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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the current professional preparation and practices of music educators in relation to teaching students with formally identified disabilities. Specifically, I created a survey to investigate the preparation of music educators to work with students with disabilities and their use of inclusionary practices in today’s music classrooms. In addition, the survey included questions regarding music educators’ understanding of, and participation in, the special education process and examined their knowledge of available school district resources for working with students with disabilities. The survey also assessed the accommodations/adaptations music teachers currently utilize to aid the participation of these students. Finally, music educators were asked to provide information regarding their professional development experiences, as well as what they perceived to be the barriers to, and supports for, inclusionary practices. Participants were recruited from the membership of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association, and 363 music educators submitted complete surveys.

Respondents indicated having few training opportunities in relation to teaching students with disabilities. The instruction they reported receiving was often short in duration, provided limited practice/feedback, and rarely contained information on specific instructional techniques or hands-on experiences. Although music teachers indicated possessing limited background knowledge in the area of special education, they reported greater knowledge regarding the skills necessary to educate students with disabilities. The majority of music educators indicated being responsible for teaching students with disabilities; however, music teachers at the secondary level reported having
greater numbers of students with disabilities participating in music than their elementary counterparts. Respondents also reported being minimally involved in the special education process for their students. Music teachers at the secondary level, and in the content areas of general and choral music, indicated greater rates of personal involvement in the design and implementation of Individualized Education Programs. While music educators indicated having adequate personnel support, they reported a lack of materials/resources, money, and time in relation to teaching students with disabilities. Despite this lack of resources, music teachers reported making a number of accommodations/adaptations for students with disabilities.
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Introduction

The original statute behind the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was enacted in 1975, although the initial version of the law did not make mention of inclusion as a concept. Over three decades later, a majority of school districts are just now in the process of implementing policies for full inclusion of students with disabilities in appropriate general education settings (Hammel, 2004). As a result, music educators are experiencing an exponential influx of students with disabilities enrolling in their classrooms and ensembles (Hourigan, 2008). According to Hammel (2004), music teachers now are often responsible for students with more severe disabilities than in the past, making their jobs increasingly demanding and challenging (Montgomery & Martinson, 2006). Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994) reported there is little in the research literature devoted to the subject of providing music education to students with disabilities. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the current professional preparation and practices of music educators in relation to teaching students with formally identified disabilities.

Bernstorf and Welsbacher (1996) defined inclusion as placing students with disabilities (as identified by IDEA) in the least restrictive environment considered age appropriate, while Adamek (2001) specified schools would also provide these students with services to meet their needs in the least restrictive environment. It is important to note inclusion differs slightly from the concept of mainstreaming, as mainstreamed students placed in a regular education setting are expected to meet the same demands as all other students whereas included students may be working on different material with some formal assistance in place. Authors of previous studies have used either
mainstreaming or inclusion terminology depending upon the time period during which the research was conducted. In the context of the current literature review, I apply these terms as they were utilized by the original authors. It is important to note this study is specifically focused on the process of inclusion, which attempts to educate all students in the regular classroom by providing them with the support they require rather than sending them to another classroom in order to receive services. While inclusion does require each student benefit in some way from being placed in the regular classroom, it does not require every student to meet the same expectations. Additionally, although a majority of the reviewed studies were published over a decade ago, they represent the most current literature on the subject.

**Benefits of Inclusion in Music**

From the beginning of this inclusion process, school districts typically attempted to incorporate students with disabilities in music classes (Damer, 2001a), due to anticipated gains not only in musical skills, but in academic skills and social skills as well (Lapka, 2006). Darrow (1999) also reported some benefits of musical inclusion appear to be social but a push for musical growth should not be left out of the picture for students with disabilities. Butler (2004) stated music should be viewed as a valuable subject because of the impact it can have on students’ cognitive and emotional growth. Motivation gained through a positive experience with music can facilitate goals set in other areas by fostering abilities such as attention span, cooperation, independence, memory, and vocabulary (Adamek, 2001; Butler, 2004; Patterson, 2003; Van Weelden, 2001). Including students with disabilities in a music classroom or ensemble may also increase self-esteem by providing an outlet for self-expression (Butler, 2004); it can have
physical effects as well by relaxing the students or by stimulating and strengthening their muscles (Van Weelden, 2001).

According to Gilbert and Asmus (1981), music can also be used as a powerful reinforcement tool for students and it is an easy way to integrate material across several different domains or skills. In 75% of school districts studied, the only students with disabilities who were exposed to music as part of their curriculum were those who were mainstreamed (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994). As a result, music educators should encourage mainstreaming students with disabilities into their classrooms (Gilbert & Asmus, 1981). Van Weelden (2001) cautioned, however, the importance of the percentage of students with disabilities in one classroom never exceeding the percentage of students with disabilities in an entire school district.

Placement Decisions for Students Included in Musical Settings

Unfortunately, the placement of students with disabilities in music classes often is done without consulting music educators (Damer, 2001b). Darrow (1999) reported it often appears administrators misunderstand the highly-structured nature of music classrooms, wrongly assuming it is easy to insert students with disabilities into a musical environment. According to Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994), 72% of music educators mentioned they either never or rarely participate in programming decisions for students with disabilities, even when it may involve a student’s enrollment in a music classroom. Only 21% of music educators reported being involved in the musical placement of students with disabilities, and very few of them indicated following the principle of placing students based on their achievement in music as is suggested by the concept of least restrictive environment. Although that practice is generally conducted
more by instrumental teachers, many music teachers report students with disabilities are placed in a music classroom based solely on the idea of mainstreaming them with non-handicapped peers (Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden, 1990). This practice has the potential to make music classrooms and ensembles nothing more than a “dumping ground” for students with disabilities (Forrest & Maclay, 1997). Frisque et al. stated 92% of music educators reported being employed in a setting in which partial or full mainstreaming is occurring, although only 84% of music teachers indicated actually having special education students attending their courses.

Inclusion of all students in music education is an idea with underpinnings nearly a century ago. In the 1920s, the Music Supervisors’ National Conference advocated for public school music education for all students. Approximately 30 years later, the Music Educator’s National Conference (MENC) drafted a “Child’s Bill of Rights in Music” (Sheldon, 1997). Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) indicated in 1986, MENC published a document titled “The School Music Program: Description and Standards” containing specific regulations related to music education and mainstreaming. Some of the ideals put forth included that music educators should: be involved in placement decisions made regarding students eligible for special education services, consult regularly with educators in the field of special education, offer to provide relevant training for other staff members as needed, and be provided with a sufficient amount of preparation time in order to best assist in the mainstreaming process for these students (Gfeller et al., 1990). According to Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994), not all music teachers surveyed, however, believed the recommendations put forth by MENC were important to achieving a successful mainstreaming process. As a result, even
though MENC has suggested a student’s ability be the major reason behind his being mainstreamed into a music setting, only 3% of music teachers report abiding by that practice; thirty-four percent of music educators report to have incorporated students with disabilities because music was an area of interest for the students, while 49% report incorporating these students due to the socialization opportunities possible for them in the ensembles (Frisque et al., 1994).

**Music Educators’ Perceptions of Inclusion**

In the past, many music teachers chose not to mainstream students with disabilities due to the obvious performance aspect of their field (Van Weelden, 2001). According to Wilson and McCrary (1996), many music educators believe the process of inclusion would negatively affect the overall quality of a musical ensemble’s performance; this view is particularly true for instrumental music teachers who tend to be the most reluctant when it comes to the overall concept of inclusion as it relates to their classrooms. Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994) stated many music teachers admitted to valuing the opportunity to incorporate students with disabilities, but wish the mainstreaming process would be possible without adverse effects for the rest of the student population. In fact, 61% of music educators surveyed reported a belief that mainstreaming students with disabilities actually hindered the education of nondisabled students incorporated in the same classroom (Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden, 1990). According to Darrow (1999), however, music educators tend to discuss inclusion’s benefit for students without disabilities more than they touch on the positives for the students in special education. Although 62% of music educators reported an opinion that mainstreaming is a successful practice, 33% of music teachers still indicated a belief that
the overall practice of integrating those students into the music classroom is an ineffective one (Frisque et al., 1994).

According to Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990), 50% of music teachers believe students with disabilities will have their skill sets matched better by instruction in classrooms solely devoted to special education. Darrow (1999) reported while many music educators have expressed favorable views on students with disabilities, it has been reported these teachers still feel as though placements other than regular education may be more appropriate than inclusion; this may be due to limited interactions with these children. According to Darrow, although it appears music educators do make unfavorable statements about the inclusion process, the statements are often in reference to particular incidents, generally involving students with behavior disorders. Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994) stated a music educator’s attitude toward working with students with disabilities was not able to be predicted by a variety of variables (e.g., sex, age, years of professional experience), although previous studies had shown elementary and instrumental music teachers to possess the most favorable attitudes toward this population. According to Darrow, past studies examining possible factors with regard to music educators’ feelings toward including children concluded educational attainment, years of experience, prior work with students with disabilities, and training with disabled populations did not affect teachers’ attitudes.

A single classroom in any school district will contain a multitude of unique and individual students, all with their own strengths and weaknesses (Adamek, 2001; McCord & Fitzgerald, 2006). Many music teachers are constantly analyzing these students in an effort to discover in what ways music aids their overall learning, and students with
disabilities should be treated no differently (Atterbury, 1983). Music educators unsure of including students with disabilities should remember artistic experiences are possible for these students just as they are for the average students in their classrooms (Chadwick & Clark, 1980; Williams, 1985). All students possess the skills to be creative, and music is often considered a vital school experience (Butler, 2004). Including these students has the potential to positively change the attitudes both teachers and other students previously held about them (Forrest & Maclay, 1997).

When students with disabilities are given the opportunity to participate in musical ensembles, the entire group benefits from this inclusion; the new environment encourages an atmosphere of working together toward a common goal (Bernstorf, 2001; Forrest & Maclay, 1997). According to Darrow (1999), inclusion allows for the development of important skills such as learning to give and receive aid to and from others. According to Humpal and Dimmick (1995), a musical setting may even be where students with disabilities are operating at their finest. Therefore, although music educators may find students with disabilities require more patience and often more time than other students, it is clearly important they be allowed to participate in a subject that can be incredibly rewarding (Stambaugh, 1996). However, the overall success of these students with disabilities greatly depends upon the level of teacher preparedness with regard to accommodating or adapting the music curriculum to the needs of each individual student (Zdzinski, 2001).

**Training Music Educators to Work with Students with Disabilities**

Fitzgerald (2006) stated music teachers across the country have been exposed to very little training with regard to effective educational methods for students with
disabilities, and their training often is only a short introduction to basic concepts (Walter, 2006). According to Darrow (1999), music educators are not trained to instruct students with disabilities, which may often cause unfavorable opinions with regard to working with such children. Previous research has shown when it comes to working with exceptional students, it is often regular education teachers’ lack of knowledge regarding this population that causes them to be unsupportive of inclusion and the decrease of separate special education programs (Wilson & McCrary, 1996). More than 40% of music educators reported having received no training specifically focused on working with special education students, including 44% of music teachers who had not even received an in-service level introduction to educating this population (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994). Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) also reported music educators do not frequently attend in-service trainings related to mainstreaming.

According to Frisque et al. (1994), 94% of music educators reported being responsible for the instruction of special education students, although 40% of those surveyed had no relevant training on how to do so. Additionally, a majority of music educators reported feeling comfortable mainstreaming in the music classroom despite that only 20% reported developing Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals/objectives/music programming or assessing progress for their students with disabilities. In addition, 80.7% indicated a desire for more instructional information (Gilbert & Asmus, 1981). Wilson and McCrary (1996) also reported although music educators tend to report receiving limited in-service training on topics related to special education, they indicate great confidence in being able to musically educate students with disabilities.
Despite this confidence, music teachers tend to be more reluctant when it comes to mainstreaming children with more severe disabilities, as they become increasingly concerned about their ability to handle related classroom management issues and a lower level set of skills (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994; Wilson & McCrary, 1996). Frisque et al. (1994) indicated music teachers believe these more severely disabled students will require excessive amounts of support or accommodation, eventually taking away from the available instruction time they have for working with other students in their ensembles. Music educators have reported students with emotional or physical disabilities as the most difficult candidates for mainstreaming, although students with physical handicaps are often considered better choices for incorporation by many administrators (Frisque et al., 1994). Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) reported the majority of music educators view students with emotional or behavioral disorders and those with hearing impairments are the most challenging mainstreaming cases, while students with speech or language impairments or other health impairments are viewed as the least challenging. The most frequently musically mainstreamed students have been those with specific learning disabilities and students experiencing behavioral or emotional difficulties (Frisque et al., 1994). Darrow (1999) indicated music educators generally find themselves teaching students with behavior disorders or learning disabilities, and often list these classifications as troublesome to deal with in their ensembles.

**Pre-service preparation.** Nocera (1972) reported between 1970 and 1971 less than 10 university professors across the country offered a course related to both music education and working with exceptional children. Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990)
indicated music educators report receiving little to no college coursework devoted to the subject of mainstreaming special education students; approximately 25% of music educators indicated having one college class relevant to the topic of mainstreaming, although the course was often closer in focus to child psychology than instruction relating to the education of handicapped children. According to Hourigan (2008), a majority of music educators have taken only a single course in special education. Consequently, “many music educators do not understand their rights and responsibilities as teachers of students with special needs” (Hourigan, 2008, p. 27). Herein lies the potential to deny students with disabilities access to instruction or appropriate instruction, which violates educational law and puts school districts in danger of complaints or lawsuits being filed based on discriminatory practices (McCord & Watts, 2006).

According to Hammel (2001), less than half of music teachers surveyed had pre-service experiences involving students with disabilities, with the majority having spent only 5 hours, on average, being trained for educating such a population. Darrow (1999) indicated although many music educators are introduced to the idea of students with disabilities during their undergraduate training, the majority of these teachers did not receive hands-on experience with such a population or instruction detailing how to effectively instruct these children. Pontiff (2004) suggested pre-service teacher training for music educators must include both formal and practical components, informing future teachers not only about students with disabilities but demonstrating how to educate them as well. Nocera (1972) also advocated for hands-on experience during the training of future music educators. It has been demonstrated a greater amount of field experience may lead to more positive attitudes when working with students with disabilities and may
provide a more realistic picture of what it is truly like to have these students in the music classroom (Hammel, 2001). Programs allowing music education students to observe and volunteer in music classrooms with special education students are considered beneficial to both the public school system and the future educators (Nocera, 1972). However, Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) cautioned simply exposing music educators to students with disabilities often does nothing to alter the perception they hold about mainstreaming; it has been suggested music teachers may benefit more from a training course on class management or behavior modification related to students with severe disabilities, or perhaps even sign language instruction.

Music teachers may not have a good understanding of what skills a student with a disability possesses, and are therefore not sure where to set expectations for a particular student in a musical ensemble or a music classroom (Montgomery & Martinson, 2006). According to Gilbert and Asmus (1981), music educators often report being less willing than their music therapist counterparts to work with students with disabilities due to feeling less capable with that specific population. Darrow (1999) reported music teachers have called increasingly for the use of music therapists as more appropriate instructors in the inclusion process. It is within a music educator’s responsibility to be cognizant of the abilities of each and every student with whom he or she is working (Bernstorf & Welsbacher, 1996). It has been argued music education students should be required to study and be familiar with optimal patterns of growth for both average and exceptional learners, including the development of motor and perceptual skills, in order to better understand the potential and limits possessed by each group (Gilbert & Asmus, 1981;
Nocera, 1972). Darrow indicated such education is something every child in a classroom will benefit from, not just those with disabilities.

**Effects of training.** Nocera (1972) indicated students who attended a series of lectures covering various special education classifications developed healthier attitudes with regard to inclusion of these students in music classrooms. Past research also has demonstrated educational professionals who have been specifically trained regarding students with disabilities reported feeling more capable when working with such a population; a greater understanding of these students allowed them to confront or prevent problems more efficiently and successfully (de l'Etoile, 2005). Similarly, Gilbert and Asmus (1981) indicated music teachers who attended sessions regarding mainstreaming reported possessing more positive attitudes toward incorporation, as well as an increased skill set when working with exceptional children.

According to Wilson and McCrary (1996), providing music educators with special education training involving lectures, readings, videos, or activities designed to teach specific educational techniques has been shown to result in a greater willingness to work with students with disabilities, as well as more positive attitudes about instructing such a population; however, similar trainings do not seem to affect class management skills and sometimes do not demonstrate a noticeable change in those being educated. Darrow (1999) stated various studies have demonstrated techniques such as providing music educators with helpful instructional strategies or a preparation course focused on students with disabilities increased how capable the teachers felt; unfortunately, attitudinal changes rarely followed. When another course of this type was offered, participants demonstrated feeling more capable than they did prior to instruction;
nevertheless, the participants ended up feeling less comfortable and unwilling to have students with disabilities placed in their classrooms (Wilson & McCrary, 1996). Wilson and McCrary mentioned music education students did, however, report a more representative view of what it is like to work with special education students, including both the challenges and rewards such students present everyday. Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994) stated a successful mainstreaming process was predicted by a music educator’s perceived ability in working with special education students, while number of years experience was not found to be a predictor of successful mainstreaming practices.

A positive attitude and more refined skills are elements considered critical to the success of the mainstreaming movement (Gilbert & Asmus, 1981). This pre-service education is an important element, as it should allow music teachers to use multiple techniques in ensembles in order to satisfy the students with disabilities without losing focus on the remaining students (Forrest & Maclay, 1997). As a result, Nocera (1972) suggested music educators be offered a “Music in Special Education” class as part of their training, as well as the opportunity to take other courses toward a specialization in teaching exceptional children. Gilbert and Asmus (1981) suggested future training should include information regarding how teaching students with disabilities affects the educational environment as a whole. Wilson and McCrary (1996) reported music educators have also stated a desire to be exposed to more experience designing and implementing lesson plans for special education students.

**Collaboration Between Music Educators and Other Professionals**

Music teachers tend to report feelings of escalating fear about their role in educating students with disabilities, as well as feeling unsupported and uninformed in
relation to their colleagues (Fitzgerald, 2006). Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994) reported in 90% of cases studied, a music educator was found solely responsible for the instruction of students with disabilities in a mainstreamed musical setting. It has been suggested special educators must take a leadership role when it comes to educating other staff members about instructing students with disabilities (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990). Darrow (1999) indicated the critical inclusion issue for most music educators to be a desire for collaboration with educators trained for working with students with disabilities. Gilbert and Asmus (1981) reported music teachers generally feel most concern over being able to work with several exceptional children in one group and still be able to meet all their individual differences, while avoiding psychological harm to them.

It seems as though music educators, as well as their students, are trying to achieve positive results with little outside assistance (Bernstorf, 2001). Bernstorf and Welsbacher (1996) stated the environments most conducive to learning are often created when educational professionals are able to successfully partner with one another. Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990), indicated the process of mainstreaming tends to be the most successful when all of a school’s faculty and staff are able to come together. According to Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994), music educators reported viewing the process of mainstreaming as more successful when they were assigned a colleague with whom they would share the responsibilities of mainstreaming students with disabilities into a music setting. It is unreasonable to expect any one educator to have all of the answers when it comes to working with students with disabilities, making collaboration and
cooperation an essential element in this particular problem solving process (Damer, 2001a).

**Individualized Education Programs and Music Educators**

Although general education teachers are often involved in the development of IEPs for their students, music educators are frequently left out of this process. Rarely do music educators report being involved in IEP development, although they often admit to knowing they should play a more significant role (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994). Darrow (1999) stated it has been suggested music educators may not have time to fit in special education elements such as IEP meetings, so perhaps other solutions could be created to include them. Many music educators indicate they do not generally receive proper information about the capabilities of their students with disabilities, and feel as though they are often excluded from the educational planning sessions for these students (Wilson & McCrary, 1996).

According to McCord and Watts (2006), more than half of music teachers do not participate in IEP decisions and many music educators are even unaware of which specific students in their classrooms or ensembles have disabilities. It appears only two-thirds of music educators even report being familiar with Public Law 94-142, with general and elementary music teachers often being the most knowledgeable (Gilbert & Asmus, 1981). One prior study, published almost 30 years ago, indicated only 62.9% of music educators surveyed reported working with the special education population; less than one-third of survey respondents, most often general music and vocal teachers, indicated involvement in the IEP process (Gilbert & Asmus, 1981). Adamek (2001)
stated this is most unfortunate because one of the major keys to teaching a student with a
disability effectively is understanding the contents of his or her IEP.

According to Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys (1994), a scarcity of research
exists with regard to the creation of music related objectives as part of the IEP process,
even though music educators have indicated students with disabilities should be pursuing
both musical and nonmusical goals as part of the mainstreaming process. Gfeller,
Darrow, and Hedden (1990) stated the majority of music educators admitted to having
immense trouble with determining appropriate musical objectives for students with
disabilities. Regarding standards for students with disabilities in a music setting, 67% of
music educators reported focusing on nonmusical goals and 63% of music teachers
indicated a desire for those students to meet the exact same achievement objectives as all
of the other students (Gfeller et al., 1990).

Gfeller et al. suggested when music educators are attempting to judge how
successful their mainstreaming efforts have been they should look to whether or not the
incorporated students have reached the achievement level or goals set for them prior to
their entry into the music classroom. Gfeller et al. cautioned although music objectives
may need to be altered for students with disabilities, those students should still be graded
similarly and held to similar standards as the rest of their peers. Darrow (1999) stated the
most often used accommodation reported by music educators was using either a
paraprofessional or a peer partner to work with students with disabilities; however this
was not always viewed as a favorable solution. Other music teachers either attempted to
provide an adapted curriculum or one-on-one instruction for their included students
(Darrow, 1999).
Many music teachers, as well as many general education teachers, perceive the IEP as solely relating to a student’s special education and therefore do not feel they play an important role in team procedures (Menlove, Hudson, & Suter, 2001). Even those music educators who manage to be included in the IEP process are not generally asked to make particular recommendations for music classes (McCord, 2001), although they could be a valuable source for information such as prescribing music therapy for those students able to utilize motivation gained from music to achieve goals in related developmental areas (Patterson, 2003). Music teachers can no longer continue to allow themselves to be uninvolved in the planning for students with disabilities (Damer, 2001a). According to Damer (2001b), they too should have considerable input into where a student with a disability is placed. Therefore, Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) challenged music educators to be advocates for the mainstreaming issues they are currently faced with by informing administrators of their desire to be more involved in the process, and pushing for the provision of the materials and the instruction they desperately need for the movement to be successful.

**Inclusion in Music: Barriers and Supports**

Darrow (1999) indicated respondents to a survey were able to pinpoint 13 areas significant to the issue of inclusion for music educators including: “accessibility, adaptive music/materials, collaboration/consultation, expectations of parents, experience/education, grading/evaluation, information, performance expectations, planning, placement of students, socialization, time, and varied abilities.” Eighty-nine percent of music teachers reported a lack of time to prepare was a major impediment to mainstreaming students with disabilities into music classrooms, while 69% of music
teachers indicated a lack of resources regarding the mainstreaming process was also a critical issue (Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys, 1994). Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) and Darrow also indicated music teachers feel as though they experience a general lack of time to individualize curriculum to address the needs of all students in their courses. In the past, it has been reported more instructional support seems to be provided to instrumental teachers, rather than to general music or choral instructors (Gfeller et al., 1990). Previous studies have demonstrated an existing positive correlation between the amount of instruction or support provided to a music educator and the amount of perceived success that teacher feels with regard to the mainstreaming of special education students (Gfeller et al., 1990).

**Inclusion in Regular Education: Barriers and Supports**

Because the inclusion movement in regular classrooms began over 20 years ago, the research literature regarding regular educators and inclusion is more substantial than that on music educators and inclusion. Therefore, regular educators’ experiences with inclusion were explored to gather details regarding their professional preparation and practices, in order to inform and extend future work with music educators, particularly in the areas of training and support.

**Training and preparation.** As is the case with music educators, regular education teachers receive less training regarding this specific student population (Jones & Bender, 1992). Few teachers have been provided with the chance to attend such classes either as pre-service or in-service options (Bailey, Gable, & Hendrickson, 1989). As a result, Nader (1984) stated 85% of regular education teachers reported they do not feel they possess an appropriate skill set for teaching students with disabilities. More
elementary than secondary teachers felt as though they possessed an adequate skill set when working with this specific population (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). This shortage of regular educators well-prepared to work with students receiving special education services has been considered a major barrier to providing services to students with disabilities (Buell, Hallam, Gamel-McCormick, & Scheer, 1999).

Providing training or support to regular educators has been shown to increase their self-efficacy, as a greater understanding of inclusion often increases their beliefs about being able to positively affect students with disabilities (Buell, Hallam, Gamel-McCormick, & Scheer, 1999; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) indicated programs to prepare teachers may not be any better than in the early years of the mainstreaming movement, as educators’ perceptions of inclusion do not appear to be getting more positive than when IDEA was first introduced. Those being trained in the field of education need to understand they will be responsible for teaching all students within the confines of the regular classroom, as well as be explicitly instructed on how to alter curriculum accordingly (Villa, Thousand, & Chapple, 1996). However, only 68% of educators indicated feeling as though additional professional development would be helpful to them in a general sense, while just 32.8% mentioned training would specifically improve their instruction to students with disabilities (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996).

Miller and Savage (1995) stated in order for inclusion to be a successful venture, the educators involved must be willing to both accommodate and modify instruction for their included students. Fritz and Miller (1995) also mentioned teachers’ perceptions of inclusion as a possible barrier to its success, as educators who do not believe in the
movement toward inclusion are less likely to utilize resources provided to help such an endeavor. Educators struggling with implementing inclusion report difficulty with the idea of providing differing amounts of instructional time to individual students, rather than spending equal time teaching each one (Campbell & Fyfe, 1995). In addition to a teacher's resistance to change, Campbell and Fyfe (1995) reported several other barriers to inclusion, as reported by educators, including a lack of time, a lack of resources (educational, financial, and material), a lack of knowledge regarding inclusion, other competing models of education, and certification standards that do not currently allow room for teacher trainees to elect taking extra courses focused on students with disabilities.

**Resources and time.** According to Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996), less than one-third of teachers report they have the resources, skills, time, or training to successfully participate in inclusionary practices. Approximately 27.7% of educators reported they were given an overall sufficient amount of time to devote to the pursuit of full inclusion (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Only 36.3% of teachers indicated being provided sufficient instructional time, while 28.1% mentioned adequate preparation time and 21.7% stated having sufficient consultation time. Scruggs and Mastropieri reported although 87.2% of educators indicated desiring an hour or more each day to focus on crafting instruction for their students with disabilities, less than 80% indicated having even 30 minutes per day for such activities.

Regular education teachers working in classrooms containing students with disabilities consistently report receiving few resources from their district’s administration and special education colleagues in order to facilitate of inclusion (Stoler, 1991). A lack
of support from building principals has been shown to be a major barrier to inclusion (Fritz & Miller, 1995). The amount of support provided to educators becomes particularly important when students with more severe disabilities are placed in the regular classroom (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Only 25.5% of educators report even being aware of district resources available to them regarding inclusion. More specifically, 11% of teachers feel as though they are provided with adequate personnel support and 37.6% report having sufficient material support (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, and Lesser (1991) reported 79.73% of regular education teachers indicated receiving materials from special education teachers to supplement their instruction would positively impact their inclusion of students with disabilities, while 60% would be receptive to special educators providing instructional techniques. Approximately 76.9% of educators report interest in having a paraprofessional in their classroom for at least half a school day, while only 13.8% experience such assistance (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996).

**Collaboration.** Teachers who feel supported and less personally responsible for including students with disabilities generally report more positive attitudes toward the process (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Although some regular education teachers have reported receiving help from principals or specialists, a majority still expressed need for collaborative planning between regular and special education teachers, as well as additional time to meet with students’ families, training, staff, materials, and better class sizes in order for inclusion to be successful (Buell, Hallam, Gamel-McCormick, & Scheer, 1999). According to Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996), 92.1% of teachers would prefer less than 20 students in a class, with that currently being the case for about 39.3%
of educators. More specifically, 83.3% of teachers reported a desire to limit the overall number of students with disabilities included in each regular classroom (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). However, as Bailey, Gable, and Hendrickson (1989) reported, few regular education teachers have even received training on how to effectively collaborate with their colleagues in special education.

In order for teachers to work successfully as a team, all members must possess background knowledge of how to problem-solve, how to both listen to and question others, the curriculum to be utilized and ways it could be adapted, techniques for instructing large number of students, and how to promote behavioral change (Miller & Savage, 1995). According to Miller and Savage (1995), as educators receive professional development and support in the area of collaboration, they not only gain skills, but are generally more positive and willing to work with their colleagues. An integrated team of professionals which jointly and consistently shares in the decision making process, as well as the responsibility, for included students is more likely to see positive results (Miller & Savage, 1995). For this reason, Sindelar (1995) suggested teachers be exposed to this idea of collaboration as part of their pre-service experience, by providing joint coursework and professional development opportunities to students studying regular education and special education (Villa, Thousand, & Chapple, 1996). Pugach and Seidl (1995), too, stress the importance of teachers being instructed on how to work together effectively before they officially enter the field of education, as progress toward inclusion may not be possible in the absence of peers supporting and learning from one another (Campbell & Fyfe, 1995; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). The survey conducted by Buell, Hallam, Gamel-McCormick, and Scheer (1999) also indicated teachers desired more
training in the specific areas of modifying or adapting curriculum, managing behavior, evaluating students’ progress, developing IEP components, and using assistive technology. Villa et al. (1996) stated educators should also be provided with training regarding the movement toward inclusion, its impact on all students, how parents can be involved, what expectations are appropriate for students with disabilities, and the various disability classifications relevant to special education.

**Characteristics of Effective Professional Development for Teachers**

Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, and Yoon (2001) cautioned in order for additional professional development to be effective it must be content-focused, include an active learning component, and demonstrate how techniques may be integrated into the everyday functioning of the classroom. Traditionally, trainings do not have a significant impact on educators’ everyday practice in the classroom because they have not been long in duration, have not provided a sufficient amount of hands-on activities, and have not contained information focused on a teacher’s specific content area. Therefore, professional development should be offered in a manner that promotes communication among educational colleagues, links new ideas to previously learned concepts, and consists of sessions that are conducted intensively over a sustained period of time (Garet et al., 2001; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996).

Joyce and Showers (1980) also stressed training should be concerned with participants being able to transfer learned skills into the classroom environment. Individuals attending sessions should be both exposed to a theory and be able to experience that theory in action, perhaps by allowing participants to practice or observe a demonstration of the techniques being taught. Professional development also needs to be
structured, be ongoing in duration, provide timely feedback to those individuals acquiring skills, and allow for the coaching and evaluation of the newly taught practices as they are applied in a classroom setting (Joyce & Showers, 1980). Previous research has stated these characteristics appear to be largely absent in the majority of trainings attended by educators. Villa, Thousand, and Chapple (1996) stressed school districts must act more responsibly when planning and providing training opportunities to their educators, allowing staff members to continually upgrade their skills over several years (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). School systems must move educators from the initial acquisition phase to mastery, by offering more than one session on a particular topic and by utilizing various forms of professional development when covering the same concept, such as a presentation, a workshop, consultation sessions, and coaching by a mentor (Villa et al., 1996).

**Purpose**

As mentioned previously, little research has been devoted to the subject of providing music education to students with disabilities (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994). In addition, much of the research literature regarding this topic was conducted more than 10 years ago, with results specifically related to the initial implementation period of inclusion following the re-authorization of IDEA in 1990. Also, much of this literature consists of articles written to convey a specific author’s viewpoint about such topics as what direction music educators should go when working in a classroom containing students with disabilities or current struggles when attempting to set up an inclusive ensemble. Of the few empirical studies completed to date, many have been limited by small sample size (Darrow, 1999; Wilson & McCrary, 1996) or a limited
geographic area from which participants (music educators) were selected (Frisque et al., 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990). Frisque et al. (1994) advocated for future research to include both qualitative and quantitative components, while Gfeller et al. (1990) suggested the progression of mainstreaming should be examined in states other than Iowa and Kansas, given the majority of previous studies were completed in these states. It was also proposed that additional studies be completed to determine if a music educator’s area of specialization impacted the process of inclusion in any way (Wilson & McCrary, 1996).

As a result, the purpose of this study was to examine the current professional preparation and practices of music educators in relation to teaching students with formally identified disabilities. The preparation of music educators to work with such a population was investigated; in addition, the prevalence of inclusionary practices in today’s music classrooms was explored. Music educators’ understanding of, and participation in, the special education process also was surveyed, as was their knowledge of available school district resources with regard to working with students with disabilities in music ensemble and classroom settings. As an extension of Frisque, Niebur, and Humphrey’s (1994) research, this study assessed the accommodations/adaptations music teachers currently utilize to aid the participation of these students. Finally, music educators were asked to provide information regarding their professional development experiences, as well as what they perceived to be the barriers to, and supports for, inclusionary practices.
Research Questions

Several research questions were addressed in this study.

1. How are pre-service and in-service music educators prepared for instructing students with disabilities?

2. How do music educators perceive their knowledge and skill level related to working with students with disabilities?

3. To what degree are students with disabilities currently present in music classrooms?

4. To what degree are music educators involved in the design and implementation of special education services for their students with disabilities?

5. What do music educators identify as barriers to, and supports for, inclusionary practices in music education?

6. Does the presence of students with disabilities in music classrooms differ depending on the grade level or content area?

7. Does the degree to which music educators are involved in the design and implementation of special education services differ depending on the grade level or content area?
Method

Participants

Participants for this study were recruited from the membership of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association (PMEA), a state organization affiliated with the National Association for Music Education. Currently, over 7,000 music educators belong to PMEA, and its general membership is divided into 12 districts spanning the state of Pennsylvania. While PMEA’s membership consists of both employed and retired music educators, only those individuals currently working in a school setting were eligible for participation in the study. PMEA also represents music educators across several levels of instruction, but only members presently working with students in kindergarten through twelfth grade were eligible to participate. Only members with an email address currently on file with PMEA were contacted.

The initial email was sent to 2,370 PMEA members. Of those individuals, 61 emails were undeliverable. An additional 32 individuals indicated that they were not interested in participating. Although 448 of the PMEA members indicated that they would participate, 85 respondents only completed a portion of the survey. The remaining 363 respondents completed the entire survey and were included in the sample. This resulted in an overall return rate of 15.3%. Table 1 reports demographic information for both the sample and those respondents who only completed a portion of the survey.
Table 1

Percentage of Complete and Partial Responders by Sex, Age, Race/Ethnicity, and Highest Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Complete Responders (N = 363)</th>
<th>Partial Responders (N = 85)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or older</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity/Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dates of bachelor’s degree completion ranged from 1967 to 2008 (Mdn = 1995).

According to their responses, 85% of participants held a bachelor’s degree in music education. Of those participants having earned a master’s degree, nearly half (47.9%) held a master’s in music education; completion dates ranged from 1973 to 2010 (Mdn = 2000). Dates of doctoral degree completion ranged from 2001 to 2006 (Mdn = 2003). According to their responses, 30% of participants holding a doctoral degree did so in music education.
Participants in the sample ranged in years employed as a music educator from 1 to 49 years ($M = 14.7$). Total number of years employed in their school district ranged from 1 to 40 years ($M = 9.6$). The PMEA districts in which participants were employed, along with the actual percentage of PMEA members belonging to each PMEA district, are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Percentage of Participants by PMEA District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PMEA District in which Employed</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>PMEA Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 11</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $N = 351$.*

Demographic information for both the sample’s school districts and the school districts of those respondents who only completed a portion of the survey is reported in Table 3.
Table 3

*Percentage of Complete and Partial Responders’ School Districts by Type of Area, Size of Student Population, and Student Socioeconomic Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Complete Responders (N = 363)</th>
<th>Partial Responders (N = 85)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of area in which school district is located</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate size of student population enrolled in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (less than 1,500 students)</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (between 1,501 and 2,600 students)</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (between 2,601 and 4,300 students)</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra large (more than 4,300 students)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status of majority of student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-moderate</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-high</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presented in Table 4 are the grade levels and content areas for which participants were responsible.

Table 4

*Distribution of Participants by Grade Level and Content Area Taught*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>General Music</th>
<th>Choral Music</th>
<th>Instrumental Music (Band)</th>
<th>Instrumental Music (Orchestra)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High School</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 363.*

**Measure**

A survey examining the current professional preparation and practices of music educators in relation to teaching students with formally identified disabilities was created
specifically for this study (see Appendix A), drawing from surveys previously utilized in the related research literature. After the initial questions were developed, a focus group was held to evaluate the proposed survey. Questions were reviewed in order to determine whether participants understand the vocabulary used, if the questions are being interpreted consistently, and whether the items sufficiently cover the focus of this study. Several experts in the area of research in music education were consulted for feedback on the format of the survey, the clarity of the questions, and the relevance of the items to the overall research questions put forth in this study (Fowler, 2009).

Including the collection of demographic information discussed above, participants responded to 83 questions, including both free-response and forced-choice items. While the free-response questions were more open-ended, the forced-choice response options varied between fixed-choice (e.g., Yes, No, or I am unsure) and Likert scale (e.g., Never to Almost Always) formats. Multiple items were included to address each of the research questions posed in this study.

**Focus group.** A focus group was conducted to solicit preliminary feedback regarding the content and format of the survey. The members of the focus group (2 males and 3 females) were Caucasian and ranged from 22 to 30 years of age. Each participant’s highest degree of education was a Bachelor’s degree, and their years of experience as an employed music educator varied from .5 to 8 years. Of the focus group participants, two were employed at the elementary school level, one was employed at both the elementary and high school level, and two were employed at both the middle school/junior high and the high school level. One of the members of the focus group was responsible for general music, two were responsible for instrumental music (band), one
was responsible for both general music and instrumental music (band), and one was
responsible for general music, choral music, and instrumental music (band). Three focus
group participants were employed in PMEA District 4 and two were employed in PMEA
District 6.

Initially, members of the focus group were asked to share their experiences as
teachers of students with disabilities in order to determine if an important aspect of their
involvement in inclusionary practices had been omitted from the survey. Focus group
participants were then instructed to complete the survey, in part to gain an estimated time
for completion, after which a discussion was held regarding any questions that were not
easily understood. General feedback also was solicited from the members of the focus
group regarding ways to improve the survey. As a result, several questions and response
options were revised to reflect the input of the music educators participating in the focus
group.

**Expert feedback.** Three experts in the area of research in music education were
contacted in an effort to further refine the format and content of the survey. One
individual was a professor of music education, and two were assistant professors of music
education, all at a university in the northeastern United States. Each also was actively
involved in research. Copies of the research questions and the survey were provided to
the experts, in order for them to comment on issues of relevance and clarity. As a result,
a few of the demographic questions were revised in order to collect additional
information, while more explicit response options were included for several of the survey
questions.
Focus group participants also were asked to complete the survey online to determine the typical amount of time required for completion and identify any potential problems with the administration of the online survey. As a result, some adjustments (e.g., altering text boxes for free-response items to ensure they were accepting respondents’ comments) were made to the website to improve its operation.

**Procedure**

A list of current members was obtained from PMEA, from which a sample was drawn including all currently employed music educators teaching kindergarten through twelfth grade across the state of Pennsylvania with an email address currently on file. Prospective participants were contacted through an email informing them of their eligibility to participate in a research study regarding music educators’ professional preparation and practices to provide instruction to students with disabilities (see Appendix B). This initial email included a brief description of the study and a link to an online site, which included the implied consent form (see Appendix A) and the survey. A second email was sent as a follow up to members of the chosen sample 2 weeks after the first contact (see Appendix C), and a third email was sent as a final reminder 1 week later (see Appendix D). Upon completion of the survey, participants were entered into a drawing for $25 gift cards to a department store. After the recruitment process had been completed, the printed email address list was shredded, and the computer file of the email addresses was permanently deleted from the computer hard drive.

**Data Analysis**

Due to a lack of current research literature devoted to the subject of providing music education to students with disabilities, this study was designed to be largely
descriptive in nature. However, two research questions were able to be addressed using statistical analyses. As a result, responses to both the brief demographic questionnaire and the survey data were analyzed utilizing PASW Statistics 17.0 software. The data were screened for errors prior to analysis. Listwise deletion was applied in cases of missing data on an analysis by analysis basis. While the initial five research questions were answered through descriptive analyses, the sixth and seventh research questions utilized two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques. Assumptions of random sampling, independence of variables, normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variance were addressed prior to completing these analyses.

Prior to any analyses being conducted, grade level was re-coded into two levels (elementary and middle/junior high – high) and content area was re-coded into 2 levels (general/choral and instrumental). The instrumental group encompassed both band and orchestra. To answer Research Question 6, a new variable was created (using responses to items #49 and 50) to represent the percentage of formally identified students music educators were teaching relative to the total number of students taught. To answer Research Question 7, three composite variables were created. The first composite (items #55 and #56) represented music educators’ involvement in placement decisions for their students receiving special education services. The second composite (items #58 - #65) represented music educators’ involvement in the IEP design process. The third and final composite (items #66, #67, and #69) represented music educators’ involvement in the IEP implementation process. For all three composite scores, individuals’ responses were summed across items so that low values indicated lower levels of involvement.
Results

Seven research questions guided this study. As such, the results section is organized by research question. To provide some background context on the current prevalence of music classes, Table 5 reports whether specific content areas are a requirement, an elective, or not offered at specific grade levels within participants’ school districts.

Table 5

Percentage of Participants’ School Districts Requiring General, Choral, or Instrumental Music at Each Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area/Grade Level</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Not Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High School</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High School</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music (Band)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High School</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High School</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 362.*

Research Question 1: Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Disabilities

**Undergraduate training.** Survey responses indicated that 59.2% of music educators completed at least one undergraduate course that included at least some information regarding students with disabilities, while an additional 4.4% were unsure as to whether or not they had completed such a course. Located in Table 6 is the number of
these courses participants completed including at least some information regarding students with disabilities.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/Music Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 215.*

Respondents indicated that more than half (59.5%) of these courses provided minimal information on policy or legislation regarding the education of students with disabilities. In addition, 64.2% of these courses provided minimal training regarding specific instructional techniques. Of those that provided training regarding specific instructional techniques, 77% featured differentiated instruction, 44% peer assisted learning strategies, and 62.8% direct instruction; 6.3% taught other instructional techniques including how to adapt or modify activities and materials, teaching toward multiple intelligences, and basic instruction in sign language.

Less than half (44.7%) of these courses did not provide any classroom-based experience working with students with disabilities. Similarly, 49.3% of these courses provided minimal information on techniques for collaborating, and 52.1% did not promote interaction with pre-service students from other educational disciplines.

**Graduate training.** Results for graduate courses were very similar to the undergraduate responses (Table 7). Specifically, 58.4% of music educators did not have any graduate courses that included at least some information regarding students with disabilities, while an additional 1.9% were unsure if they had completed such a course.
Table 7  
Number of Graduate Courses Completed in Specific Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/Music Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 144.*

Nearly half (45.8%) of these courses provided minimal information on policy or legislation. In addition, 44.4% of these courses provided minimal training regarding specific instructional techniques. Of those that provided such training, 87.1% featured differentiated instruction, 62.9% peer assisted learning strategies, and 67.7% direct instruction; 4.8% taught other instructional techniques including redirection, various behavioral methods, and the use of adaptive technology.

Many (61.8%) of these courses did not provide any classroom-based experience working with students with disabilities. Similarly, 52.1% of these courses provided minimal information on techniques for collaborating.

**In-service professional development.** Survey responses indicated that 82.6% of music educators completed at least one in-service training or professional development workshop that included at least some information regarding students with disabilities, while 3.0% were unsure as to whether or not they had completed such a training. On average, music educators attended 4.3 workshops within the last 5 years that included at least some information regarding students with disabilities. Less than half (41.5%) of these trainings provided a minimal or moderate amount of information on policy or legislation.
Approximately half (46.5%) of these workshops provided a minimal amount of training regarding specific instructional techniques. In regards to those that provided training regarding specific instructional techniques, 91.8% featured differentiated instruction, 51.6% peer assisted learning strategies, and 54.8% direct instruction; 9.3% provided other techniques including the use of adaptive technology, social stories/picture schedules, and music therapy techniques.

More than half (51.7%) of these trainings provided a minimal amount of information on techniques for collaborating. Many (77.3%) of these workshops involved demonstrations/modeling, 21.3% included practice, and 25% provided coaching/feedback; 19% involved other components including the provision of handouts or research articles, group discussion or sharing amongst colleagues, and multimedia presentations. Additionally, 66.7% of these workshops typically lasted less than one day, 28% one day, 3.0% two days, and 2.3% three days or more.

Additional information was collected to identify the in-service or professional development topics that survey respondents thought would be most useful in improving music educators’ work with students with disabilities. Responses included strategies that work for teaching music to a mainstreamed population (47.4%), short and practical consultations with professionals in specific areas related to special education (19.3%), and how to engage students with autism (11.8%).

**Research Question 2: Knowledge and Skills Related to Working with Students with Disabilities**

Large percentages of music educators reported that they had limited knowledge of their legal responsibilities (54.5%), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
(IDEIA; 56.2%), least restrictive environment (LRE; 36.9%), specially designed instruction (SDI; 43.8%), and collaborating (41.3%). Additionally, 55.6% reported moderate knowledge of IEPs.

Less than half of music educators (44.6%) reported limited or moderate knowledge of teaching students with disabilities.

Research Question 3: Presence of Students with Disabilities in Music Classrooms

A large number of respondents (93.1%) reported teaching students receiving special education services, although an additional 4.1% were unsure of whether or not this was occurring. The total number of students taught by the music educators ranged from 15 to 1,200 ($M = 316.8$), while the number of formally identified students taught ranged from 0 to 300 ($M = 36.0$). On average, 11.4% of their students were formally identified, in comparison to the average 15.1% of children enrolled in special education across the state of Pennsylvania in the 2009-2010 school year. Table 8 reports the formal special education classifications music educators indicated being present in their classrooms.
Table 8  
*Percentage of Participants Indicating Having Specific Formal Classifications in their Classrooms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-blindness</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment including Blindness</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 338.*

**Research Question 4: Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services**

**Amount of involvement.** More than half (57.7%) of music educators reported their school district had a policy regarding how inclusion decisions are made, while 40.2% were unsure of whether or not such a policy existed. More than half (60.9%) reported never having been consulted in the placement decisions made for their students who were receiving special education services. Of those who had been consulted in the placement decisions, 64.4% provided suggestions sometimes.

Approximately half (49.1%) reported their input was solicited on occasion regarding the present level of educational performance of their students with disabilities. Of those whose input was solicited, 59.4% sometimes contributed. More than half (55.9%) reported their goal recommendations were never solicited for their students’ annual IEPs. Of those who had goals solicited, 64% contributed on occasion. Similarly, 53.3% never had accommodations/adaptations solicited from them for inclusion in their
students’ annual IEPs. Of those who had accommodations/adaptations solicited, 64.4% sometimes contributed.

Less than half (43.5%) of respondents never were invited to attend their students’ annual IEP meetings. Of those who had been invited to attend, 64.9% did so on occasion. More than half (53.8%) of respondents reported typically being provided with copies of their students’ IEPs. Of those who had been provided with copies, 59.1% almost always read the copies and 40.2% typically understood the copies.

Participants were asked to identify the largest impediment to their participation in the annual IEP process for their students: scheduling issues (31.4%), a lack of time (15.1%), and not being invited to participate or being aware of meetings (13.3%).

**Adaptations and accommodations.** Of those music educators who were provided with copies of their students’ IEPs, 44.6% almost always incorporated their students’ required accommodations or adaptations into their classrooms. Music educators who were rarely or unable to implement their students’ required accommodations or adaptations into their classrooms were asked why they were unable to do so. Individuals specified a number of reasons including: requirements not being relevant to or necessary in a music setting (32.1%), having too many students (and too many students with IEPs) in each class to provide individualization (24.5%), and not being provided with enough support or time (22.6%). The type of accommodations/adaptations music educators were using with, or providing to, students with disabilities are presented in Table 9, by special education classification.
### Table 9
*Percentage of Participants Implementing Specific Accommodations/Adaptations for Students with Different Disabilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Adaptive Materials/Music</th>
<th>Alternate Evaluation</th>
<th>Individual Instruction</th>
<th>Para-professionals</th>
<th>Peer Partners</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-blindness</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment including Blindness</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 338.*
Several music educators provided additional comments regarding accommodations/adaptations. Individuals mentioned specific provisions they utilize when working with their students who were receiving special education services including preferential seating and adaptive technology.

**Research Question 5: Barriers and Supports**

Individuals responding to the survey provided their thoughts on the most available resources in their school district in regards to their work with students who were receiving special education services. These resources included special education teachers (45.3%), paraprofessionals or support staff (6.5%), having access to IEPs (5.9%), guidance counselors (5.9%), and the students’ aides (5.9%). Individuals also provided their thoughts on what they believed to be the most limited resource relative to their work with students with disabilities. The most commonly identified limitations included: money (11.5%), time (10.9%), and instruments/practical printed materials/technological resources (8.9%).

Less than half (42.9%) of respondents reported a moderate level of administrative support available to them, 34.6% reported a low level of financial/material support, 48.2% indicated a low amount of planning or preparation time, and 46.2% reported a moderate overall level of support. The availability of various school personnel (as indicated by music educators) and the frequency with which music educators have sought assistance (from various school personnel) regarding their students’ special education services are presented in Table 10.
Table 10

*Availability of Personnel and Frequency with which Participants Sought Assistance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Frequency Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Nurse</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education Teacher</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and Language Therapist</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapist</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care Aide/Therapeutic Support Staff</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Teacher (Art, Library, Music, Physical Education, etc.)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Guardian</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 338.
Research Question 6: Student Participation Rates by Level and Content Area

Basic assumptions (random sampling, independence of variables, normality, and linearity) were tested (e.g., visual examination of histograms, boxplots, and scatterplots). Homogeneity of variance was also tested (Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variance). The variables appeared to have a negative skew, with skewness values ranging from -0.2 to 4.4. The variables also appeared to be leptokurtic in nature, with kurtosis values ranging from -2.0 to 27.3. The percentage of formally identified students taught deviated from being normally distributed. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), violations of the normality assumption may not be as severe with a sample size of more than 100 cases. Correlations among these variables ranged from -0.1 to 0.2.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted with the categorical independent variables of grade level and content area. The continuous dependent variable was the number of formally identified students music educators were teaching, as a percentage of the music educators’ total number of students taught. Statistical significance was set a priori at $p < .05$. Table 11 reports descriptive statistics for the percentage of formally identified students taught, grouped by grade level and content area.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle/Junior High-High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General-Choral</td>
<td>9.6$^1$</td>
<td>15.7$^3$</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>8.6$^2$</td>
<td>9.8$^4$</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $^1N = 74; ^2N = 18; ^3N = 59; ^4N = 27.$

Results of the ANOVA (Table 12) indicated there was a significant main effect for grade level: Elementary music educators indicated being currently responsible for a lower percentage of formally identified students than music educators at the
Middle/Junior High – High level. There was no significant main effect for content area.

There was no significant grade level by content area interaction

**Table 12**

*Tests of Between-Subject Effects (Grade Level/Content Area) for the Percentage of Formally Identified Students Taught*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>429.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>429.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area</td>
<td>392.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>392.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level * Content Area</td>
<td>189.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>17848.3</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43098.2</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 7: Music Educators’ Involvement in Placement Decisions and the IEP Process**

Basic assumptions (random sampling, independence of variables, normality, and linearity) were tested (e.g., visual examination of histograms, boxplots, and scatterplots). Homogeneity of variance was also tested (Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variance). The variables’ skewness values ranged from -1.1 to 1.0 and their kurtosis values ranged from -2.0 to 0.0. Correlations among these variables ranged from -0.1 to 0.5. Two-way ANOVAs are thought to be less sensitive to homogeneity of variance violations, as the analyses are thought to be weakened but not fatally invalidated (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). All three composite variables were found to violate the assumption of homogeneity of variance; findings should therefore be interpreted with caution.

Two-way ANOVAs were conducted with the categorical independent variables of grade level and content area. The continuous dependent variables were a composite representing music educators’ involvement in placement decisions made for their students who were receiving special education services, a composite representing music educators’ involvement in the IEP design process, and a composite representing music
educators’ involvement in the IEP implementation process. Statistical significance was set a priori at \( p < .05 \). Table 13 reports descriptive statistics for the three composite variables, grouped by grade level and content area.

**Table 13**

*Means for the Three Composite Variables Grouped by Grade Level/Content Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Involvement in Placement Decisions</th>
<th>Involvement in IEP Design Process</th>
<th>Involvement in IEP Implementation Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Middle/Junior High-High</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General-Choral</td>
<td>2.1(^1)</td>
<td>2.2(^3)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>1.5(^2)</td>
<td>2.1(^4)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^1\) \(N = 75\); \(^2\) \(N = 22\); \(^3\) \(N = 60\); \(^4\) \(N = 36\); Possible range for Placement Decisions variable is 0-8; Possible range for IEP Design Process variable is 0-32; Possible range for IEP Implementation Process variable is 0-12.

Regarding music educators’ involvement in placement decisions for their students who were receiving special education services (Table 14), there was no significant main effect for grade level, content area, or a grade level by content area interaction.

**Table 14**

*Tests of Between-Subject Effects (Grade Level/Content Area) for Involvement in Placement Decision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level * Content Area</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>587.5</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1405.0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For music educators’ involvement in the IEP design process (Table 15), there was a significant main effect for grade level. Specifically, elementary music educators
indicated a lower level of involvement than music educators at the Middle/Junior High – High level. There was also a significant main effect for content area: General/Choral music educators indicated a higher level of involvement than Instrumental music educators. There was no significant grade level by content area interaction, though.

Table 15
*Ttests of Between-Subject Effects (Grade Level/Content Area) for Involvement in the IEP Design Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>559.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>559.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area</td>
<td>288.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>288.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level * Content Area</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7514.3</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31413.0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to music educators’ involvement in the IEP implementation process (Table 16), there was a significant main effect for grade level: Elementary music educators indicated a lower level of involvement than music educators at the Middle/Junior High – High level. There was also a significant main effect for content area: General/Choral music educators indicated a higher level of involvement than Instrumental music educators. There was no significant grade level by content area interaction.

Table 16
*Ttests of Between-Subject Effects (Grade Level/Content Area) for Involvement in the IEP Implementation Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area</td>
<td>317.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>317.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level * Content Area</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2696.1</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16310.0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Comments/Feedback

Participants also provided additional comments and feedback regarding the need for training, support, and/or practices necessary for successfully including students with disabilities in music classrooms. Their responses included: the need for better training specifically tailored to music educators (26.0%), the necessity of students with disabilities being addressed in undergraduate curriculum through observations and hands-on experiences (17.5%), and the need for additional and more intensive training to be provided by school districts/intermediate units/PMEA (8.2%).
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the current professional preparation and practices of music educators in relation to teaching students with formally identified disabilities. Specifically, I created a survey to investigate the preparation of music educators to work with students with disabilities and their use of inclusionary practices in today’s music classrooms. In addition, the survey included questions regarding music educators’ understanding of, and participation in, the special education process and examined their knowledge of available school district resources for working with students with disabilities. The survey also assessed the accommodations/adaptations music teachers currently utilize to aid the participation of these students. Finally, music educators were asked to provide information regarding their professional development experiences, as well as what they perceived to be the barriers to, and supports for, inclusionary practices.

Interpretation of Results

Training and preparation to work with students with disabilities. Music educators reported receiving some information regarding students with disabilities in their undergraduate courses and their in-service trainings/professional development workshops, but there appears to be a complete lack of exposure in their graduate courses. Compared to past reports (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Hourigan, 2008), music educators in the current survey reported a greater number of courses or trainings completed; although, close to 40% are still not be exposed to this topic at the undergraduate level. A larger amount of individuals are now more likely to attend at least a single course or be provided with at least one in-service training.
Results also indicated that music educators who completed their undergraduate training after the enactment of the 1997 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act often attended an undergraduate course relevant to students with disabilities, while their more experienced counterparts generally reported not having experienced such a class.

Current music teachers reported attending approximately four workshops (within a 5-year period) relevant to the teaching of students with disabilities, which is consistent with results by both Gfeller et al. and Wilson and McCrary (1996). In accordance with work by Darrow (1999) and Fitzgerald (2006), participants’ collegiate coursework and workshops included minimal content on specific instructional techniques. Music educators also reported, similar to what was observed previously (Darrow; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Hammel, 2001), that both undergraduate and graduate courses provided no or little classroom-based experience. However, it does appear as though there has been a slight increase in the amount of pre-service hands-on experience provided to music educators. Additionally, many of the music teachers’ workshops lasted less than 1 day, matching findings by Garet et al. and Joyce and Showers (1980) that professional development was not often long or ongoing in duration. Despite their brevity, approximately 20% of these workshops involved practice and 25% involved coaching/feedback.

According to Joyce and Showers (1980), coaching/feedback was largely absent in trainings attended by educators three decades ago. Participants in the current survey reported coaching/feedback occurring during the course of workshops they had completed. However, it is important to note these characteristics were still only present in about one-fourth of music educators’ experiences.
Knowledge and skills related to working with students with disabilities.

Similar to results found by Gilbert and Asmus (1981) and Hourigan (2008), music educators report limited knowledge of special education. However, the current survey expanded upon past findings by exploring the knowledge of music teachers beyond their familiarity with Public Law 94-142 or with their rights and responsibilities as educators of such students. It is important to note that music educators today appear to have received no more instruction related to students with disabilities than was the case almost 30 years ago. Although music educators indicated limited background knowledge, they believe themselves to have a slightly higher level of knowledge specifically related to the teaching of students with disabilities. This was in accordance with previous findings (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994; Wilson & McCrary, 1996). Despite a lack of training in topics related to special education, a majority of music teachers report feeling comfortable with the mainstreaming process, indicating they possess great confidence in their ability to educate such students.

Presence of students with disabilities in music classrooms. Responses to the current survey indicated the majority of music educators currently teach students who are receiving special education services. This finding is consistent with past work (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994; Gilbert & Asmus, 1981). However, the number of music teachers reporting the presence of such students appears to have increased over time, as it is higher now (93.1%) than in 1994 (84%; Frisque et al.) and 1981 (62.9%; Gilbert & Asmus).
Involvement in the design and implementation of special education services.

It appears as though music educators are making more than minimal adaptations or accommodations for students with disabilities within their music classrooms, as they indicated using a variety of accommodations/adaptations and nearly half of those who had been provided with IEP copies were regularly incorporating the students’ requirements.

In accordance with previous work (Damer, 2001b; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994), many music educators indicated never being consulted in the placement decisions made for their students who were receiving special education services. On a positive note, the number of music teachers left out of such decisions appears to be on the decline from around 72% in 1994 to 60.9% in the current study. The music educators also reported neither having goals or accommodations/adaptations solicited from them for their students’ annual IEPs nor being invited to attend their students’ annual IEP meetings. These results were consistent with previous studies (Frisque et al.; Gilbert & Asmus, 1981; McCord, 2001; McCord & Watts, 2006; Wilson and McCrary, 1996). However, music teachers’ involvement in the IEP process has increased somewhat from 1981, as well as from 1994.

Conversely, nearly half of the current respondents reported having their input solicited regarding the present level of educational performance of their students with disabilities. Unfortunately, those music teachers who were consulted only provided suggestions, contributed input, contributed goals, contributed accommodations, contributed adaptations, or attended on occasion. On a positive note, most of the music educators were typically provided with copies of their students’ IEPs. Additionally, they
reported frequently reading and understanding the copies, as well as regularly incorporating their students’ required accommodations or adaptations into their classrooms. In general, music educators appear to be utilizing preferential seating and adaptive technology. More specifically, they tend to use adaptive materials/music for specific learning disabilities, alternate evaluation for students with mental retardation, and individual instruction/para-professionals/peer partners for autism. Similar to Darrow’s (1999) findings, music educators explained the largest impediment to their participants in the annual IEP process is scheduling.

In contrast to prior research (Darrow, 1999), music educators reported using a slightly greater variety of accommodations/adaptations, including alternate evaluation, in their classrooms and ensembles. In fact, music teachers reported frequently incorporating their students’ requirements once the educators had been provided with IEP copies. Those music educators who indicated not providing these accommodations/adaptations often did not find the specified modifications relevant to their instruction. This increase in provision may be true due to the majority of music educators reporting they are recipients of copies of their students’ IEPs. Although many other areas of music educators’ involvement in the special education process mirrored the low levels seen in the past, receiving IEP copies was one area where the teachers do appear to be included at a greater rate. Also, Wilson and McCrary (1996) reported music educators generally do not receive information about their students with disabilities, while music teachers in the present study mentioned typically receiving copies of their students’ IEPs. The increased exchange of information reported by today’s music educators could be a result of a greater use of technology by many school districts. A large portion of special education
departments now utilize electronic databases for their filing systems, and as a result more of a student’s relevant faculty/staff members may have easier access to necessary paperwork.

**Barriers and supports.** Although it appears music educators believe there to be appropriate personnel readily available to support their efforts, they noted that few other resources (e.g., materials or time) were available to them.

Respondents to the survey indicated having a low level of both financial/material support and planning/preparation time available to them, while they rated their administrative support to be of a more moderate level. In regard to their work with students who were receiving special education services, music teachers consider special education teachers to be the most available resource in their school districts, while money is seen as the least available resource. The finding that music educators reported a lack of time was consistent with previous studies (Darrow, 1999; Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990).

Viewing faculty as an available resource was somewhat in contrast to past research (Buell, Hallam, Gamel-McCormick, & Scheer, 1999; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996), in which only 11% of music educators previously reported having access to adequate personnel and expressed a need for additional staff members. The music teachers in the current study indicated many different individuals to be available to them, as well as having pursued these individuals for resources and support. As the population of students receiving special education services has increased, many school districts have added personnel to work with those students. Increases in personnel also have resulted from changes in federal special education law, which now details that an IEP should
indicate the specific staff member responsible for providing students with disabilities with their required supports. As such, music educators’ more positive view of personnel may simply be due to an increased level of staffing in school districts.

During the past decade, there has been an increased emphasis on co-teaching or team teaching. As a result, networks for collaboration may have a greater presence in today’s school districts than in the past. In addition, the current finding regarding administrative support somewhat contradicted Fritz and Miller’s (1995) results, which indicated music educators lacked support from their principals. This too may have resulted from an increase in individuals working with one another as the changing climate of the school system, including such movements as response to instruction/intervention or school-wide positive behavior support, calls for a greater amount of teamwork. It is also possible that as greater numbers of students with disabilities are placed in music classrooms and ensembles, administrators have devoted more of their efforts to supporting the work of music educators. The training of administrators, in relation to educating students with disabilities, may also have improved over the last 15 years, thus affecting the level of support they are able to provide to music teachers.

**Student participation rates by level and content area.** The results of the current study indicated significantly more students with disabilities participate in music at the middle/junior high-high level than at the elementary level. The findings, however, did not demonstrate a significant difference amongst the content areas of general/choral and instrumental music.
As mentioned previously, students with disabilities are now included in music classrooms at a greater rate than was previously reported. This increased exposure could possibly lead students to pursue additional music education as they progress through the course of their schooling, more than was the case in the past. Also, it can easily be forgotten that music education is still required during a portion of students’ secondary education, resulting in the potential misconception that music teachers at the elementary level are responsible for educating more students who are receiving special education services than their middle/junior high or high school counterparts. Additionally, due to the presence of instructional support teams, particularly at the elementary school level, students with disabilities may not be formally identified until secondary school. A team may provide students with interventions in order to determine if progress can be made prior to having a child’s need for special education services assessed. As a result, the presence of such students may appear to be higher in middle/junior high or high school, when in fact the percentage may partially reflect a delay in assigning a formal diagnosis.

**Music educators’ involvement in placement decisions and the IEP process.**

Middle/junior high-high teachers reported greater involvement in both the IEP design process and the IEP implementation process than elementary teachers. However, general/choral teachers indicated being more involved in both the IEP design process and the IEP implementation process than instrumental teachers. This was similar to results found by Gilbert and Asmus (1981), where general/choral music educators indicated greater involvement in the IEP process. The higher rates of IEP involvement presently reported by middle/junior high or high school music educators may be a result of the large amount of students with disabilities enrolled in their classrooms and ensembles.
Implications for Practice

There are several prospective implications for practice resulting from this study. Music educators need to see an increase in both the quantity and the quality of exposure to the topic of students with disabilities, and it is essential this occur at the undergraduate training level as well as in the form of in-service trainings or professional development workshops. While this increase should focus on an overview of the area of special education, bolstering music teachers’ background knowledge on relevant topics, it must also be relatively specific to the music classroom. As for the content of these courses or trainings, music educators must receive greater information about policy or legislation regarding the education of students with disabilities and specific instructional techniques.

In addition, because many music educators indicated having collaborated in the music education of their students with disabilities, they should be provided with instruction on techniques for collaborating. Music teachers must also be provided with greater amounts of classroom-based experience and interaction with pre-service students from other educational disciplines. It is also important that the trainings’ duration be extended past one day, occurring across multiple sessions that utilize both practice and feedback. Due to the larger than expected presence of students with disabilities reported at the middle/junior high-high level, or in the area of general/choral music, music educators teaching that content or at that level may benefit from additional educational opportunities. Several potential topics requested by the music educators themselves included strategies that work for teaching music to a mainstreamed population, short and practical consultations with professionals in specific areas related to special education, and how to engage students with autism. The music teachers expressed additional
concern over their ability to balance group instruction for a large class size with the needs of individuals, and would therefore benefit from training in this area as well.

Music educators also need to advocate for themselves as professionals and lobby their colleagues in order to be included in the various aspects of the special education process. This may help to partially solve the insufficient communication music teachers report occurring between the various personnel involved in the process of special education. However, music educators must accept greater responsibility and actually participate when they are invited to play a role in procedures; this includes educating themselves about their school district’s policy regarding how inclusion decisions are made. Finally, music educators should open a dialogue with their administrators about issues that may prevent them from being successful with their students who are receiving special education services. This includes the need for a student’s support staff (i.e., paraprofessionals or aides) to attend music classes or ensembles with the student, scheduling conflicts that prevent music educators from actively participating in IEP meetings, as well as the reported lack of money, time, and materials/resources.

**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

The current study had several limitations. Although drawing a sample of participants from Pennsylvania did extend prior research that was mostly conducted in the Midwest, respondents to the survey only represented a single state. As a result, the conclusions drawn may or may not be representative of other music educators across the country. Future research should survey music teachers in other states to determine if the findings of the present study are generalizable. Additionally, individuals who chose to respond were volunteers. It is important to consider whether or not there could be
something distinctly different about those people who completed the survey as compared to those who chose not to participate. For example, participants could have possessed a greater interest in regards to the education of students with disabilities; therefore, their responses could vary considerably from other music teachers who viewed this area as less important. Consequently, future studies should explore additional variables such as music educators’ opinions regarding inclusion and whether or not they are supportive of the process.

Another potential limitation is that the responses provided by the participants may be inaccurate due to poor recall or to the effects of social desirability. In regards to the issue of social desirability, individuals could have purposely altered their answers in an effort to be viewed more positively due to the potentially sensitive nature of the topic at hand. Finally, as mentioned previously, the statistical analyses conducted as part of this research suffered from violations of several assumptions. Although both the sample size and the choice of analysis technique in the current study were thought to increase robustness, conclusions drawn must still be interpreted with significant caution.

Participants who completed the survey were able to provide feedback regarding their thoughts on the survey itself, and 52.1% of the sample chose to do so. Several individuals (4.8%) mentioned the survey being quite lengthy, tedious, involved, time consuming, and difficult to complete in addition to their everyday activities. As a result, future studies could examine the topics covered in the present research on an individual basis, perhaps studying each area in greater depth, while still shortening the overall amount of information collected. The response rate of such studies may be increased not only by using a briefer survey, but also by providing greater incentives for participation.
Additionally, 4.8% of participants mentioned not always feeling as though the forced-choice response options provided them with an adequate selection of answers, as they wished to provide more open-ended comments. Also, 0.5% reported sometimes finding it difficult to distinguish the forced-choice response options from one another. In addition, a limited number of respondents (5.4%) also mentioned feeling as though they had to guess at some questions for a variety of reasons including: the questions being too vague or unclear, being unsure as to an exact number of students fitting particular criteria, having too limited knowledge or experience to understand the terminology, and being too far removed from the timeframe to which a particular question referred.

On the other hand, many individuals responding to the survey (7.0%) reported finding it clear, concise, formatted and organized well, easy to follow, very specific and thorough, and well thought out. Several participants (11.3%) also indicated they found the survey to be thought provoking, be interesting, contain excellent questions, and be on an appropriate and important topic that currently needs to be addressed.

Conclusion

The current study attempted to update the research on providing music education to students with disabilities, by examining the current professional preparation and practices of music educators in relation to teaching students with formally identified disabilities, as much of the literature was conducted more than 10 years ago and consists of few empirical studies. Music educators today indicate completing an increasing number of courses (graduate and undergraduate), as well as professional development training, related to students with disabilities. They also report greater amounts of pre-service hands-on experience and coaching/feedback occurring. Despite these
advancements, nearly half of music teachers still are not exposed to this topic as undergraduates. Additionally, many music educators do not receive any coaching/feedback as part of their workshop experiences. The majority also appear no more knowledgeable regarding a variety of topics related to special education than was the case almost 30 years ago.

Music educators are currently responsible for more students with disabilities than has been reported in the past, and with that responsibility has come increased involvement in placement decisions and the IEP process. Music teachers also indicate greater provision of accommodations/adaptations to their students, as copies of IEPs continue to be received at a higher rate. Additionally, today’s music educators view both their administrative and personnel support more positively than previously.

Although it appears as though some progress has been made in improving the professional preparation and practices of music educators in relation to teaching students with formally identified disabilities, there still exists much room for improvement. Music teachers should seek additional training on effective collaboration techniques, as well as make an effort to inform administrators of supplementary resources they feel are necessary in their work with students with disabilities. Music educators must also advocate for themselves as professionals, both by requesting an increase in the quantity and quality of exposure to this topic and by enhancing their participation in the special education process.
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Appendix A

Implied Informed Consent Form/Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding Inclusion

**Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding**

**Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research -- The Pennsylvania...**

**Title of Project:** Inclusion of Students with Special Needs: Preparation and Practices of Music Educators

**Principal Investigator:** Kathryn Hahn  
S113 Henderson Building  
University Park, PA 16802  
krd137@psu.edu  
814-308-4291

**Advisor:** James DiPerna  
105 Cedar Building  
University Park, PA 16802  
jdiperma@psu.edu  
814-863-2405

1. **Purpose of the Study:** The purpose of this study is to examine the current professional preparation and practices of music educators in relation to teaching students with disabilities.

2. **Procedures to be followed:** You will be asked to complete a brief background questionnaire. Then, you will be asked to answer a variety of questions regarding your training and professional experience. All questions will be administered and answered online.

3. **Duration/Time:** It will take between 15 and 20 minutes to complete both the questionnaire and the survey.

4. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is confidential. The survey does not ask for your name or any other unique identifying information. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared because your name cannot be linked to your survey responses. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties.

5. **Right to Ask Questions:** Please contact Kathryn Hahn at (814) 308-4291 or James DiPerna at (814) 863-2405 with questions or concerns about this study.

6. **Payment for participation:** Upon completion of the survey, you will be entered into a drawing for 1 of 20 $25 gift cards to Target.

7. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time without penalty. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. Completion and return of the survey implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to take part in the research.

Please print this form to keep for your records or future reference.

**Background Questionnaire**

**Please indicate:**
Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

1. Your sex:
   - Female
   - Male

2. Your age:
   - 20-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60 or older

3. Your ethnicity/race (select all that apply):
   - African American
   - American Indian/Alaska Native
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - Caucasian
   - Hispanic
   - Other (please specify):

Background Questionnaire

Please indicate your education (complete all that apply):

4. Bachelor’s Degree:
   - Major(s):
   - College/University:
   - Specified "In Progress" or Year Completed:

5. Master’s Degree:
   - Major(s):
   - College/University:
   - Specified "In Progress" or Year Completed:
### Background Questionnaire

**6. Doctoral Degree:**
- Major(s):  
- College/University:  
- Specify "In Progress" or Year Completed:  

**Please indicate:**

7. Your total number of years employed as a music educator:

8. The PMEA district in which you are employed:
   - District 1
   - District 2
   - District 3
   - District 4
   - District 5
   - District 6
   - District 7
   - District 8
   - District 9
   - District 10
   - District 11
   - District 12

9. Your total number of years employed in your school district:

10. The type of area in which your school district is located:
   - Rural
   - Suburban
   - Urban
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11. The approximate size of the student population enrolled in your school district:
   - Small (less than 1,500 students)
   - Medium (between 1,501 and 2,600 students)
   - Large (between 2,601 and 4,300 students)
   - Extra large (more than 4,300 students)

12. How you would characterize the socioeconomic status of the majority of the student population enrolled in your school district:
   - Low
   - Low-moderate
   - Moderate
   - Moderate-high
   - High

13. Which content areas are a requirement, an elective, or not offered at the following grade levels within your school district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Music</th>
<th>Choral Music</th>
<th>Instrumental Music (Band)</th>
<th>Instrumental Music (Orchestra)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. The grade level(s) and content area(s) for which you are responsible (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Music</th>
<th>Choral Music</th>
<th>Instrumental Music (Band)</th>
<th>Instrumental Music (Orchestra)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions

For the remaining questions on this survey, "students with special needs" refers to those students eligible for services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) including those students formally classified as having autism, deaf-blindness, deafness, emotional disturbance, hearing impairment, mental retardation, multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, specific learning disability, speech or language
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impairment, traumatic brain injury, and visual impairment including blindness.

Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Special...

15. Have you completed any undergraduate courses that included at least some information regarding students with special needs?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ I am unsure

Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Special...

Please indicate:

16. The number of undergraduate courses you have completed in each of the following disciplines that included at least some information regarding students with special needs:
   Education: 
   Human Development: 
   Music/Music Education: 
   Psychology: 
   Special Education: 

17. The amount of information provided in these undergraduate courses on policy or legislation regarding the education of students with special needs:
   ○ None
   ○ Minimal
   ○ Moderate
   ○ Substantial
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18. The amount of training provided in these undergraduate courses regarding **specific instructional techniques** for use with students with special needs:

- None
- Minimal
- Moderate
- Substantial

### Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Special...

Please indicate:

19. **Specific instructional techniques** taught in these undergraduate courses (select all that apply):

- [ ] Differentiated instruction
- [ ] Peer assisted learning strategies
- [ ] Direct instruction
- [ ] Other (please specify) [ ]

### Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Special...

Please indicate the amount of:

20. **Classroom-based experience** working with students with special needs provided in these undergraduate courses:

- None
- Minimal
- Moderate
- Substantial
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21. Information provided in these undergraduate courses on techniques for collaborating with another faculty/staff member:
   - None
   - Minimal
   - Moderate
   - Substantial

22. Interaction with pre-service students from other educational disciplines, such as regular education or special education, your undergraduate course experiences involved:
   - None
   - Minimal
   - Moderate
   - Substantial

Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Specia...

23. Have you completed any graduate courses that included at least some information regarding students with special needs?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I am unsure

Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Specia...

Please indicate:
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24. The number of **graduate** courses you have completed in each of the following disciplines that included at least some information regarding students with special needs:

- **Education:**
- **Human Development:**
- **Music/Music Education:**
- **Psychology:**
- **Special Education:**

25. The amount of information provided in these graduate courses on **policy or legislation** regarding the education of students with special needs:

- None
- Minimal
- Moderate
- Substantial

26. The amount of training provided in these graduate courses regarding **specific instructional techniques** for use with students with special needs:

- None
- Minimal
- Moderate
- Substantial

### Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Special...

**Please indicate:**
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27. **Specific instructional techniques** taught in these graduate courses
   (select all that apply):
   - Differentiated instruction
   - Peer assisted learning strategies
   - Direct instruction
   - Other (please specify)

Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Special...

Please indicate the amount of:

28. **Classroom-based experience** working with students with special needs
    provided in these graduate courses:
   - None
   - Minimal
   - Moderate
   - Substantial

29. Information provided in these graduate courses on **techniques** for
    collaborating with another faculty/staff member:
   - None
   - Minimal
   - Moderate
   - Substantial

Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Special...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Have you completed any in-service trainings or professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development workshops that included at least some information regarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students with special needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ I am unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Specia...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The number of trainings or workshops you have attended within the last 5 years that included at least some information regarding students with special needs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The amount of information provided in these trainings or workshops on policy or legislation regarding the education of students with special needs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The amount of training provided in these experiences regarding specific instructional techniques for use with students with special needs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Substantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Specia...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

34. Specific instructional techniques taught in these trainings or workshops (select all that apply):
- [ ] Differentiated instruction
- [ ] Peer assisted learning strategies
- [ ] Direct instruction
- [ ] Other (please specify) [ ]

### Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Special...

Please indicate:

35. The amount of information provided in these trainings or workshops on techniques for collaborating with another faculty/staff member:
- [ ] None
- [ ] Minimal
- [ ] Moderate
- [ ] Substantial

36. If your trainings or workshops involved (select all that apply):
- [ ] Demonstrations/Modeling
- [ ] Practice
- [ ] Coaching/Feedback
- [ ] Other (please specify) [ ]
Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

37. What has been the format of your trainings or workshops related to the education of students with special needs (select all that apply):
   - Conferences
   - Consultations
   - Courses
   - Institutes
   - Internships
   - Mentoring
   - Seminars
   - Workshops

38. The typical length of your trainings or workshops related to the education of students with special needs:
   - Less than one day
   - One day
   - Two days
   - Three days or more

39. If these trainings or workshops primarily focused on specific content related to the education of students with special needs in the music classroom:
   - Yes
   - No
   - I am unsure

Pre-service and In-service Preparation for Instructing Students with Special...

40. What in-service or professional development topic(s) do you think would be most useful in improving music educators’ work with students with special needs?

Knowledge and Skills Related to Working with Students with Special
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Music Educators' Preparation and Practices Regarding Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on all of your courses, trainings, and workshops regarding students with special needs, how would you rate your overall knowledge and/or skills regarding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Legal responsibilities when working with students with special needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderate knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well-developed knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderate knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well-developed knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderate knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well-developed knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderate knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well-developed knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding**

45. Specially Designed Instruction (SDI), which refers to appropriately adapting the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction to address the unique needs of a student resulting from a disability?

- [ ] No knowledge
- [ ] Limited knowledge
- [ ] Moderate knowledge
- [ ] Well-developed knowledge

46. Collaborating with another faculty/staff member?

- [ ] No skills
- [ ] Limited skills
- [ ] Moderate skills
- [ ] Well-developed skills

47. Teaching students with special needs?

- [ ] No skills
- [ ] Limited skills
- [ ] Moderate skills
- [ ] Well-developed skills

**Presence of Students with Special Needs in Music Classrooms**

48. Are any of your students receiving special education services?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] I am unsure

**Presence of Students with Special Needs in Music Classrooms**

49. Please indicate the total number of students you teach:  

________________________

50. Of the total number of students you teach, how many are formally identified?

________________________
### Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

51. How do you know these students have been formally identified as students with special needs (select all that apply)?

- [ ] Student IEP
- [ ] Information from Special Education Teacher
- [ ] Other (please specify):

52. Please indicate whether any of your students are classified as having (select all that apply):

- [ ] Autism
- [ ] Deaf-blindness
- [ ] Deafness
- [ ] Emotional Disturbance
- [ ] Hearing Impairment
- [ ] Mental Retardation
- [ ] Multiple Disabilities
- [ ] Orthopedic Impairment
- [ ] Other Health Impairment
- [ ] Specific Learning Disability
- [ ] Speech or Language Impairment
- [ ] Traumatic Brain Injury
- [ ] Visual Impairment including Blindness

53. How do you know the formal classifications for your students with special needs (select all that apply)?

- [ ] Student IEP
- [ ] Information from Special Education Teacher
- [ ] Other (please specify):

---

### Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education
Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding Services

54. Does your school district have a policy regarding how inclusion decisions are made for students who are receiving special education services?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ I am unsure

55. Please indicate how frequently you have been consulted in the placement decisions made for your students who are receiving special education services:
   ○ Never
   ○ Sometimes
   ○ Often
   ○ Almost Always

Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

56. Please indicate how frequently you have provided suggestions regarding the placement decisions made for your students who are receiving special education services:
   ○ Never
   ○ Sometimes
   ○ Often
   ○ Almost Always
### Survey of Music Educators' Preparation and Practices Regarding Special Needs

57. For each of the following classifications, please indicate the type of accommodations/adaptations you use with, or provide to, students with special needs in your classroom (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Adaptive materials/music/evaluation/grading</th>
<th>Alternate Instruction</th>
<th>Individual Instruction</th>
<th>Paraprofessionals/Peer Partners</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-blindness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Blindness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify classification and accommodation/adaptation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

Regarding your students receiving special education services:

58. How frequently has your input been solicited regarding the present level of educational performance of your students with special needs?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Almost Always
### Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

**Regarding your students receiving special education services:**

59. How frequently have you contributed input regarding the present level of educational performance of your students with special needs?

- [ ] Never
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Often
- [ ] Almost Always

### Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

**Regarding your students receiving special education services:**

60. How frequently have goals been solicited from you for your students’ annual Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)?

- [ ] Never
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Often
- [ ] Almost Always

### Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

**Regarding your students receiving special education services:**

61. How frequently have you contributed goals for your students’ annual IEPs?

- [ ] Never
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Often
- [ ] Almost Always

### Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

**Regarding your students receiving special education services:**
## Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

62. How frequently have accommodations/adaptations been solicited from you for inclusion in your students’ annual IEPs?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Almost Always

## Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

Regarding your students receiving special education services:

63. How frequently have you contributed accommodations/adaptations for inclusion in your students’ annual IEPs?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Almost Always

## Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

Regarding your students receiving special education services:

64. How frequently have you been invited to attend your students' annual IEP meetings?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Almost Always

## Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

Regarding your students receiving special education services:
### Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

65. **How frequently have you attended your students’ annual IEP meetings?**
- [ ] Never
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Often
- [ ] Almost Always

### Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

Regarding your students receiving special education services:

66. **How frequently have you been provided with copies of your students' annual IEPs?**
- [ ] Never
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Often
- [ ] Almost Always

### Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

Regarding your students receiving special education services:

67. **How frequently have you read copies of your students' annual IEPs?**
- [ ] Never
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Often
- [ ] Almost Always

68. **How frequently have you understood copies of your students' annual IEPs?**
- [ ] Never
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Often
- [ ] Almost Always
Survey of Music Educators' Preparation and Practices Regarding

69. How frequently have you incorporated your students' required accommodations or adaptations into your classroom?
   - Never
   - Sometimes
   - Often
   - Almost Always

Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

Regarding your students receiving special education services:

70. Why have you not been able to incorporate your students' required accommodations or adaptations into your classroom with moderate or high frequency?

Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

71. Please indicate what is the largest impediment to your participation in the annual IEP process, for your students who are receiving special education services:

Barriers and Supports

Regarding your students who are receiving special education services, please indicate:

72. The level of administrative support available to you:
   - No support
   - Low support
   - Moderate support
   - High support
### Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

**73. The level of financial/material support available to you:**
- [ ] No support
- [ ] Low support
- [ ] Moderate support
- [ ] High support

**74. The amount of planning or preparation time available to you:**
- [ ] No amount of time
- [ ] Low amount of time
- [ ] Moderate amount of time
- [ ] High amount of time

**75. The overall level of support (e.g., consultation, information) available to you:**
- [ ] No support
- [ ] Low support
- [ ] Moderate support
- [ ] High support

### Barriers and Supports

Regarding your students who are receiving special education services:
### Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

#### 76. For all of the following personnel, please indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>How available this individual is</th>
<th>How frequently you have sought assistance from this individual regarding your students’ special education services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and Language Therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aide/Therapeutic Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Teacher (Art, Library, Music, Physical Education, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Guardian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify personnel, availability, and frequency of assistance sought)

---

### Barriers and Supports

#### 77. Have you collaborated with another faculty/staff member (not limited to music educators) in the musical education of your students with special needs?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] I am unsure

### Barriers and Supports

Regarding your work with students who are receiving special education services, please indicate what you believe to be the most:
### Survey of Music Educators’ Preparation and Practices Regarding

78. Available resource in your school district:

79. Limited resource in your school district:

### Barriers and Supports

Regarding the implementation of inclusive practices within your school district, please indicate what you believe to be the:

80. Most significant barrier(s) to success:

81. Most significant support(s) necessary for success:

### Additional Comments/Feedback

Please provide any additional:

82. Thoughts you have regarding the need for training, support, and/or practices necessary for successfully including students with special needs in music classrooms:

83. Comments/feedback regarding the questions on this survey:

Thank you for your participation; it is greatly appreciated. You will now be directed to a separate page allowing you to enter into a drawing for 1 of 20 $25 gift cards to Target. If you are not interested in entering the drawing, you may close your web browser at this time.
*Identifying information provided here cannot be linked to your survey responses.*

1. In order to enter a drawing for 1 of 20 $25 gift cards to Target, please provide your contact information:

Name: 
Address: 
Address 2: 
City/Town: 
State:   
ZIP/Postal Code: 
Email Address: 
Phone Number:
Appendix B

Initial Email to Prospective Participants

Dear Music Educator,

We are seeking volunteers to participate in a survey regarding music educators’ current professional preparation and practices in relation to teaching students with disabilities. Individuals eligible for participation in the study include members of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association (PMEA) who are currently employed as a music educator teaching any grade(s) from kindergarten through high school. The results of this research may be used to inform instructional preparation and training for future music educators. As such, your participation would be greatly appreciated.

The brief demographic questionnaire and survey should take between 15 and 20 minutes to complete. Participation is entirely voluntary. Upon completion of the survey, you will be entered into a drawing for 1 of 20 $25 gift cards to Target.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at The Pennsylvania State University. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further questions regarding the study. If you would like to participate, please click on the link below to proceed to the survey. Thank you for considering this invitation to participate in this research study.

Link to Study: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

Sincerely,

Kathryn R. Hahn, M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate, School Psychology
The Pennsylvania State University
S113 Henderson Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-308-4291
krd137@psu.edu

James C. DiPerna, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
The Pennsylvania State University
105 Cedar Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-2405
jdiperna@psu.edu

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
Appendix C

First Follow-up Email to Prospective Participants

Dear Music Educator,

Two weeks ago, we sent you an email (copied below) regarding an opportunity to participate in a research project regarding music educators’ current professional preparation and practices in relation to teaching students with disabilities. If you have not yet completed the survey, you still have 14 days to contribute to the research before the end of the study. Again, thank you for considering this request – your participation would be greatly appreciated.

November 1, 2009

We are seeking volunteers to participate in a survey regarding music educators’ current professional preparation and practices in relation to teaching students with disabilities. Individuals eligible for participation in the study include members of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association (PMEA) who are currently employed as a music educator teaching any grade(s) from kindergarten through high school. The results of this research may be used to inform instructional preparation and training for future music educators. As such, your participation would be greatly appreciated.

The brief demographic questionnaire and survey should take between 15 and 20 minutes to complete. Participation is entirely voluntary. Upon completion of the survey, you will be entered into a drawing for 1 of 20 $25 gift cards to Target.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at The Pennsylvania State University. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further questions regarding the study. If you would like to participate, please click on the link below to proceed to the survey. Thank you for considering this invitation to participate in this research study.

Link to Study: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

Sincerely,

Kathryn R. Hahn, M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate, School Psychology
The Pennsylvania State University
S113 Henderson Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-308-4291
krd137@psu.edu

James C. DiPerna, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
The Pennsylvania State University
105 Cedar Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-2405
j diperna@psu.edu

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
Appendix D
Second Follow-up Email to Prospective Participants

Dear Music Educator,

Three weeks ago, we sent you an email (copied below) regarding an opportunity to participate in a research project regarding music educators’ current professional preparation and practices in relation to teaching students with disabilities. If you have not yet completed the survey, you still have 7 days to contribute to the research before the end of the study. Again, thank you for considering this request – your participation would be greatly appreciated.

November 1, 2009

We are seeking volunteers to participate in a survey regarding music educators’ current professional preparation and practices in relation to teaching students with disabilities. Individuals eligible for participation in the study include members of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association (PMEA) who are currently employed as a music educator teaching any grade(s) from kindergarten through high school. The results of this research may be used to inform instructional preparation and training for future music educators. As such, your participation would be greatly appreciated.

The brief demographic questionnaire and survey should take between 15 and 20 minutes to complete. Participation is entirely voluntary. Upon completion of the survey, you will be entered into a drawing for 1 of 20 $25 gift cards to Target.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at The Pennsylvania State University. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further questions regarding the study. If you would like to participate, please click on the link below to proceed to the survey. Thank you for considering this invitation to participate in this research study.

Link to Study: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

Sincerely,

Kathryn R. Hahn, M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate, School Psychology
The Pennsylvania State University
S113 Henderson Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-308-4291
krd137@psu.edu

James C. DiPerna, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
The Pennsylvania State University
105 Cedar Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-2405
jdiperna@psu.edu

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
Appendix E

Notice of Exemption from IRB Review

From  "Maney, Dee" <dwm3@psu.edu>  
"Maney, Dee" <dwm3@psu.edu>  

To  "krd137@psu.edu" <krd137@psu.edu>  
"krd137@psu.edu" <krd137@psu.edu>  

Subject  IRB 32210 Inclusion of Students with Special Needs: Preparation and Practices of Music Educators

Date  Fri, Oct 30, 2009 02:24 PM

CC  "jcd12@psu.edu" <jcd12@psu.edu>, "Maney, Dee" <dwm3@psu.edu>  
"jcd12@psu.edu" <jcd12@psu.edu>, "Maney, Dee" <dwm3@psu.edu>  

Safe View

Dear Kathryn Hahn:

The Office for Research Protections (ORP) has reviewed the above-referenced study and determined it to be exempt from IRB review. You may begin your research. This study qualifies under the following category(ies):

**Category 2:** Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observations of public behavior unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human participants can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the participants; and (ii) any disclosure of the human participants’ responses outside the research could reasonably place the participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the participants’ financial standing, employability, or reputation. [45 CFR 46.101(b)(2)]

**PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:**

- Include your IRB number in any correspondence to the ORP.

- The principal investigator is responsible for determining and adhering to additional requirements established by any outside sponsors/funding sources.

**Record Keeping**

- The principal investigator is expected to maintain the original signed informed consent forms, if applicable, along with the research records for at least three (3) years after termination of the study.

- This will be the only correspondence you will receive from our office regarding this modification determination.

**MAINTAIN A COPY OF THIS EMAIL FOR YOUR RECORDS.**
**Consent Document(s)**

- The exempt consent form(s) will no longer be stamped with the approval/expiration dates.
- The most recent consent form(s) that you sent in for review is the one that you are expected to use.

**Follow-Up**

- The Office for Research Protections will contact you in three (3) years to inquire if this study will be on-going.
- If the study is completed within the three year period, the principal investigator may complete and submit a Project Close-Out Report: [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/index.asp#other](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/index.asp#other)

**Revisions/Modifications**

- Any changes or modifications to the study must be submitted to the Office for Research Protections on the Modification Request Form available on our website: [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/index.asp#mods](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/index.asp#mods)
- Send all modification requests to ORProtections@psu.edu
- Modifications will not be accepted unless the Modification Request Form is included with the submission.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Dolores "Dee" W. Maney, Ph.D, Research Compliance Coordinator, Office for Research Protections

The 330 Building, Suite 205, Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802

PHONE: 814-865-8459 & 865-1775 | EMAIL: dwm3@psu.edu | FAX: 814-863-8699 | WEB: [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/about.asp](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/about.asp)

**ATTENTION University Park Faculty, Staff & Students:** Effective October 1, 2009, University Park faculty, staff, and students must submit applications for NEW studies using the IRB eSubmission process (PRAMS) located at [http://www.prams.psu.edu](http://www.prams.psu.edu). Paper applications for NEW studies WILL NOT be accepted beginning October 1, 2009. Instructions for accessing PRAMS from outside of the Penn State computer network are available at: [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/accessingprams.asp](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/accessingprams.asp).

**Other Campus Locations:** Use of the IRB eSubmission process (PRAMS) to submit applications for NEW studies will be required as of January 1, 2010. However, you may begin using the system now - [http://www.prams.psu.edu](http://www.prams.psu.edu). Instructions for accessing PRAMS from outside of the Penn State computer network are available at: [http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/accessingprams.asp](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/applications/accessingprams.asp).
The IRB team conducts office hours at the HUB every Tuesday during the semester from 9 AM-12 Noon [except November 24th]. We are located next to the grand staircase on the main floor. Please come see us to have your questions answered!
Appendix F

Supplemental Results: Pre-service and In-Service Preparation for Instructing Students with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of information provided in these courses on policy or legislation regarding the education of students with special needs</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of training provided in these courses regarding specific instructional techniques for use with students with special needs</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom-based experience working with students with special needs provided in these courses</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information provided in these courses on techniques for collaborating with another faculty/staff member</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with pre-service students from other educational disciplines, such as regular education or special education, your course experiences involved</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 144.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The amount of information provided in these trainings or workshops on policy or legislation regarding the education of students with special needs</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of training provided in these experiences regarding specific instructional techniques for use with students with special needs</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of information provided in these trainings or workshops on techniques for collaborating with another faculty/staff member</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 301.*

Many (75.0%) of these trainings were not primarily focused on specific content related to the music classroom; 4.3% of music educators were unsure as to whether or not these workshops had such a focus.
Appendix G

Supplemental Results: Knowledge and Skills Related to Working with Students with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No Knowledge</th>
<th>Limited Knowledge</th>
<th>Moderate Knowledge</th>
<th>Well-Developed Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal responsibilities when working with students with special needs</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA)</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Restrictive Environment</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Education Program (IEPs)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specially Designed Instruction (SDI), which refers to appropriately adapting the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction to address the unique needs of a student resulting from a disability</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating with another faculty/staff member</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students with special needs</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 363.*
Appendix H

Supplemental Results: Involvement in the Design and Implementation of Special Education Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate how frequently you have been consulted in the placement decisions made for your students who are receiving special education services¹</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate how frequently you have provided suggestions regarding the placement decisions made for your students who are receiving special education services²</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently has your input been solicited regarding the present level of educational performance of your students with special needs¹</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you contributed input regarding the present level of education performance of your students with special needs³</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have goals been solicited from you for your students’ annual Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)¹</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you contributed goals for your students’ annual IEPs⁴</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have accommodations/adaptations been solicited from you for inclusion in your students’ annual IEPs¹</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you contributed accommodations/adaptations for inclusion in your students’ annual IEPs⁵</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you been invited to attend your students’ annual IEP meetings¹</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you attended your students’ annual IEP meetings⁶</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you been provided with copies of your students’ annual IEPs¹</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you read copies of your students’ annual IEPs⁷</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you understood copies of your students’ annual IEPs⁷</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you incorporated your students’ required accommodations or adaptations into your classroom⁷</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ¹N = 338; ²N = 132; ³N = 239; ⁴N = 150; ⁵N = 158; ⁶N = 191; ⁷N = 296.
### Appendix I

#### Supplemental Results: Barriers and Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No Support/ Amount of Time</th>
<th>Low Support/ Amount of Time</th>
<th>Moderate Support/ Amount of Time</th>
<th>High Support/ Amount of Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The level of administrative support to you</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of financial/material support available to you</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of planning or preparation time available to you</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall level of support (e.g., consultation, information) available to you</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 338.*

More than half (81.7%) had collaborated in the music education of their students with disabilities, while an additional 1.5% were unsure as to whether or not they had collaborated.

Survey respondents indicated what they believed to be the most significant barrier to success in regards to their work with students who were receiving special education services, including: time (12.4%), balancing group instruction for a large class size with the needs of individuals (10.1%), and no or insufficient communication (8.3%).

Additionally, they also indicated what they believed to be the most significant support necessary for success in regards to their work with students who were receiving special education services, including: special education support staff/paraprofessionals/aides (16.3%), special education teachers or staff (11.8%), and communication (11.2%).
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