means for questions a and b of Sections 1 through 14. Content analysis was used to analyze the answers to open-ended teacher survey questions (question c in Sections 1 through 14 as well as Sections 15, 16, and 17). Additionally, the surveys from the ten instrumental teachers from the exemplary schools were analyzed separately to determine whether what appears in curricula actually is being taught in those schools. The curricula obtained from the exemplary schools were analyzed by thoroughly reading the

document(s). As each Standard appeared, if at all, in the language within the band program's music curricula, the Standard was noted and deemed to be present.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Exemplary Schools Survey and Curricula

Band directors from each of the exemplary schools were contacted and asked to voluntarily participate in the curricular portion of the study. Of the eleven schools deemed exemplary by University-level band conductors, graduate conducting students, and music educators, only two directors chose to participate in this portion of the study, and each sent a Xerox copy of their schools' music curriculum. Additionally, these two band directors returned their completed survey. One of the eleven exemplary schools' band directors communicated via telephone that his/her music faculty was in the process of designing a new, Standards-based curriculum and therefore would be unable to send any curricular information. Additionally, this band director did not return the survey. Another of the eleven exemplary schools' band directors communicated via telephone that his/her program did not have a written curriculum. This band director did return the survey. Two of the eleven exemplary schools' band directors communicated via telephone that their programs had no written music curriculum and therefore could not participate in the curriculum portion of the study. Additionally, these two band directors did not return their survey. Five of the eleven exemplary schools' band directors chose not to participate in the curriculum portion of the study. However, two of these band directors returned their survey. Table 1 illustrates the exemplary schools band directors' participation in both the curricular and survey portions of the study.

Table 1

Exemplary Schools' Band Directors' Participation in Study

	Provided Curriculum	No Curriculum	Returned Survey	No Survey Returned	Did not participate in curriculum portion of study
Band Director 1	X		X		
Band Director 2	X		X		
Band Director 3		X (developing)		X	X
Band Director 4		X	X		X
Band Director 5		X		X	X
Band Director 6		X		X	X
Band Director 7		Not known	X		X
Band Director 8		Not known	X		X
Band Director 9		Not known		X	X
Band Director 10		Not known		X	X
Band Director 11		Not known		X	X

The survey returned from Band Director 1 indicated that all nine of the Standards were being implemented throughout his/her band program. The band director's response for Standard 3, student improvisation, was particular to the Jazz Band. However, the band director also indicated that he/she implements improvisational warm-up activities for the entire band. The band director's response for Standard 4, student composition, indicated that composition was an extra credit option for students to improve their letter grade. All other responses provided by the band director indicated activities towards the

implementation of the seven other Standards. In reference to Standard 8, the band director indicated that the following arts and subjects were taught in his/her band program: Visual Arts, Literature, and Science. The band director did not indicate which historical periods were being taught in his/her band program, but specified that the following cultures were being taught in his/her band program: African, South Asian, Australian, European, Japanese, Native American, and any other cultures that may be reflected by chosen band literature.

The curriculum provided by Band Director 1 consisted of four categories: Production, Appreciation, Criticism, and Aesthetics. The first category, Production, integrated Standard 2, Standard 4, and Standard 5. The second category, Appreciation, integrated Standard 2, Standard 8, and Standard 9. The third category, Criticism, integrated Standard 6 and Standard 7. The fourth category, Aesthetics, integrated Standard 6. Standard 1 and Standard 3 were not present in the language of the written curriculum. However, the band director indicated on the survey that Standard 1 was integrated in band class and Standard 3 was integrated in Jazz Band and possibly band class.

The survey returned from Band Director 2 indicated that all Standards except Standard 4 (composition) were being implemented throughout his/her band program. However, Standard 3 was exclusive to the Jazz Band; the band director indicated that little improvisation takes place outside of the Jazz Band program. Additionally, the director indicated that he/she had few opportunities in his/her large performing classes to allow students to engage in Standard 5 (notating music), and Standard 6 (analyzing music). In reference to Standard 8, the band director did not indicate which arts and/or

disciplines outside the arts were being taught within his/her band program, if any.

Similarly, the band director did not indicate which historical periods or cultures were being taught in his/her band program, if any.

The curriculum provided by the Band Director 2 was based on the 1995 National Standards for Arts Instruction. This document contains seven Content Standards that are identical to the Standards used for this study. However, two of the current Standards are not present in the 1995 National Standards for Arts Instruction: Standard 3, improvisation, and Standard 4, composition and arranging. The band director notated on his/her curriculum that the school's music faculty are currently revising the music curriculum to adhere to all nine Standards. As indicated by the survey completed by Band Director 2, all seven of the Content Standards from the 1995 National Standards for Arts Instruction are being integrated on a regular basis within the band director's band program, with the exception of the subcategories in Standards 5 and 6 of notating and analyzing music.

The survey returned from Band Director 4 indicated that the following Standards were being implemented throughout his/her band program: Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 4, Standard 5, Standard 6, Standard 8, and Standard 9. No response was indicated for Standard 3, improvisation or for Standard 7, evaluating music and music performances. In reference to Standard 4, composition and arranging, the band director indicated that he/she offers a final exam option in which a student(s) may write a composition. Additionally, the band director did not specify which arts and disciplines, historical periods, or cultures he/she incorporates within his/her classroom.

The survey returned from Band Director 7 indicated that the following Standards were being implemented throughout his/her band program: Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 6 (describing music), Standard 7, Standard 8, and Standard 9 (understanding music in relation to history). No responses were indicated for Standard 3, improvisation, Standard 4, composition and arranging, Standard 5, reading and notating music, Standard 6, listening to and analyzing music, or Standard 9, understanding music in relation to culture. In reference to Standard 8, the band director indicated that Drama and Visual Arts were incorporated within his/her band program; however, no disciplines outside of the Arts were specified.

The survey returned from Band Director 8 indicated that Standard 1 (singing) was being implemented throughout his/her band program. No response was indicated for Standards 2 through 9. It is possible that Band Director 8 began his/her survey with intention to complete it, but was unable to due to an interruption. Perhaps he/she, after the fact, thought he/she completed the survey and therefore sent it back. Conversely, Band Director 8 might not have been invested in the topic or simply did not have the time to complete the survey but chose to send it back anyway. Nevertheless, Band Director 8 must be implementing at least Standard 2 in addition to Standard 1.

Summary

Only two out of the eleven band directors from the exemplary programs chose to participate in the curricular portion of the study. Six out of the eleven exemplary band directors chose to return their survey. It is possible that the overall participation of these directors was low due to a lack of time, a lack of interest and/or investment in the topic,

and perhaps sheer embarrassment about their lack of incorporating the Standards in their music classrooms.

Results indicate that only one of the eleven band directors (9%) is incorporating all specified areas of the Standards within his/her music curriculum. Despite the fact that this band director's music curriculum does not include Standards 1 and 3, he/she indicated on the survey that these types of activities are included within his/her program. Four of eleven band directors (36%), only one of which provided a curriculum but all of which completed surveys, are incorporating various Standards into their band programs, but not all Standards. Three of the eleven band directors (27%) did not have a music curriculum.

The results clearly indicate that band programs deemed exemplary by University-level band conductors, graduate conducting students, and music educators are not thoroughly meeting the objectives detailed in the National Standards for Music Education. Thus, students of Michigan's exemplary band programs are not learning what the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations states they should learn and be able to do. It is possible that these programs are deficient in meeting the Standards due to performance obligations set by the director(s) and expected by the administration and community. A great deal of class time is necessary to prepare an ensemble for exceptional performances, which may relegate Standards-based classroom activities to a status of less importance. Conversely, these same performances were the basis on which these programs were identified as exemplary.

Surveys

Of the 202 randomly selected schools that received the survey, only 36 band directors (including the exemplary schools band directors) chose to voluntarily complete and return the survey, even after receiving a second request. The return rate was 17.82%, which is extremely low. As with the band directors from the exemplary programs, it is possible that band directors who received a survey chose not to participate in the study due to a lack of time, a lack of interest and/or investment in the topic, or perhaps sheer embarrassment about their failure to incorporate the Standards in their music classrooms.

Survey Results, Question “a”

Sections 1 through 14 of the survey each focused on an individual Standard. Each section had three questions. The first question (indicated by the representative question number and the letter “a”) of each section asked teachers how often they engaged students in the activity or activities specified by the Standard. The first question was a multiple-choice question with the following response options: a: not at all, b: seldom, c: occasionally, d: frequently, and e: every rehearsal (see Appendix B for survey questions and scale). Table 2 contains the means for each first question of Sections 1 through 14 derived from band director responses indicated on the survey. Each bold mean score represents the highest mean score for that question.

Table 2

Mean Scores for Survey Questions One Through Fourteen, Question "a:" How Often Students Are Engaged in the Activities Delineated by the Standards

	Choice A, not at all	Choice B, seldom	Choice C, occasionally	Choice D, frequently	Choice E, every rehearsal
Question 1a <i>Solo Playing</i>	2.77	33.33	50.00	11.11	2.77
Question 2a <i>Group Playing</i>	2.77	11.11	16.66	16.66	52.77
Question 3a <i>Improvisation</i>	31.42	34.28	8.57	25.71	0.00
Question 4a <i>Composition</i>	50.00	33.33	11.11	5.55	0.00
Question 5a <i>Arranging</i>	63.88	25.00	8.33	2.77	0.00
Question 6a <i>Reading</i>	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.22	77.77
Question 7a <i>Notating</i>	33.33	33.33	22.22	8.33	2.77
Question 8a <i>Listening</i>	0.00	2.85	34.28	51.42	11.42
Question 9a <i>Analyzing</i>	42.85	14.28	17.14	20.00	5.71
Question 10a <i>Describing</i>	8.57	28.57	28.57	22.85	11.42
Question 11a <i>Evaluating</i>	0.00	27.77	33.33	22.22	16.66
Question 12a <i>Other Arts</i>	8.33	13.88	36.11	36.11	5.55
Question 13a <i>History</i>	8.33	16.66	36.11	36.11	2.77
Question 14a <i>Culture</i>	8.57	31.42	37.14	20.00	2.85

Note. Each bold numerical value signifies the highest mean score for that question.

Table 2 illustrates that the more than half of the band directors indicated on their survey that the following Standards were fully being implemented at least occasionally in their programs: Standard 2 (performing in solo and with others), Standard 7 (evaluating music and music performances), Standard 8 (understanding relationships between music,

the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts), and Standard 9 (understanding music in relation to history and culture). More than half of the band directors indicated on their survey that the following Standards were partially being implemented at least occasionally in their programs: Standard 5 (reading music, but not notating music), and Standard 6 (listening and describing music, but not analyzing music). Although Standard 6 (describing music, but not listening and analyzing music), Standard 7, and Standard 9 (understanding music in relation to culture, but not history) were being incorporated, they were being implemented less often. These conclusions were derived by combining the total mean scores for each band director who answered c (occasionally), d (frequently), or e (every rehearsal) on their survey. More than half of the band directors indicated on their survey that the following Standards were not being implemented in their programs: Standard 3 (improvisation) and Standard 4 (composition and arranging). These conclusions were derived by combining the total mean scores for each band director who answered a (not at all) or b (seldom) on their survey.

Survey Results, Question “b”

The second question asked each band director how competent he/she felt teaching his/her students the activity or activities specified by the Standard. The answers to the second question (indicated by the representative question number and the letter “b”) were indicated on a four-point scale: a: not at all, b: somewhat, c: moderately so, d: very much so (see Appendix B for survey questions and scale). Table 3 contains the means for each question “b” of Sections 1 through 14, according to band directors’ responses to the survey. Each bold mean score represents the highest mean score for that question.

Table 3

Mean Scores for Survey Questions One Through Fourteen, Question "b:" How Competent Band Directors Feel in Teaching the Activities Delineated by the Standards

	Choice A, not at all	Choice B, somewhat	Choice C, moderately so	Choice D, very much so
Question 1a <i>Solo Playing</i>	0.00	2.77	25.00	72.22
Question 2a <i>Group Playing</i>	0.00	2.77	13.88	83.33
Question 3a <i>Improvisation</i>	8.57	31.42	42.85	17.14
Question 4a <i>Composition</i>	11.11	22.22	38.88	27.77
Question 5a <i>Arranging</i>	8.33	19.44	30.55	41.66
Question 6a <i>Reading</i>	0.00	0.00	2.77	97.22
Question 7a <i>Notating</i>	8.33	2.77	13.88	75.00
Question 8a <i>Listening</i>	0.00	2.85	11.42	85.71
Question 9a <i>Analyzing</i>	5.71	8.57	31.42	54.28
Question 10a <i>Describing</i>	2.85	2.85	34.28	60.00
Question 11a <i>Evaluating</i>	0.00	5.55	27.77	66.66
Question 12a <i>Other Arts</i>	0.00	17.14	25.71	57.14
Question 13a <i>History</i>	2.77	5.55	41.66	50.00
Question 14a <i>Culture</i>	2.85	25.71	34.28	37.14

Note. Each bold numerical value signifies the highest mean score for that question.

Table 3 illustrates that the majority of band directors indicated on their survey that they feel at least moderately competent teaching all Standards outlined in the National Standards for Music Education. This finding suggests that secondary band directors in Michigan are capable of teaching the musical activities detailed by the Standards, but there are factors that are preventing them from teaching the Standards in their classroom.

Additionally, the mean scores suggest that, out of all the Standards, band directors feel least comfortable teaching Standard 3 (improvisation) and Standard 4 (composition, but they are comfortable with teaching arranging).

Survey Results, Question “c” and Section 15

Sections 1 through 14, question three (indicated by the representative question number and the letter “c”), and Section 15 of the survey were open-ended questions. Each question in Sections 1 through 14 and Section 15 allowed band directors to list the activity or activities they had implemented to allow their students to fulfill the activity or activities outlined by the Standard. The following list is a compilation of each survey question “c” and Section 15 as well as the responses from all band directors (Notes: 1. The number of band directors who communicated each bulleted response is found in the parenthetical reference immediately following the response. 2. Each response was taken directly from the survey. 3. Many of the responses indicate a setting(s) or passive method(s) rather than specific activity or activities that allow students to engage in a Standards-based action.).

1. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to perform on instruments in solo a varied repertoire of music, if any?
 - No response (2)
 - Solo & Ensemble Festival (28)
 - Solo in concert literature (9)
 - Recitals (5)
 - Soloing with Concert Band (5)
 - Community performances (4)
 - Senior groups, church’s, community groups, concerts
 - Playing tests (4)
 - After school solo literature rehearsals (3)
 - Jazz Band (3)
 - Church performance (3)
 - District Festival (3)
 - In class performance/participation (2)

- Private lessons (2)
- Multiple large ensembles (2)
- Ensembles at concerts (2)
- Solo/Ensemble day (2)
- Solo & Ensemble class (1)
- In class performances of personally chosen music (1)
- Pre-concert music (1)
- Cabarets (1)
- Competitions (1)
- College prep auditions (1)
- Auditions (1)
- School events (1)
- Masterclasses(1)
- Concerto Competition (1)
- Solo concert (1)
- Solo exams (1)
- Student demonstrations (1)

2. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to perform on instruments with others a varied repertoire of music, if any?

- No response (5)
- Daily rehearsal (14)
- Solo & Ensemble performance (11)
- All bands, small and large ensembles (5)
- Concerts (5)
 - Public, conferences, conventions
- Church performances (4)
- Sectionals (3)
- Recitals (2)
- Competitions (2)
- Community functions (2)
- Chamber groups (1)
- Chamber recitals (1)
- Festivals (1)
- Special functions (1)
 - Area mass bands (1)
 - All-star bands (1)
- Guest conductors (1)
- Solo & Ensemble class (1)
- Small ensembles (1)
- Student recitals (1)
- In class performances (1)
- Solo concert (1)

- Honors band (1)
 - Secondary instrument concert (1)
3. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to improvise melodies, variations, and accompaniments, if any?
- No response (14)
 - Jazz Band improvisation (17)
 - Warm-up exercises (2)
 - 12 bar blues, 32 bar solos
 - Individual improvisation projects
 - Beginning Band (3)
 - Music Theory class (3)
 - Band Class (2)
 - Rhythmic, scalar improvisation within warm-up (1)
 - Dixieland Band (1)
 - Guest artists (1)
 - Small group work (1)
 - Books (1)
 - Students transcribe what they are listening to on CD or radio in class (1)
 - Secondary instrument class (1)
 - Honors band assignments (1)
4. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to compose music, if any?
- No response (17)
 - Encourage students to compose (4)
 - In class performance and holiday concert performance
 - Music Theory class (4)
 - Music technology/composition software (3)
 - Small group work (2)
 - Pep Band (1)
 - Jazz Band (1)
 - Honors band assignments (1)
 - Composition in advanced placement theory class (1)
 - General composition time allotted (1)
 - A composition assignment (1)
 - Extra credit composition assignment (1)
 - Final exam option (to write a composition) instead of general final (1)
 - Music Theory assignments (1)
 - Secondary instrument class (1)
5. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to arrange music, if any?

- No response (20)
 - Music technology/computer software (4)
 - Encouraged to arrange (3)
 - Arranging parts for different instrumentation or ensembles (2)
 - Marching Band (2)
 - Music Theory class (2)
 - Pep Band (2)
 - Music Theory assignments (1)
 - Music writing day (1)
 - Honors Band assignments (1)
 - Secondary instrument class (1)
 - Arrange chorales (1)
 - Arrangements performed in class and at holiday concerts (1)
6. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to read and notate music, if any?
- No response (3)
 - Daily rehearsals and sectionals (13)
 - Music vocabulary study, written quizzes, sight reading activities
 - Daily review of major/minor keys, scales, & exercises
 - Daily review of rhythmic studies
 - Frequent reading of pre-selected literature
 - Sight reading (11)
 - Daily sight reading (4)
 - Concerts (2)
 - Rhythm reading drills (2)
 - Music Theory in rehearsal (1)
 - Flash cards (1)
 - Sight reading a couple of times/week (1)
 - Private lessons (1)
 - Sight singing (1)
 - Sight singing with solfege (1)
 - Chanting (1)
 - Counting rhythms (1)
 - Solos and ensembles (1)
7. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to notate music if any?
- No response (20)
 - Music Theory class or study (3)
 - Music Theory worksheets in band class (3)

- Notate music in band class (2)
 - Writing parts out (2)
 - Scales (1)
 - Note names, fingerings, position exercises (1)
 - Jazz transcribing (1)
 - Transposition exercises (1)
 - Homework (1)
 - Music technology/computer software (1)
 - Sectionals (1)
 - Arranging parts for instrumentation (1)
 - Rhythmic dictation (1)
 - Practice sheets when substitute teacher is present (1)
 - Music written by students and taught by students (1)
8. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to partake in listening to music, if any?
- No response (6)
 - Listen to other groups' performances (11)
 - Listen to music being rehearsed or performed (10)
 - Listen to good soloists (4)
 - Field trip (3)
 - Guided listening (3)
 - Listening to pieces that may be played in band (3)
 - Listen to music similar to music being played in band (2)
 - Discussion of why or why not music should or should not be selected
 - Listening to one another in rehearsal (2)
 - Music playing as class begins (2)
 - Special presentations (1)
 - Guest ensembles (1)
 - Distribution of band literature CD (1)
 - Listen to music from same period as music being played (1)
 - Listen to performances (1)
 - Listen to a variety of styles (1)
 - Listening assignments (1)
 - Rehearsal recordings (1)
 - Style study day (1)
 - Music Appreciation class (1)
 - Extra credit given to students who attend concerts (1)
 - Videos (1)
9. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to partake in analyzing music, if any?

- No response (16)
- Analysis of musical form (4)
- General analysis and discussion of music being played (4)
- Music Theory class (3)
- Creating flow charts (2)
- Analysis of melody (1)
- Analysis of style (1)
- Sight reading discussions (1)
- Honors Band assignments (1)
- Style study day (1)
- Written analysis/critiques of music (1)
- Listening (1)
 - Chord identification and analysis (1)
 - Progression identification (1)
 - Form identification (1)
 - Phrase identification (1)
- Record rehearsal – listen and discuss the good and the bad that came across recording (1)

10. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to partake in describing music, if any?

- No response (14)
- Daily question and answer (5)
- Verbal and or written commenting on specific aspects of music performance following a listening or playing (4)
- Discussion of performance (4)
- Written assignments (3)
- Written concert reviews/critiques (2)
- Honors Band assignments (1)
- Journals (1)
- Discussion of flow of a piece (1)
- Discussion improvements to be made after playing (1)
- Discussions of how the music makes them feel (1)
- Discussion of expressive elements in music (1)
- Discussion of how they feel the music should be played (1)
- Discussion of listening, tone, style, chords, colors, and how music should sound and attempt to emulate (1)
- Rehearsal reflections (1)
- Performance reflections (1)
- Following a listening students write a “story” of what they heard (1)
- Critique peers playing (1)
- Quizzes (1)

11. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to evaluate music and music performances, if any?
- No response (6)
 - Concert reviews – live and recorded (11)
 - Rate pieces and identify reasons for rating (1)
 - Written analysis and critiques (1)
 - Aural concert review (1)
 - Rehearsal critique (1)
 - Rehearsal reflections (1)
 - Performance reflections (1)
 - Journals (1)
 - Performance elicits constant evaluation (1)
 - General discussion within rehearsal (5)
 - Self evaluations (3)
 - Observing performances and reviewing them (3)
 - Writing across the curriculum assignments (2)
 - Record rehearsals – identify good things and changes that need to be made (1)
 - Evaluate individual stylistic interpretation and depict most appropriate (1)
 - Evaluate sections as they play for band (1)
 - Evaluate music to program within audience served in mind (1)
 - Field trips with written reviews (1)
 - Student use of adjudicator sheets (1)
 - Discussion of how the music makes them feel (1)
 - Style day (1)
 - Baldridge system with chart (1)
12. What types of activities do you implement to promote your students' understanding of relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts, if any? Which arts do you incorporate? What subjects do you incorporate?
- No response (13)
 - General discussion (5)
 - Incorporation of other disciplines through the music and listening of music (5)
 - History (4)
 - Music History (3)
 - Math (2)
 - Physics of Music and Instruments (2)
 - Presentations (2)
 - Videos (2)
 - Fine Arts Festival incorporating visual arts (1)

- Visual Arts (1)
 - Impressionistic Arts (1)
- Dance (1)
- Literature (1)
- Drama (1)
- Athletics (1)
- Discussion of music period music is written in and other disciplines going on at the same time music was written (1)
- Research (1)
- Guest speakers/teachers (1)
- Field trips (1)
- Reading music like language (1)
- Writing across the curriculum (1)
- English (1)
- Artistic culture (1)

13. What types of activities do you implement to promote your students' understanding of music in relation to history, if any? Which historical periods have you incorporated?

- No response (9)
- Taught through the music (8)
- Discussion of composer(s) of piece (5)
- General discussion (5)
- All music periods covered (4)
- Discussion of history of piece (3)
- History of pieces being played (3)
- Concerts with historical themes (2)
- Guest speakers (2)
- Videos (2)
- Use of props and visual aids (1)
- Use of internet to gather composer information (1)
- Information sheets distributed about music and composer being performed (1)
- Research project (1)
- Research on a composer and a historical period (1)
- Student presentations (1)
- Videos (1)
- Classical, Romantic, Contemporary, Renaissance, Baroque, 20th Century covered (1)

14. What types of activities do you implement to promote your students' understanding of music in relation to culture, if any?

- No response (16)
- Diverse band music (5)
- Taught through the music being played (4)
- Video (2)
- Guest speakers (2)
- General discussion (2)
- European, African, American, Japanese (2)
- Spanish, Jewish, African-American, Chinese, Asian, Latin American, Native American, Indonesian, African, Australia (1)
- As it relates to culture or history of piece being played (1)
- Listening examples of similar music from culture being played in rehearsal (1)
 - Indian, European, Jewish (1)
- Presentations (1)
- Research (1)
- Text reading (1)

15. What types of singing activities, individual or ensemble, do you incorporate in rehearsals, if any?

- No response (5)
- Instrumental music part singing (10)
- Sing tuning notes (8)
- Sight sing rhythms (5)
- Sing before sight reading or playing (5)
- Sing melodies (5)
- Sing chorales (5)
- Instrumental music that calls for voices (4)
- Singing scales/arpeggios (3) with solfege (2)
- Sing scales (2)
- Sing rhythms (2)
- Sing intervals (2)
- Sing phrases (2)
- Sight sing music (2)
- Sing chords (2)
- Sing entire piece (1)
- Rhythmic clapping (1)
- Sing harmonies (1)
- Sing in warm up and in rehearsal (1)
- Sing solfege daily (1)
- Sing rounds (1)
- Modeling/imitation (1)
- Sing articulations (1)
- Sing individual pitches (1)

- Sight sing pitches (1)
- Sing dynamics (1)
- Matching pitches vocally (1)

Summary

Sections 1 through 14, question c, and Section 15 were designed to gather numerous band directors' responses so that band directors who are not implementing specific Standards-based activities, can review them and conceivably modify their activities and/or settings so that they may implement the Standards in their music classrooms. Although some directors chose not to respond to some of the survey questions outlined in Section 1 through 14, question c, and Section 15, there are still various activities and/or settings listed that propose different ways to implement all of the Standards in instrumental music education. The following list delineates the common themes derived from band directors' responses from each Section 1 through 15 by Standard; some of the multifaceted Standards were separated on the survey to gain a better understanding of how band directors implement activities outlined by the Standard.

Standard 1, singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music:

- Instrumental part singing
- Singing tuning notes
- Singing before sight reading or playing
- Singing melodies, chorales, and rhythms

Standard 2, performing on instruments alone a varied repertoire of music:

- Solo and ensemble contest
- Students soloing in concert repertoire
- Students soloing with the concert band
- Solo recitals

Standard 2, performing on instruments with others a varied repertoire of music:

- Daily rehearsal
- Solo and ensemble contest
- Participation in small and large ensembles
- Concerts

Standard 3, improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments:

- Jazz band
- Music theory class
- Beginning band class

Standard 4, composing music within specified guidelines:

- Music theory class
- Encouragement
- Use of music technology/computer software

Standard 4, arranging music within specified guidelines:

- Use of music technology/computer software
- Encouragement
- Marching band and pep band
- Music theory class
- Arrange for diverse instrumentation

Standard 5, reading music:

- Daily rehearsals and sectionals
- Sight reading
- Daily sight reading

Standard 5, notating music:

- Music theory class
- Music theory worksheets
- Writing parts out
- Band class

Standard 6, listening to music:

- Listening to other groups performances
- Listening to music being rehearsed and performed
- Listening to good soloists

Standard 6, analyzing music:

- General analysis and discussion of music being rehearsed
- Analysis of musical form
- Music theory class

Standard 6, describing music:

- Daily question and answer
- Verbal or written comments following a listening or playing of a musical performance
- Discussion of performance

Standard 7, evaluating music or music performances:

- Generate concert reviews
- Discussion in rehearsal
- Self evaluations
- Observing and reviewing performances

Standard 8, understanding music relationships between music, other arts, and disciplines outside the arts:

- Incorporation of other disciplines through the music and listening of music
- General discussion
- History

Standard 9, understanding music in relation to history:

- History is taught through the music
- Discussion of composer(s) of music
- General discussion

Standard 9, understanding music in relation to culture

- Diverse band music
- Culture is taught through music
- Video, guest speakers, and general discussion

Survey Results, Sections 16 and 17

Sections 16 and 17 of the survey were open-ended questions. Section 16 allowed band directors to list the factors that facilitate the implementation of the Standards within their music classrooms. Section 17 allowed band directors to list the factors that hinder the implementation of the Standards within their music classrooms. The following list is a compilation of responses from Section 16 and Section 17 of the survey as well as the responses from all band directors. The number of band directors who communicated each bulleted response is found in the parenthetical reference immediately following the response, and each response was taken directly from the wording of the directors on the survey.

16. What factors facilitate your teaching of the above curricular goals?

- Time (5)
- The National Standards (5)
- Administration support (3)
- Personal desire (3)
- Stereo equipment (2)
- Established program/teacher (2)
- Performance based philosophy (2)
- Knowledge of subject matter (2)
- Resources (2)
- Great students (2)
- Community support (1)
- Benchmarks (1)
- Goals (1)
- Personal initiative although the district does not mandate teaching based on Standards (1)
- Worksheets (1)
- Scheduling (1)
- Budget, funding (1)
- Location (1)
- Cooperative faculty (1)
- Music scores with information on of piece and composer (1)
- Solo & Ensemble Festival (1)
- Previous experience/past successes (1)
- Knowledge of band literature (1)
- Knowledge of various subjects related to music (1)
- Assistance from other music teachers (1)
- Daily rehearsal (1)
- The music program itself (1)
- K-12 curriculum (1)
- Student interest (1)
- Strong work ethic (1)
- Teacher interest (1)
- Eager students (1)
- Student retention (1)
- Booster group, parental support (1)
- Music recordings (1)
- Visual aids (1)
- Videos (1)
- Books (1)
- Technology (1)
- Extensive music library (1)
- Quality repertoire (1)

- Quality instruments and inventory (1)

17. What factors hinder your teaching of the above curricular goals?

- Time (16)
- Performances (6)
- Performance pressure to be good/expectations (5)
- Budget (5)
- Class size (3)
- Community expectations (2)
- Lack of K-12 music teacher communication/collaboration (2)
- Lack of prep time for advanced/complex activities (2)
- Marching band time commitment (2)
- Lack of music staff (2)
- Lack of music technology (2)
- Small music library (2)
- Student resistance (2)
- Facilities (2)
- Newer repertoire lacking depth (1)
- Shared classroom (1)
- Lack of knowledge (1)
- District expectations (1)
- K-12 assigned position consumes time (1)
- Teaching of general music in addition to band duties (1)
- Tradition (1)
- Unsupportive administration and faculty (1)
- Block schedule (1)
- Parade commitment (1)
- Pep Band commitment (1)
- Goals (1)
- Student retention (1)
- Relevance of National Standards (1)
- Lack of materials that guide how to incorporate standards which coincide with instructional framework of district (1)
- Classroom facilities (1)
- Instrumentation (1)
- Performance-based class (1)
- Classroom integration (1)
- Lack of previous (student) instruction prior to entering program (1)
- Inexperienced students (1)
- Special Education students (1)
- Student attentiveness (1)

Summary

The responses indicated on the survey by band directors for Sections 16 provide insight as to what factors facilitate the implementation of the Standards in music classrooms. Time, the influence of the National Standards, administration support, and personal desire were the top factors that allowed and/or motivated band directors to implement the Standards in their music classrooms. The remainder of the responses also facilitates implementing the Standards in instrumental music classrooms.

The responses indicated on the survey by band directors for Sections 17 provide insight as to what factors hinder the implementation of the Standards in music classrooms. The lack of time was a prominent hindrance for nearly half of the band directors. Additionally, performances, performance pressures and high expectations, and budget were factors that prevented band directors from implementing the Standards in their music classrooms. The remainder of the responses also serves as reasons why band directors are not able to fully implement the Standards in their music classrooms.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary

The purpose of this research was to gather information on the implementation of the National Standards for Music Education in secondary instrumental music programs in Michigan. The research questions for this study follow:

1. Do curricula obtained from selected exemplary secondary instrumental music programs in Michigan meet the National Standards?
2. Are the National Standards being taught within secondary instrumental music programs in Michigan?
3. Do secondary instrumental music teachers in Michigan feel competent teaching all core areas included in the National Standards?
4. What factors hinder or facilitate the implementation of the National Standards in secondary instrumental music settings in Michigan?
5. What types of activities do secondary instrumental music teachers use to help them achieve the National Standards?

Two out of eleven requested band curricula from exemplary schools were obtained and analyzed for this study. The results indicate that neither of the two band director's music curricula fully integrate the National Standards for Music Education, although one of the eleven exemplary schools band director's survey responses indicated that all nine of the Standards were being implemented in his/her program. The common Standards that are integrated in the two band directors' curricula are Standards 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Out of the two band directors, one indicated that his/her music faculty was currently designing a new music curriculum that fully integrates the Standards. Likewise, one of the nine band directors who did not submit a curriculum for analysis communicated that his/her district was in the process of curricular development based on

the Standards. Potentially, two out of the eleven exemplary schools' band directors may, in the near future, have a music curriculum that fully integrates the National Standards.

Since only 17.82% of the surveys were returned, and the survey population made up less than half of the secondary band programs in Michigan, one cannot generalize from the data whether the National Standards are being taught in secondary instrumental programs in Michigan. However, according to the survey mean scores, patterns suggest that the following Standards are being fully included at least occasionally in secondary band programs in Michigan: Standard 2 (performing in solo and with others), Standard 7 (evaluating music and music performances), Standard 8 (understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts), and Standard 9 (understanding music in relation to history and culture). Additionally, the following Standards are being partially implemented at least occasionally in secondary band programs in Michigan: Standard 5 (reading music, but not notating music), and Standard 6 (listening and describing music, but not analyzing music). Also, 86% of band directors indicated that they are implementing singing activities (Standard 1) in their music classrooms. Patterns from survey mean scores may suggest that the following Standards are not being taught in Michigan's secondary band programs: Standard 3 (improvisation) and Standard 4 (composition and arranging).

The band directors who returned the survey all feel competent teaching the Standards. The majority of band directors indicated that they feel moderately to very competent in teaching all core areas included in the Standards. Few band directors indicated not at all or somewhat competent in teaching all core areas included in the Standards. Band directors felt least competent teaching improvisation and composition, although the mean

scores for both imply that the majority of band directors feel moderately competent teaching these activities.

Conclusions

The single most important conclusion from this study is that most Michigan band directors feel competent teaching the Standards, yet the Standards are not being taught thoroughly throughout Michigan band programs. The fact that band directors indicated that they felt at least moderately competent in teaching all of the activities outlined by the Standards is evidence that the Standards are being taught in collegiate music education programs. However, there are factors that are preventing these music educators from implementing the Standards in their classrooms. Nearly half of the band directors indicated that time was the factor that most hindered the implementation of the Standards in their classrooms. Additionally, over a quarter of the band directors listed performance factors as considerable hindrances. The Standards were developed to foster the complete musical development and competence of music students in all music education settings. This research suggests that the Standards are not being taught thoroughly in secondary band programs in Michigan. Specifically Standards 3 (improvisation) and Standard 4 (composition, but not arranging) are being neglected. Kirkland (1996), Adderly (1999), and Byo (1999) had similar findings relative to these two Standards. Overall, these findings suggest that students are not learning what the Consortium of National Arts Education deems to be the components of a comprehensive music education. These reasons why music teachers are not teaching the Standards need to be addressed by the entire educational community so that students can develop the means through which they can reach their full musical potential.

Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

If the Standards are to become a unifying force in the Music Education profession, then it is imperative that the results of this and similar but more extensive research on this topic be communicated to influential persons in the music education community that have the expertise to positively influence what music teachers are including in their classrooms. Music educators need to know what is being done to successfully implement the Standards, how the Standards are being achieved, and what factors promote the realization of the Standards in the music classroom. Likewise, educators need to know why the Standards are not being implemented and the factors that prevent them from being realized in the music classroom. Without the input of music teachers, it will be impossible for the prominent persons in the education field to offer meaningful recommendations on how music teachers should implement the Standards and potentially overcome or modify the constraints placed upon them by external influences, such as the lack of time and performance obligations and expectations. Additionally, research would benefit those persons involved in curricular planning and modification by helping them to be cognizant of the factors that teachers face on a regular basis, which unequivocally deter Standards-based teaching.

Further research needs to be conducted on the implementation of the National Standards in Music Education to detail any advancement and changes music educators have made in their instruction related to the development of the Standards. Research, performed by music educators currently teaching in the classroom pertaining to the Standards would bring administrators, professors of music education, and future music educators up to date on the role of the Standards in music programs. Additionally, it

would be beneficial to the music education community to uncover to a greater degree the factors that hinder music educators' teaching of curricular goals that relate to the Standards.

To attain more meaningful results, this study should be duplicated with a larger sample. Seeking information from a band director at each high school throughout Michigan may produce more data, and therefore allow the researcher to generalize plausible conclusions that will more accurately reflect the entire band population in Michigan. Additionally, telephoning band directors prior to their receiving the survey and asking them to participate in the study, or providing incentives for them, such as financial compensation, may generate a higher return rate. Furthermore, conducting an interview rather than a survey study with band directors might facilitate the gathering of additional information. This study should also be replicated using band directors outside of Michigan.

The National Standards have been a driving force in music education as a whole for nearly a decade, and the patterns from this study suggest that the Standards have not yet found their place in the secondary instrumental classroom. Why is that? Are secondary band directors simply choosing not to implement all the Standards, or are there other external forces and pressures that prevent them from including the topics delineated by the Standards? Where are priorities in instrumental music education? Is the primary focus only on the creation of performers? What do administrators feel about the National Standards for Music Education? How does how administrators feel about the National Standards for Music Education compare to how they feel about the Standards for other discipline areas? Does the music education community respect the Standards? How can

the music education community facilitate the implementation of the Standards for Music Education? What steps have administrators and educators taken to facilitate the implementation of Standards within their curricula? These questions, as well as similar questions, should be studied and resolved so that teachers can successfully implement the National Standards for Music Education and so that music students have the opportunity to develop more fully as thinking, performing, literate musicians.

REFERENCES

- Adderly, C. L., III. (1999). Preparation of future band directors relative to the National Standards-Goals 2000. *Journal of Band Research*, 35 (1), 63-73.
- Austin, J. R. (1998). Comprehensive musicianship research: Implications for addressing the National Standards in music ensemble classes. *Update*, 17 (1), 25-32.
- Baraiolo, E. D., Jr. (1997). Status report on the awareness and implementation of the National Standards for Music within selected Massachusetts communities. *Masters Abstracts International*, 36 (2), 0297.
- Bell, J. R. (1986). The high school band: Instructional tasks, administrative tasks, and terminal outcomes. *Doctoral Abstracts International*, 47 (9a), 3348.
- Byo, S. J. (1999). Classroom teachers' and music specialists perceived ability to implement the National Standards for Music Education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 47 (2), 111-123.
- Fallis, T. L. (1999, January). Standards-based instruction in rehearsal. *Music Educators Journal*, 85 (4), 18-23, 50.
- Fehrs-Rampolla, B. (1994). Opportunities in the classroom. In B. O. Boston (Ed.), *Perspectives on implementation* (pp. 31-37). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Jennings, J. F. (1998). *Why National Standards and tests?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Kirkland, N. J. (1996). South Carolina schools and Goals 2000: National Standards in Music (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1996). *Doctoral Abstracts International*, 57 (3), 1069.
- Lehman, P. R. (1995). The National Standards for Music Education: Meeting the challenges. *The Quarterly Music Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*, 6 (2), 5-13.
- Lockwood, A. T. (1998). *Standards: From policy to practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McCaskill, L. L. (1998). The National Standards for Music Education: A survey of general music methods professors' knowledge, attitudes, and professional practices (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1998). *Doctoral Abstracts International*, 59 (3a), 0765.
- Music Educators National Conference. (1994a). *Opportunity-to-learn standards for music instruction: Grades pre-K-12*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Music Educators National Conference. (1994b). *Teaching examples: Ideas for music educators*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Music Educators National Conference. (1994c). *What every young American should know and be able to do in the arts: National Standards for Arts Education*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Shuler, S. C. (1995). The impact of National Standards on the preparation, in-service professional development, and assessment of music teachers. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96 (3), 2-14

- Van Patten, B. W. (1997). A model curriculum for high school instrumental music program implementing the "National Standards for Arts Education." *Masters Abstracts International*, 36 (2), 0326.
- Wells, R. (1997, July). Designing curricula based on the standards. *Music Educators Journal*, 84 (1), 34-39.

APPENDIX A

Content and Achievement Standards for Grades Nine Through Twelve

Content Standard 1: Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music

Achievement Standard, Proficient:

Students

- a. Sing with expression and technical accuracy a large and varied repertoire of vocal literature with a level of difficulty of 4, on a scale of 1 to 6, including some songs performed from memory
- b. Sing music written in four parts, with and without accompaniment
- c. Demonstrate well-developed ensemble skills

Achievement Standard, Advanced:

Students

- d. Sing with expression and technical accuracy a large and varied repertoire of vocal literature with a level of difficulty of 5, on a scale of 1 to 6
- e. Sing music written in more than four parts
- f. Sing in small ensembles with one student on a part

Content Standard 2: Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music

Achievement Standard, Proficient:

Students

- a. Perform with expression and technical accuracy a large and varied repertoire of instrumental literature with a level of difficulty of 4, on a scale of 1 to 6
- b. Perform an appropriate part in an ensemble, demonstrating well-developed ensemble skills
- c. Perform in small ensembles with one student on a part

Achievement Standard, Advanced:

Students

- d. Perform with expression and technical accuracy a large and varied repertoire of instrumental literature with a level of difficulty of 5, on a scale of 1 to 6

Content Standard 3: Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments

Achievement Standard, Proficient:

Students

- a. Improvise stylistically appropriate harmonizing parts
- b. Improvise rhythmic and melodic variations on given pentatonic melodies and melodies in major and minor keys
- c. Improvise original melodies over given chord progressions, each in a consistent style, meter, and tonality

Achievement Standard, Advanced:

Students

- d. Improvise stylistically appropriate harmonizing parts in a variety of styles
- e. Improvise original melodies in a variety of styles, over given chord progressions, each in a consistent style, meter, and tonality

Content Standard 4: Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines

Achievement Standard, Proficient:

Students

- a. Compose music in several distinct styles, demonstrating creativity in using the elements of music for expressive effect
- b. Arrange pieces for voices or instruments other than those for which the pieces were written in ways that preserve or enhance the expressive effect of the music
- c. Compose and arrange music for voices and various acoustic and electronic instruments, demonstrating knowledge of the ranges and traditional usages of the sound sources

Achievement Standard, Advanced:

Students

- d. Compose music, demonstrating imagination and technical skill and applying the principles of composition

Content Standard 5: Reading and notating music

Achievement Standard, Proficient:

Students

- a. Demonstrate the ability to read an instrumental or vocal score of up to four staves by describing how the elements of music are used

Students who participate in a choral or instrumental ensemble or class

- b. Sightread, accurately and expressively, music with a level of difficulty of 3, on a scale of 1 to 6

Achievement Standard, Advanced:

Students

- c. Demonstrate the ability to read a full instrumental or vocal score by describing how the elements of music are used and explaining all transpositions and clefs
- d. Interpret nonstandard notation symbols used by 20th-century composers

Students who participate in a choral or instrumental ensemble or class

- e. Sightread, accurately and expressively, music with a level of difficulty of 4, on a scale of 1 to 6

Content Standard 6: Listening to, analyzing, and describing music

Achievement Standard, Proficient:

Students

- a. Analyze aural examples of a varied repertoire of music, representing diverse genres and cultures, by describing the uses of elements of music and expressive devices
- b. Demonstrate extensive knowledge of the technical vocabulary of music
- c. Identify and explain compositional devices and techniques used to provide unity and variety and tension and release in a musical work and give examples of other works that make similar uses of these devices and techniques

Achievement Standard, Advanced:

Students

- d. Demonstrate the ability to perceive and remember music events by describing in detail significant events¹ occurring in a given aural example
- e. Compare ways in which musical materials are used in a given example relative to ways in which they are used in other works of the same genre or style
- f. Analyze and describe uses of the elements of music in a given work that make it unique, interesting, and expressive

Content Standard 7: Evaluating music and music performances

Achievement Standard, Proficient:

Students

- a. Evolve specific criteria for making informed, critical evaluations of the quality and effectiveness of performances, compositions, arrangements, and improvisations and apply the criteria in their personal participation in music

¹ E.g., fugal entrances, chromatic modulations, developmental devices

- b. Evaluate a performance, composition, arrangement, or improvisation by comparing it to similar or exemplary models

Achievement Standard, Advanced:

Students

- c. Evaluate a given musical work in terms of its aesthetic qualities and explain the musical means it uses to evoke feelings and emotions

Content Standard 8: Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts

Achievement Standard, Proficient:

Students

- a. Explain how elements, artistic processes (such as imagination or craftsmanship), and organizational principles (such as unity and variety or repetition and contrast) are used in similar and distinctive ways in the various arts and cite examples
- b. Compare characteristics of two or more arts within a particular historical period or style and cite examples from various cultures
- c. Explain ways in which the principles and subject matter of various disciplines outside the arts are interrelated with those of music²

Achievement Standard, Advanced:

Students

- d. Compare the uses of characteristic elements, artistic processes, and organizational principles among the arts in different historical periods and different cultures
- e. Explain how the roles of creators, performers, and others involved in the production and presentation of the arts are similar to and different from one another in the various arts³

Content Standard 9: Understanding music in relation to history and culture

Achievement Standard, Proficient:

Students

- a. Classify by genre or style and by historical period or culture unfamiliar but representative aural examples of music and explain the reasoning behind their classifications
- b. Identify sources of American music genres⁴, trace the evolution of the genres, and cite well-known musicians associated with them

² E.g., language arts: compare the ability of music and literature to convey images, feelings, and meanings; physics: describe the physical basis of tone production in string, wind, percussion, and electronic instruments and the human voice and of the transmission and perception of sound

³ E.g., creators: painters, composers, choreographers, playwrights; performers: instrumentalists, singers, dancers, actors; others: conductors, costumers, directors, lighting designers

⁴ E.g., swing, Broadway musical, blues

- c. Identify various roles⁵ that musicians perform, cite representative individuals who have functioned in each role, and describe their activities and achievements

Achievement Standard, Advanced:

Students

- d. Identify and explain the stylistic features of a given musical work that serve to define its aesthetic tradition and its historical or cultural context
- e. Identify and describe music genres or styles that show the influence of two or more cultural traditions, identify the cultural source in each influence, and trace the historical conditions that produced the synthesis of influences

⁵ E.g., entertainer, teacher, transmitter of cultural tradition

APPENDIX B

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

UCRIHS Approval

April 29, 2002

TO: Cynthia TAGGART
209 Music Practice Bldg.

RE: **IRB# 02-244 CATEGORY: EXEMPT 1-1, 1-2**

APPROVAL DATE: April 24, 2002

**TITLE: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR MUSIC
EDUCATION WITHIN SECONDARY INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC PROGRAMS
IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN**

The University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects' (UCRIHS) review of this project is complete and I am pleased to advise that the rights and welfare of the human subjects appear to be adequately protected and methods to obtain informed consent are appropriate. Therefore, the UCRIHS approved this project.

RENEWALS: UCRIHS approval is valid for one calendar year, beginning with the approval date shown above. Projects continuing beyond one year must be renewed with the green renewal form. A maximum of four such expedited renewals possible. Investigators wishing to continue a project beyond that time need to submit it again for a complete review.

REVISIONS: UCRIHS must review any changes in procedures involving human subjects, prior to initiation of the change. If this is done at the time of renewal, please use the green renewal form. To revise an approved protocol at any other time during the year, send your written request to the UCRIHS Chair, requesting revised approval and referencing the project's IRB# and title. Include in your request a description of the change and any revised instruments, consent forms or advertisements that are applicable.

PROBLEMS/CHANGES: Should either of the following arise during the course of the work, notify UCRIHS promptly: 1) problems (unexpected side effects, complaints, etc.) involving human subjects or 2) changes in the research environment or new information indicating greater risk to the human subjects than existed when the protocol was previously reviewed and approved.



OFFICE OF
RESEARCH
ETHICS AND
STANDARDS
University Committee on
Research Involving
Human Subjects
Michigan State University
202 Olds Hall
East Lansing, MI
48824
517/355-2180
FAX: 517/432-4603
Web: www.msu.edu/user/ucris
E-Mail: ucris@msu.edu

If we can be of further assistance, please contact us at (517) 355-2180 or via email: UCRIHS@msu.edu. Please note that all UCRIHS forms are located on the web: <http://www.msu.edu/user/ucris>

Sincerely,

Ashir Kumar, M.D.
UCRIHS Chair

AK: kj

CC: Jason Skube
238 W. Saginaw St. #107
East Lansing, MI 48823

APPENDIX C

Consent Form: Exemplary Schools

Dear Secondary Instrumental Music Educator,

This letter is to obtain written consent from you regarding participation in my Masters thesis study.

The purpose of my study is to gather information on the implementation of the National Standards for Music Education within secondary instrumental programs in the state of Michigan. To achieve this, I have designed a survey, which has been sent to you, that reflects each of the nine Content Standards determined for secondary music education. Additionally, I will analyze the music curricula from ten pre-selected high school band programs (deemed exemplary by collegiate wind conductors) to determine if the Content Standards are present within the document. Your school has been deemed an exemplary school.

The degree to which the Content Standards are present within your music curriculum is not a prerequisite to participate in this portion of the study. I am asking that you voluntarily send me a copy of your secondary instrumental music curriculum, specifically band, regardless of the level the Content Standards may or may be present in the document. All curricular information will be in the sole possession of the secondary investigator (myself) and the primary investigator for this study, Dr. Cynthia Taggart, associate professor of music education, Michigan State University, and remain confidential at all times. Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law.

By signing this letter, you indicate your voluntary agreement to participate in this study. Your participation is extremely appreciated. If any changes to the study are made you will be notified. If you have any questions about this study, please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Taggart or myself. If you have questions or concerns regarding your rights in this study, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this research, you may contact – anonymously, if you wish – Ashir Kumar, Chair of the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects.

Dr. Cynthia Taggart
School of Music
102 Music Building
East Lansing, MI 48824
517-432-9678, fax: 517-432-2880
ctaggart@msu.edu

Ashir Kumar
Chair of the University Committee on
Research Involving Human Subjects
202 Olds Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
517-355-2180, fax: 517-353-2976
ucrihs@msu.edu

I, _____, voluntarily

Signature

agree to participate in this study.

Date

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jason T. Skube
721 N. Capitol, Suite #3
Lansing, MI 48906

Home: 517-827-0827
Work: 517-367-2225, fax: 517-367-2228

APPENDIX D

Secondary Instrumental Music Educator Survey

General Information

Which best describes your school setting?

- a) rural b) urban c) suburban

Are you a tenured teacher?

- a) yes b) no

How many years have you been teaching? _____

What is your age? _____

If the investigators have a question concerning a response, may they contact you?

- a) yes b) no

If yes, please indicate how we may contact you by providing either of the following:

Email: _____

Phone: _____

At the conclusion of this study, would you like a copy of the results via email?

- a) yes b) no

If yes, please provide your email address: _____

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS:

Please circle one answer per question. Written responses may be continued on the back of the corresponding page or you may include a separate page. Please note the key below before beginning.

Key: Seldom = once or twice per month Occasionally = more than once or twice per month, but less than once per week Frequently = at least once per week

PLEASE RETURN SURVEY BY WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 2002

- 1a. How often do your students perform on instruments in solo a varied repertoire of music within a two month period?
- a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal
- 1b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to perform on instruments in solo a varied repertoire of music?
- a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so
- 1c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to perform on instruments in solo a varied repertoire of music, if any?
-
-
-
-
-
-
- 2a. How often do your students perform on instruments with others a varied repertoire of music within a two month period?
- a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal
- 2b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to perform on instruments with others a varied repertoire of music?
- a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so
- 2c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to perform on instruments with others a varied repertoire of music, if any?
-
-
-
-
-
-
- 3a. How often do your students improvise melodies, variations, and accompaniments within a two month period?
- a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal

3b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to improvise melodies, variations, and accompaniments?

a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

3c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to improvise melodies, variations, and accompaniments, if any?

4a. How often do your students compose music within specified guidelines in a two month period?

a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal

4b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to compose music?

a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

4c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to compose music, if any?

5a. How often do your students arrange music within specified guidelines in a two month period?

a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal

5b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to arrange music?

a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

5c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to arrange music, if any?

6a. How often do your students read music within a two month period?

a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal

6b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to read music?

a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

6c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to read and notate music, if any?

7a. How often do your students notate music within a two month period?

a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal

7b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to notate music?

a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

7c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to notate music, if any?

- 8a. How often do your students listen to music within a two month period?
a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal
- 8b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to partake in listening to music?
a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so
- 8c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to partake in listening to music, if any?
-
-
-
-
-
- 9a. How often do your students analyze music within a two month period?
a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal
- 9b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to partake in analyzing music?
a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so
- 9c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to partake in analyzing music, if any?
-
-
-
-
-
- 10a. How often do your students describe music within a two month period?
a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal
- 10b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to partake in describing music?
a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

- 10c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to partake in describing music, if any?

- 11a. How often do your students evaluate music and music performances within a two month period?

a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal

- 11b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to evaluate music and music performances?

a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

- 11c. What types of activities do you implement to allow your students to evaluate music and music performances, if any?

- 12a. How often do you teach your students to understand relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts within a two month period?

a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal

- 12b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to understand relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts?

a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

- 12c. What types of activities do you implement to promote your students' understanding of relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts, if any? Which arts do you incorporate? Which subjects do you incorporate?

- 13a. How often do you teach your students to understand music in relation to history within a two month period?

a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal

- 13b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to understand music in relation to history?

a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

- 13c. What types of activities do you implement to promote your students' understanding of music in relation to history, if any? Which historical periods have you incorporated?

- 14a. How often do you teach your students to understand music in relation to culture within a two month period?

a) not at all b) seldom c) occasionally d) frequently e) every rehearsal

- 14b. How competent do you feel in teaching your students to understand music in relation to culture?

a) not at all b) somewhat c) moderately so d) very much so

- 14c. What types of activities do you implement to promote your students' understanding of music in relation to culture, if any? Which cultures have you incorporated?

15. What types of singing activities, individual or ensemble, do you incorporate in rehearsals, if any?

16. What factors facilitate your teaching of the above curricular goals?

17. What factors hinder your teaching of the above curricular goals?

THANK YOU FOR YOU TIME!

APPENDIX E

Consent Form: Survey Participation

Dear Secondary Instrumental Music Educator,

This letter is to obtain written consent from you regarding participation in my Master's thesis study.

The purpose of my study is to gather information on the implementation of the National Standards for Music Education within secondary programs in the state of Michigan. To achieve this, I have designed a survey that reflects each of the nine Content Standards determined for secondary music education. Additionally, pre-selected high schools instrumental music curricula will be analyzed to determine if the Content Standards are present within the document.

The degree to which the Content Standards are or are not taught within your program is not a prerequisite to participate in this study. I am asking that you voluntarily complete the survey regardless of your level of familiarity of the Content Standards. Your responses will be in the sole possession of the secondary investigator (myself) and the primary investigator for this study, Dr. Cynthia Taggart, Associate Professor of Music Education, Michigan State University, and remain confidential at all times. Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law.

By signing this letter, you indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing and returning this questionnaire to the secondary investigator. Your participation is extremely appreciated and should take approximately 40 minutes of your time. If any changes to the study are made you will be notified. If you have any questions about this study, please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Taggart or myself. If you have questions or concerns regarding your rights in this study, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this research, you may contact – anonymously, if you wish – Ashir Kumar, Chair of the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects.

Dr. Cynthia Taggart
School of Music
102 Music Building
East Lansing, MI 48824
517-432-9678, fax: 517-432-2880
ctaggart@msu.edu

Ashir Kumar
Chair of the University Committee on
Research Involving Human Subjects
202 Olds Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
517-355-2180, fax: 517-353-2976
ucrihs@msu.edu

I, _____, voluntarily

Signature

agree to participate in this study.

Date

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jason Skube
721 N. Capitol, Suite #3
Lansing, MI 48906

Home: 517-827-0827
Work: 517-367-2225, fax: 517-367-2225

APPENDIX F

Survey Cover Letter

May 9, 2002

Dear Music Educator,

Hello! My name is Jason Skube and I am a graduate music education student at Michigan State University.

I am writing to ask for your assistance with my Master's Thesis, which pertains to the National Standards for Music Education. I have enclosed a survey that I have designed to reflect the National Standards. Upon your consent, I am asking if you will take your valuable time to complete the survey and send it back to me in the provided self-addressed and stamped envelope by Wednesday, May 29, 2002. Your input is extremely important and will assist in the production of meaningful results that will shed light on how the National Standards have or have not influenced our profession.

The survey is primarily multiple choice. You will also encounter some open-ended questions. Your responses may be as concise as you desire (from one word responses to sentences).

Please see the consent form attached to the survey for additional details concerning this project. If you choose to participate, *please sign and date the consent form and include it with the completed survey upon return*. Again, **please return the survey by Wednesday, May 29, 2002.**

Thank you so much for your assistance and time!

Sincerely,

Jason T. Skube

Enclosures

Return address:

Jason Skube
C/O MCS
721 N. Capitol Ave, Suite 3
Lansing, MI 48906

APPENDIX G

Follow Up Letter

June 7, 2002

**To: High School Band Directors
From: Jason Skube
RE: Thesis Survey**

Dear High School Band Director:

Greetings! Recently, I sent you a survey that I designed for my Master's Thesis. The purpose of my thesis is to gather information on the implementation of the National Standards for Music Education in the secondary instrumental (band) setting. By completing the survey, you are providing me with the necessary feedback to compile meaningful results.

Your input is extremely important. If you are willing to participate, please return the completed survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope I provided you.

Thank you for your understanding and time. Have a terrific summer!

Respectfully,

**Jason Skube
Home: 517-827-0827
Work: 517-367-2225
Fax: 517-367-2228**

If you have misplaced your envelope, the sending address is:

**Jason Skube
C/O MCS
721 N. Capitol Ave., Suite 3
Lansing, MI 48906**

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 02328 7828