



University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

5-1-1999

Music educators' attitudes toward the placement of special education students in music classrooms.

Timothy W. Keller

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Keller, Timothy W., "Music educators' attitudes toward the placement of special education students in music classrooms." (1999). *Student Work*. 2940.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2940>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



MUSIC EDUCATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PLACEMENT
OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS IN MUSIC CLASSROOMS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Music

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Music

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Timothy W. Keller

May, 1999

UMI Number: EP74402

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74402

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Music, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name	Department/School
<i>Shuai G. Jia</i>	<i>Special Education</i>
<i>William R. Babs</i>	<i>Music</i>

Chairperson *Stephen R. Stuber* *Music Ed.*

Date *4/12/99*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare elementary, middle school, junior high, and high school music educators' attitudes towards the inclusion of special education students in their respective classrooms. One hundred twelve (N=112) music educators from five Omaha-metropolitan area school districts were given a four-part survey to determine attitudes toward inclusion. The sample involved band, vocal, string and general music educators. Data was analyzed using SPSS 9.0 in order to show frequencies and allow for comparisons. Statistical analysis was conducted at $p < .05$ and $p < .01$. Results indicated an unwillingness in string educators in regards to inclusion. Band educators showed a variety of levels of willingness, from very willing to very unwilling, to teach varying disabilities. Vocal/choral and general music educators showed an overall willingness to work with special education students. Further research was recommended.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the faculty of the Department of Music from the University of Nebraska at Omaha, especially Dr. Bales, Dr. Crisara, Dr. Kelly, Dr. Saker and Dr. Stuber for their instruction during my graduate studies. Special thanks also go to my committee members Dr. Bales and Dr. Callahan, who have influenced my life beyond the writing of this thesis. I would especially like to thank my committee chairman, Dr. Stuber, for his guidance and support during the writing process.

I am deeply grateful for the support of the music educators in the Omaha area who made the results of the project possible. I learned early that networking is important. A special thanks to Monica Jones-Cox and Elmer Ellefson for promoting my survey in their districts. I would also like to thank my fellow graduates, Kate Knudsen and Carolyn DeLay, for their support.

Finally, I would like to thank my companion in life, Kelly, who provided immeasurable support as my editor-in-chief and typist throughout this process. Thanks also to my two-year-old son, Jordan, who at times made this an especially interesting experience.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Chapter II: Related Literature.....	8
Chapter III: Methodology.....	22
Chapter IV: Results.....	25
Chapter V: Conclusion.....	45
References.....	60
Appendices:	
A: Survey Cover Letter.....	63
B: Survey.....	64

List of Tables

1: Distribution of sample based on teaching level.....	24
2: Distribution of sample based on content area.....	25
3: Distribution based on school district.....	25
4: Distribution based on years of experience.....	26
5: Distribution based on courseware/training in special education.....	26
6: Distribution of teachers having special education students in class....	27
7: Distribution based on school districts having self-contained music classrooms.....	27
8: Grading procedures for special education students.....	28
9: Inclusion as a problem.....	28
10: Cognitive response/attitude table.....	29
11: Behavioral and affective response/attitude table.....	30
12: Willingness to teach mentally retarded students by content area.....	31
13: Willingness to teach hearing impaired students by content area.....	32
14: Willingness to teach learning disabled students by content area.....	32
15: Willingness to teach physically disabled students by content area....	33
16: Willingness to teach visually impaired students by content area.....	34
17: Willingness to teach students with Attention Deficit Disorder by teaching level.....	34
18: Willingness to teach hyper-active students by teaching level.....	35
19: Like/Dislike teaching mentally retarded students by content area.....	35
20: Like/Dislike teaching “gifted & talented” students by content area....	36
21: Like/Dislike teaching hearing impaired students by content area.....	37

List of Tables (cont)

22: Like/Dislike teaching students with Attention Deficit Disorder by content area.....	37
23: Like/Dislike teaching learning disabled students by content area.....	38
24: Like/Dislike teaching visually impaired students by content area.....	38
25: Like/Dislike teaching learning disabled students by teaching level.....	39

Chapter I - Introduction

There is a need to study and improve the attitudes of music educators toward the inclusion of special education students in music classrooms because academically low, unmotivated, unfriendly, impolite, dishonest, socially distant and “in need of professional help” are the words many teachers used when asked to comment on their students with special needs (Hannah & Pliner, 1983). Research indicates that expectations effect student learning and behavior (Rosenthal & Jacobsen, 1966; Palardy, 1969) and negative attitudes towards handicapped children may have a detrimental effect on their functioning. “We can legislate physical access and the provision of educational opportunity as we have done, but we cannot legislate acceptance...” Antonak & Larrivee (1984) go on to state that “meaningful implementation of legislative acts will require that we give as much attention to attitudinal barriers as we have given to the elimination of barriers of physical access, employment access and educational access.” (p.139) Complete integration and acceptance will only happen through long term changes in attitudes of educational professionals, including music educators. Expected increases in the placement of special education students in music classrooms places emphasis on the need for music educators to address attitudinal barriers that may negatively impact the educational needs of special education students.

Perhaps an even more important reason why the attitudes of music educators is of particular concern is that music has long been integral to the curriculum of special education classrooms. A 1932 study conducted by Featherstone in the United States indicated that 91% of the 540 special education classrooms studied used music in their curriculum. This study also stated that music was used more than any other academic class in the development of students with special needs (Featherstone, 1932). The development of music has often been considered a building block in speech development

for the mentally retarded. According to Solomon (1980), children would frequently hum tunes before they were able to articulate words. With these early examples and current placement practices, it is expected that music will continue to have an impact on students with special needs. Jellison (1985) stated that as the number of special education students increases, the number of special education students being placed in regular music classes will probably increase in future years.

Law and legislation have had a great impact on education in the United States during the past fifty years, particularly with the educating of handicapped individuals. Court decisions such as *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) and the *Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Citizens (PARC) v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (1971) are examples of law changing educational practice. As a result of each of these cases, educational opportunities for handicapped persons have expanded. *Brown v. Board of Education* resulted in the desegregation of schools, expanding the rights of minorities to include educational opportunity. Handicapped rights advocates in the late 1960s cited the principle of *Brown v. Board of Education* as a framework for their cause (Hume, 1987). In their decision, the Supreme Court wrote, "In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms." (Hume, 1987)

PARC v. Pennsylvania expanded the rights of the handicapped by calling into question state law that relieved schools from enrolling "non-educable" students. Special education law and legislation provide prime examples of the interrelationship among issues that on the surface seem unrelated. The decision of *Brown v. Board of Education* directly effected the decision in *PARC v. Pennsylvania*. *Brown v. Board of Education* established education as a right for all. *PARC v. Pennsylvania* extended "education for

all” to include handicapped individuals. The drive of these court decisions created the framework for major special education legislation.

The Education for All Handicapped Act (PL94-142) passed by Congress in 1975 is the foundation for current special education. The statistics presented in the findings of the law state the need for special education services. In 1975, there were more than eight million handicapped children in the United States. Congress established a need for services. However, a lack of funding and teacher preparation were cited as reasons for not providing services for the handicapped (Hume, 1987). Congress responded to these findings by mandating federal support for state and local agencies. Congress further stated that a free and appropriate education was the right for every child, regardless of unique needs.

PL94-142

In 1990, PL94-142 was renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Three main concepts stressed in IDEA were 1) free and appropriate education for children, 2) an individualized education plan (IEP) for students with disabilities and 3) educational services must be provided in the least restrictive environment (LRE) appropriate to the student’s educational needs (Nielsen, 1997).

Music Educators’ Concerns

Music Educators National Conference (MENC) has been a proponent of the philosophy that music is for every child and that every child should and can experience music (Thompson, 1990). Although PL 94-142 has issued a mandate to implement this philosophy, lack of training continues to be cited as a concern of music educators. According to a study by Frisque, Niebur and Humphreys (1994), 90% of participating music educators (N=107) responded that they were sole providers of music instruction to special education students. This study further stated that 40% or more of the

participating music educators had no training in the area of special education. This need for training is also shown in a study by Gilbert and Asmus (1980) in which 80% of the music educators surveyed expressed a need for special education training.

Another concern of music educators is that the placement special education students are receiving is not appropriate in meeting the music education needs of the special education students (Frisque, et al). Frisque (1994) concluded that effective music instruction does not exist because mainstreaming is often the only music placement for special education students.

Sources also cite teacher resistance to inclusion (Frisque, et al, 1994; Gfeller, et al, 1990). Reluctance to include special education students in the music classroom may be due to perceptions that the students adversely affect classroom management, the need to make major adjustments to curriculum, and the lack of appropriate teaching strategies. According to MENC (1986), the best way for music educators to approach inclusion is to be actively involved in the process of placement. In The School Music Program: Description and Standards (1986), music educators are encouraged to be involved in placement decisions; factors such as musical achievement and class size should factor into placement decisions. However, studies show participation to be lacking. Gilbert and Asmus (1980) reported that only 33% of 789 participants in their study took part in Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) planning.

Purpose

Previous attitudinal research has focused on attitudes as a unitary concept. Researchers would measure one aspect of attitude and assume that the results would apply to all aspects (Hannah & Pliner, 1983). However, attitudes are often placed into three categories - cognitive, affective and behavioral. The cognitive component of attitude consists of beliefs about a subject. The affective component involves feelings of

like and dislike about a subject. The behavioral component consists of a predisposition toward a particular action in regard to a subject (Hannah & Pliner, 1983). Instruments need to be developed to assess all three categories of attitude in regard to a variety of handicapping conditions (Hannah & Pliner, 1983). With the apparent concern and attention inclusion of special education students has received, further research is needed in the area of attitudes toward inclusion. Therefore, the purpose of this paper will be to investigate and compare elementary, middle school, junior high, and high school music educators' attitudes towards the inclusion of special education students in their respective classrooms as measured by survey research. A secondary purpose will be to develop an attitudinal survey that incorporates the three categories of attitude - cognitive, affective and behavioral. The following questions will be addressed:

1. What are music educators' attitudes toward the inclusion of special education students?
2. Is there a significant difference in music educators' attitudes based on grade levels taught?
3. Are special education students receiving an appropriate music education?
4. Are music educators willing to modify grades for special education students?
5. Have music educators taken coursework in special education?

Definitions

Special Education- educational services provided for students that are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, orthopedically impaired, other health impaired, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, or learning disabled. This definition is taken from the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142). Other health

impairments will be defined as having limited strength, vitality, or alertness due to chronic or acute health problems such as a heart condition, tuberculosis, asthma, hemophilia, etc., which adversely affects a child's development or educational performance (Title 92, Chapter 51, 003 07H1, p4).

Least Restrictive Environment- the setting which allows the greatest student success (Smith & Luckasson, 1995).

Attitude- consistent positive or negative mental predisposition toward certain persons or experiences (Wolman, 1973). This present study will only be concerned with the attitudes of music teachers.

Individual Education Program (IEP)- A management tool, required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, used to identify and organize educational and related services for preschoolers and school-age children (Smith & Luckasson, 1995).

Mainstreaming- Including special education students in regular classrooms for some or all of their day.

Inclusion- the placement of special education students into a non-special education class with non-special education students.

Elementary Music- general music and band (grades K-6).

Junior High School, Middle School Music- general music, band and choir (grades 7-9).

High School Music- general music, band and choir.

Chapter II - Related Literature

This chapter will present related studies and information regarding attitudes toward the inclusion of special education students in music classrooms and how music has been traditionally used in the instruction of special education students has had great success in the past. Music educators have claimed inability and lack of desire to work with special education students who are being included in their non-special education classes (Frisque, et al, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, Hedden, 1990; Hawkins, 1992). In addition to tracing the history of the use of music in instructing special education students, this chapter will also outline the impact of laws and legislation defining the rights of special education students, and present studies and related information regarding subsequent teacher attitudes towards the inclusion of special education students in music classrooms.

Music and Special Education

Music in special education classrooms has long been considered integral to the curriculum (Graham, 1975). The foundation for music in special education began in France in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Frenchmen Jacob Rodrigues Perrier and Charles Michel, Abbe de l'epée worked with deaf and mute students. Perrier and de l'epée's individualized method of instruction helped students to gain control of the use of voice and manual signs to communicate kinesthetic responses to music (Graham, 1975).

The late eighteenth century also saw the development and improvement of the Braille system. Braille expanded the study of music for blind students to record their works and access music literature (Graham, 1975). Furthering the work of Perrier, Jean Marc Gaspard Itard (Graham, 1975) used pitch and isolated music sounds to train a child to define pitch and discriminate sounds from broad to narrow differences in pitch for the

purpose of socialization. Itard is considered to be the father of special education (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). Itard is best known for his work with the “wild boy of Aveyron” in 1799 (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). The child Itard worked with was found in the woods of France. It is likely that the child was mentally retarded and environmentally deprived (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). Through a series of techniques, Itard taught the child to speak a few words, to walk upright, to eat with dishes and utensils, and to interact with people (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). Eduoard Seguin (Graham, 1975) presented a system of sensorimotor training designed to develop defective sense organs. Seguin relied heavily on the integration of students’ lived experiences and everyday concepts to reach students, while using repetition and routine to instill a systematic discipline for students. Seguin proposed “to lead the child from the education of the muscular system to the senses, from general notion to abstract thought, from abstract thought to morality” (Graham, 1975). These first efforts with music used to develop disabled students were later continued in the United States.

One of the first efforts to implement music in special education in the United States was in schools for the blind, such as the New England Asylum for the Blind. Little is written about the music used in these schools, and it is likely this consisted mainly of hymn-singing (Graham, 1975). The first training opportunity for teachers of special learners was offered in 1905 at the New Jersey Training School for Feebleminded Boys and Girls (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). Residential settings were another example of places that were using music to develop students with disabilities such as epilepsy, speech impairments, learning disabilities and mental retardation (Graham, 1975). Based on the efforts of Seguin, these residential settings used marching to encourage muscular development (Graham, 1975). By 1932, a study by Featherstone indicated that 91% of

the 540 special education classes studied used music in their curriculum. Music was used more than any other academic class to develop special education students.

Music was often considered a building block in the development of language and speech in people with human needs. Ditson (1961) reported that the use of background music increased verbalization in cerebral palsied children. Studies have also shown that verbal production increased in low-verbalizing retarded and severely mentally retarded children when music was used to reinforce the concepts taught (Talkington & Hall, 1970; Walker, 1972).

Hoskins (1988) investigated the use of music activities to increase language abilities of preschool language delayed children. The researcher's subjects (N=16) were 2 to 5 year old developmentally delayed and mentally retarded children. Subjects participated in group music activities with emphasis on increasing expressive language skills, including antiphonal singing with picture cards. Hoskins (1988) found significant improvement between pre- to post-test scores, suggesting that antiphonal singing may be beneficial in improving expressive language abilities in language delayed children.

In the early 1970s, Melodic Intonation Therapy (MIT) was developed as a strategy for facilitating and retrieving language skills in adult aphasic patients (Krauss & Galloway, 1982). The effectiveness of MIT is based on the hypothesis that the damaged left hemisphere of the aphasic brain is stimulated by exaggerating the rhythm, stress and melodic contours of speech inherent in the undamaged right hemisphere. Melodic Intonation Therapy facilitates language formulation by embedding short phrases and sentences into simple melodic patterns. MIT patients are guided through four levels of difficulty. Each level consists of groups of short sentences and phrases that are content related to the patient's needs and background. The patient stays at the same level until that level is successfully completed. Krauss & Galloway (1982) conducted the first study

to explore the use of MIT on children. The Krauss & Galloway study results indicate that MIT may offer potential for improving the services provided to children with special needs in public schools or special education settings.

Special Education Law and Legislation

In addressing current inclusion practices, it is necessary to have an understanding of the developments in law and legislation that have led to diversity in the classroom. An overriding theme that has been present throughout special education history is that the handicapped have been identified as a group being denied the opportunity to realize their human potential (Thompson, 1990). Court cases and Congressional legislation have focused on creating decisions and laws relating to providing opportunities for the handicapped.

Concern for the education of the handicapped in the United States became apparent after World War II and continued throughout the 1950s. During this time, the federal government began providing financial support for special education programs. Advocacy groups were formed throughout the nation to support and encourage the financial support of the federal government. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped focused on innovative programs and parent groups lobbied state governments, seeking mandatory legislation to ensure educational rights for the handicapped (Forsythe, 1977). The social actions of the 1950s turned to legal actions in the 1960s and 1970s, and since the 1970s, the judicial system has been a powerful force in modifying public education services for the handicapped.

Although much of current policy is based on court decisions and Congressional law making since 1960, it is a court case from 1954 that is viewed as the foundation for special education equal rights issues. The landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* was the first in a long line of cases dealing with equal education

rights. The court ruled that education is a right and should be made available to all on equal terms. In effect, *Brown v. Board* began the process of racial desegregation in the schools. Although this ruling dealt with racial desegregation, there was an underlying theme that education is a right that should be made available to all children. Special education advocates used *Brown v. Board* as a platform to extend the meaning of the ruling to the needs of handicapped individuals.

If *Brown v. Board* was the foundation for current special education practices, the framework for current practices was forged in 1971. In 1971, the Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Citizens (PARC) called into question a state law that relieved schools of the responsibility to enroll “uneducable” students. The case of *PARC v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* was a class action suit seeking educational opportunities for mentally retarded children. In this case, the courts ruled in favor of PARC, discarding state law that allowed schools to keep mentally retarded children from enrolling. The courts found that mentally retarded children can benefit from an education and, therefore, are entitled to receive an education. Again, referring back to *Brown v. Board*, the theme is that all children have a right to an education. A year after *PARC v. Commonwealth*, the courts were again asked to address the issue of education for all children in *Mills v. Board of Education*.

Court decisions prior to 1972 required desegregation in schools and school districts were required to provide educational opportunities for the mentally retarded. In 1972, *Mills v. the Board of Education of the District of Columbia* extended the decision of PARC a step further towards equal education. The Washington DC school board cited lack of funds within the district for special education programs. In response to financial struggle, the school board decided to limit programs for special education children. The court cited *Brown v. Board of Education* referring to *Brown’s* “Equal terms” and made

the determination that the Washington DC school board had to educate students, even if funds were tight. The decision was a major victory for special education advocates because it extended PARC to include all handicapped children, not just those with mental retardation. In addition to access to education, both the PARC and Mills cases resulted in other educational reform. School districts were required to design individual programs for handicapped students and provide these programs to students in the least restrictive environment. It should also be noted that the Washington DC school board was slow in meeting reforms. Eight years after the judgment the Washington DC school board was held in contempt of court for failing to meet the court decision.

The historic cases of Brown, PARC and Mills paved the way for federal legislation regarding education for the handicapped. In 1975, Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL94-142). The purpose of this act was to provide a free and appropriate education to all children, including those with handicaps, and regardless of condition and severity.

In the years following PL94-142, three other court cases have helped shape current special education practices. *Battle v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* in 1980 led to an \$830 million increase in the yearly cost of special education programs nation-wide. In this case, the court overturned a state policy against offering summer school. The court said that a 180-day limit in the public school calendar was in violation of PL94-142 because it precluded proper determination of what constitutes a free and appropriate education. When there is a benefit to the student, schools are required to extend programming. A second case also addressed the requirement of schools to provide services that would allow for equal education. The case of *Henrick Hudson v. Rowley* in 1982 set limitations of what benefits should be included in providing an equal education. In this case, the parents of Amy Rowley had been seeking an interpreter for

their deaf daughter who had been performing above average in school. The court ruled in favor of the school district, stating that PL94-142 guarantees handicapped students an educational opportunity, but not an equal educational opportunity. The school is not required to maximize each child's potential commensurate with the opportunity provided other children. Schools cannot even equalize non-handicapped students' chances of maximizing their potential. Joe Schermer, Associate Executive Director of the American Association of School Administrators in 1982 was relieved with this decision, stating, "We don't want to deny opportunity of adequate education, but we don't want to be providing the Cadillac of the line." (Hume, 1987). PL94-142 does not require the best program be selected, only that the selected program is appropriate. A third case regarding education opportunity went before the courts in 1984. The case of Debra P. v. Turlington focused on the validity of minimum competency tests. Competency tests were used as prerequisites for graduation and were seen as racially based. The courts ruled in favor of the students, stating that the State must establish the validity of minimum competency tests and that if these tests are prerequisites for graduation, test material must be included in the curriculum. The result of this ruling against racially biased testing formed the ground work related to special education rulings dealing with biased testing.

As of 1975, Individual Education Programs (IEP) are required by federal law. The main purpose of IEPs is to assure the needs of special education students are considered and that plans are provided to meet these needs (Alley, 1979). Each IEP contains three general sections. First, IEPs contain a statement of present educational performance. The educational performance of each handicapped child is based on academic, social and motor skills. Accomplishments in language development are also considered. The second section is a statement of annual goals. The plan also includes

short term objectives that are designed to meet these goals. The third section contained in the IEP is a statement of services that supplement the programming. Factors included in this statement are duration of services, criteria for implementing and procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the provided service. All aspects of the IEP should be specific and based on particular skills and deficits of each child (Alley, 1979).

Special Education Population and Funding

The Education for All Handicapped Act (PL 94-142) passed by Congress in 1975 stated that more than eight million handicapped children were in need of services in the United States. Congress stated that a free and appropriate education was a right for every child, regardless of unique needs. To meet these needs, more than \$300 million in federal funds were authorized to assist state and local agencies in providing educational opportunities for the handicapped. This amount increased to \$1.16 billion in 1982 (Hume, 1987). For the 1977-1978 school year, the state of Nebraska allocated \$32,067,042 for the Special Education budget. The special education population for that school year was 28,602. By 1992, the special education population increased to 34,172 with a budget of \$139,817,449. The total number of students requiring special education services in the United States was 4,608,350. This was almost a four percent increase from the previous year. In 1994, special education population in the state of Nebraska was 39,926 out of a total enrollment of 330,800 this is equal to 12%.

Implication of Special Education Law and Legislation for Music Education

As of 1980, services are required for all handicapped students aged three to twenty-one. The question that arises for music educators is that with such a wide definition of handicapping conditions, how and why should the handicapped be included in music instruction? In PL94-142, Congress provides an answer, "The use of arts as a teaching tool for the handicapped has long been recognized as a viable and effective way

not only of teaching special skills, but also reaching youngsters who had otherwise been unteachable.” The arts, and, in this case, music, have long been using their disciplines to reach students with special needs. Congress recognizes the achievements of art educators in teaching students with special needs and has issued its mandate to continue providing these services. In response to this mandate, MENC president James Mason appointed a National Committee on Music Education for Handicapped Children (Thompson, 1982). The purpose of this committee was to observe what music educators had been doing to educate handicapped students and develop clear goals and objectives for future instruction of handicapped students in music. The following is a passage from the National Committee’s findings:

The process of learning to perform, create and respond to music makes significant contributions to the development of that part of every being which is uniquely human. Although various handicapping conditions may limit the means through which individuals can make music and respond to music, the potential for enhancing the human experience through musical learning does not change (Thompson, 1982).

Again , MENC supports the message that music is for every child. The human experience is enhanced through exposure to any kind of music.

Authors of music education research support the effectiveness of music in the development of the human experience. Gfeller (1989) states that music is often described as a good social experience. Music can enrich the human experience through social interaction. Alley (1979) asserts that so much of a person’s lifetime is spent learning to overcome a handicap that a strong rationale exists for providing learning

experiences that are enjoyable. Music can be enjoyed at varying degrees of difficulty and involvement in order to develop the human experience.

If music has the capability to develop language and social skills in special education students, why are music teachers reluctant to include special education students in the classroom? Results of a study conducted by Gfeller, Darrow and Hedden (1990) indicated a lack of consensus among music educators concerning the effectiveness of mainstreaming. Sixty-one percent of music educators (N=350) surveyed felt special education students hamper the learning of non-special education students. It should be noted that PL94-142 does not mandate mainstreaming. According to PL94-142, a student should only be mainstreamed if the regular classroom provides adequate educational support. Mainstreaming or inclusion in the classroom is not required. However, PL94-142 does require integrated education for special education students with non-handicapped students to the maximum extent appropriate (Alley, 1979). The implication of this is that music teachers must be involved in the placement of special education students to provide the least restrictive environment. The decision to mainstream a student into music may be the “most restrictive environment” if placement is not based on achievement and aptitude (Gfeller, 1989). The decision not to mainstream a student must be based on musical criteria, rather than lack of desire to adapt teaching. Adapting teaching to meet the needs of mainstreamed students causes concern. However, PL94-142 earmarks funds for training of teachers. Special education related in-service training for educators is both a right and an obligation (Hock, Hasazi & Patten, 1990). Training in the area of special education will help provide appropriate education in the least restrictive environment.

Inclusion of Special Education Students in the Music Classroom

The decision to include special education students often raises concerns.

Thompson (1990) lists three issues of concern:

- 1) The need to design successful teaching strategies
- 2) The development of effective behavior management strategies
- 3) Gaining administrative support for appropriate inclusion practices

MENC provides several recommendations to address these concerns. First, it is recommended that music educators play an active role in the placement process. Second, placement should be based on music achievement. Frisque, et al (1994) provide information that is contradictory to this recommendation. In that study, music teachers (N=107) responded to the reasons for mainstreaming. Forty-nine percent responded that the purpose of mainstreaming was to provide socialization skills. Another thirty-four percent responded that students had shown an interest to participate. Only three percent responded that previous musical achievement was the reason for placement. Frisque's results are substantiated by a study in which results showed that 54% of the surveyed music teachers felt socialization was the purpose of inclusion (Atterbury, 1998). In Atterbury's study, only 7% of special education inclusion was based on musical ability. This, according to Frisque, et al (1994) is completely opposite the recommendations of MENC. A third recommendation of MENC is that inservice and pre-service training should be provided to music educators in the area of special education. In addition to training, music educators should have access to trained special education staff. The final recommendation of MENC is that music educators should be provided adequate preparation time to develop educational strategies. Inclusion, according to MENC, should not result in classes exceeding standard class sizes and there should not be a disproportionate number of handicapped students (Frisque, et al, 1994). Gfeller (1989)

provides additional recommendations. To make inclusion a smoother process, the placement needs to be appropriate. Atterbury (1998) showed that 45% of the surveyed music educators felt special education students were successfully mainstreamed in music. Discussion needs to take place as to the purpose of objectives. Is the placement to meet academic or social objectives? In addition to a repertoire of instructional strategies, it is also necessary to provide adequate classroom structure. According to Gfeller (1989), it is often beneficial to generalize special education classroom procedures to the procedures of the music classroom.. The role of the music educator in the placement process can not be underestimated. According to Darrow (1990), experience, knowledge and the best strategies cannot compensate for the lack of teacher involvement in the placement of special education students. This notion is supported by the study of Gfeller, Darrow and Hedden (1990), regarding the effectiveness of mainstreaming in Iowa and Kansas schools. Frisque, et al (1994) report from their survey of mainstreaming practices in Arizona that 72% of the surveyed music educators were rarely involved in the placement of special education students. These results are similar to Atterbury (1998) in which 78% of the surveyed music educators participated in placement of special education students. Music educators are in the best position to assess the needs of a student and define goals as they relate to the music curriculum (Hock, et al, 1990). Gfeller (1989) encourages music educators to discuss objectives for music at the time of placement to establish expectations. It is crucial to assess each students' needs through personal teacher observation rather than depending on pre-planned curricula that does not often meet individual needs (Bernstorff & Welsbacher, 1996). When given the opportunity to observe a student before placement, the music educator is the most qualified to provide information regarding placement in the appropriate music class (Hock, et al, 1990). Music educators are encouraged to develop a few specific and easily identifiable

prerequisites for each grade level (Thompson, 1990). By providing the essential differences between grade levels, the placement of students in the appropriate setting is made easier (Thompson, 1990).

Again, it should be noted that music educators are the authority when it comes to placement in a music setting. In line with PL 94-142, music educators have the right and professional obligation to say no when a student is placed in a class which he/she cannot successfully participate in a majority of the learning activities (Thompson, 1990).

Darrow (1990) provides further insight into the importance of the music educator on the placement of special education students. Music educators that are motivated and have a positive attitude make the inclusion process possible. A potential obstacle is presented by Atterbury (1998) in which only 12% of the surveyed music educators felt their input was important during the placement process.

Once special education students are placed in music classrooms, several issues must be addressed. An issue often considered is whether instruction must be compromised to meet the needs of special education students. According to Darrow (1990), general goals in the development of music skills, knowledge and values need not change because of class composition. Forsythe & Jellison (1977) provide similar information. The music educator's role with handicapped students should not essentially differ from his or her role with non-handicapped students. The National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped, emphasizes that it is a moral, civil and legal right for handicapped persons to receive the level of services in the arts afforded to non-handicapped persons (Forsythe, et al, 1977). Information presented by Gfeller (1989) showed that 63% of surveyed music educators expected the same objectives for handicapped students and their non-handicapped peers. However, only thirty-two percent reported that they graded each set of students on the same standards. Appropriate and equal educational

opportunities need to focus on equal evaluation as well as equal programming opportunities.

Chapter III - Methodology

The purpose of this paper was to investigate and compare elementary, middle, junior high, and high school music educators' attitudes towards the inclusion of special education students in their respective classrooms. A secondary purpose was to develop an attitudinal survey that incorporated the three categories of attitude - cognitive, affective and behavioral. The following questions were addressed:

1. What are music educators' attitudes towards the inclusion of special education students?
2. Is there a significant difference in music educators' attitudes based on grade levels taught?
3. Are special education students receiving an appropriate music education?
4. Are music educators willing to modify grades for special education students?
5. Have music educators taken coursework in special education?

In order to answer these questions, survey research was used to study music educators' attitudes towards the inclusion of special education students into non-special education music classes.

Subject Selection

The subjects for the study were K-12 general, vocal and instrumental music instructors from the following Nebraska school districts: Bellevue, District 66, Millard, Omaha, Papillion-La Vista and Ralston. These school districts were chosen because of their proximity to the author. These school districts were also chosen because they are six of the largest public school districts in the Omaha area. Each district has music educators in each of the grade levels studied. The number of music educators in each

school district should provide an adequate sample. The sample was adequate because each school district had multiple music teaching positions at both the elementary and secondary levels. Names and school addresses were obtained by contacting a personnel representative from each school district by phone.

Survey Development

A survey was developed based on a review of related literature regarding teacher attitudes toward inclusion of special students in music classrooms. The survey objectives reflected the research questions found in this survey. A portion of the survey requested demographic information on grade level taught (elementary, middle school, junior high school or high school), content area taught (band, choir, strings or general music), years of experience, school district in which the subject is currently teaching, amount of training in special education, extent of teaching special education students and types of students with disabilities currently teaching at the time of the survey. The demographic information was used to create a comparison between grade levels taught and content area in relation to attitude responses. The bulk of the survey focused on the three components of attitude (cognitive, affective and behavioral). A section of multiple choice questions focused on assigning characteristics to particular handicaps. This section focused on cognitive attitudes toward inclusion. A five-point Likert-type scale ranging from "very willing" to "very unwilling" was used to elicit non-demographic data relating to affective items based on willingness to teach students with particular disabilities. Behavioral items utilized behavioral preference rankings using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from "most like to teach" to "least like to teach". The three categories of attitude and types of questions for each category are based on Hannah and Pliner's (1983) review of teacher attitudes towards handicapped children. Each category consisted of ten questions to assure reliability (Borg & Gall, 1989). In regards to ease of

completion, participants circled their responses directly on the survey. The author used SPSS 9.0 to tally responses for analysis.

Survey Distribution

Once the population was determined, three schools were randomly selected to participate in a sample survey. The three schools selected consisted of an elementary, a middle/junior high, and a high school. Results of the sample survey were used to modify and improve the clarity of the survey questions. Following revisions of the sample survey, the author delivered surveys to the central office of each school district for distribution. Self-addressed, stamped envelopes were provided for returning surveys to the author. Each survey requested the teachers to write their school name. This information was strictly confidential and was only used to track incoming data. No confidential information was published in the writing of this thesis.

Data Analysis

After the surveys were returned, the author tallied survey responses for computer data analysis. The results of computer data analysis were used to compare attitudes of music educators towards the inclusion of special education students. Comparisons were made based on data gathered from demographic information. The following statistical procedures analyzed the data in order to make comparisons:

1. Frequency and percentages in relation to demographics
2. Kruskal-Wallis test of significance in relation to behavioral and affective questions
3. Percentages of responses with regard to cognitive questions
4. Content analysis of open ended question

A copy of the survey can be found on page 64 of this study.

Chapter IV - Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare elementary, middle school, and high school music educators' attitudes toward the inclusion of special education students in their classrooms. In order to achieve this purpose, data was collected through survey research. Collected data was analyzed through the use of the SPSS Graduate Pack 9.0.

Demographics (questions 1-10)

194 surveys were sent to music educators from 5 districts in the Omaha, Nebraska area. The return rate was 57.7%. The population for the survey is N=112. The following tables describe the sample for this study. Each table represents a demographic question found in the survey. The first table provides a description of the sample based on grade level taught.

Table 1. Distribution of sample based on teaching level (N=112)

Teaching Level	Frequency	% of N
Elementary	66	58.9
Middle School	31	27.7
High School	15	13.4

These data in this table show that the majority of the sample was elementary music educators (58.1%). High school music educators (n=13) provided the smallest percentage of the sample. On the survey, there was an option to select junior high school as the grade level taught. After data was collected, it was decided to merge the one junior high school response into the middle school data.

Table 2 provides a description of the sample based on content area. The table lists the four content areas surveyed. These areas are band, vocal, strings and general music.

Table 2. Distribution of sample based on content area (N=112)

Area	Frequency	% of N
Band	33	29.5
Vocal	30	26.8
Strings	10	8.9
General Music	39	34.8

The sample was evenly distributed through all areas with the exception of string educators. General music educators provide the largest percentage of the sample with 35.2%. Band and vocal educators provided equal representation.

Table 3 shows the distribution of the sample based on school district. Five school districts participated in this survey. The five participating school districts were District 66, Millard Public Schools (MPS), Omaha Public Schools (OPS), Papillion-LaVista Public Schools (PLV), and Ralston Public Schools (RPS). In the survey, there was an option to choose Bellevue Public Schools (BPS). This choice was excluded from data analysis due to the fact that no surveys were returned from Bellevue Public Schools.

Table 3. Distribution based on school district (N=112)

District	Frequency	% of N
District 66	9	8.0
MPS	23	20.5
OPS	60	53.6
PLV	16	14.3
RPS	4	3.6

The Omaha Public Schools provided roughly half of the subjects (n=60) at 53.6%.

Ralston Public Schools provided the smallest number of subjects (n=4) at 3.6%.

Table 4 shows the distribution of the subjects based on years of experience.

Table 4. Distribution based on years of experience (N=112)

Years	Frequency	% of N
0-3	12	10.7
4-6	7	6.3
7-9	11	9.8
10+	82	73.2

Music educators with ten or more years of experience contributed the largest portion of the sample (n=79) at 73.2%. Teachers with 0-3 and 7-9 years of experience were equally represented.

Table 5 illustrates the distribution of the sample based on teachers receiving coursework or training in special education. The subjects responded yes or no in relation to receiving coursework or training in special education.

Table 5. Distribution based on coursework and/or training in special education (N=112)

Coursework/Training	Frequency	% of N
Yes	57	50.9
No	55	49.1

The subjects (n=57) responded slightly higher at 50.9% to having formal training or coursework in special education.

Table 6 shows the distribution of the sample based on the subjects having special education students in class. The subjects were given two response choices. A third category of “Don’t know” was added based on 6 responses that had not chosen yes or no. These members of the sample wrote in “Don’t know” in response to this question.

Table 6. Distribution of teachers having special education students in class (N=112)

Currently have SPED students	Frequency	% of N
Yes	98	87.5
No	8	7.1
Don't Know	6	5.4

The majority of the subjects (n=98) currently have special education students in their music classrooms. Some of the subjects (5.4%) wrote in that they did not know if they have special education students included in their classes.

Table 7 shows the distribution of the sample in response to whether or not their school districts have self contained music classrooms.

Table 7. Distribution based on school districts having self-contained music classrooms (N=112)

District have self-contained classes?	Frequency	% of N
Yes	49	45.0
No	60	55.0

A slight majority, 55.0%, of the subjects (n=60), responded that their districts do not have self-contained music classes.

Table 8 shows the distribution of the sample based on grading procedures for special education students.

Table 8. Grading procedures for Special Education students (N=112)

Grading procedure	Frequency	% of N
Same as other students	55	49.1
Pass/Fail	5	4.5
Modified	47	42.0
No Response	5	4.4

Music educators grading special education students the same as regular education students showed the greatest frequency (n=55) at 49.1%.

Table 9 shows the distribution of the sample in regards to the question of whether or not music educators see inclusion of special education students as a problem in their district.

Table 9. Inclusion as a problem (N=112)

Inclusion as a problem?	Frequency	% of N
Yes	39	35.8
No	70	64.2

Slightly more than one third of respondents (35.8%) viewed the inclusion of special education students as a problem for their district.

Attitudes

The following table corresponds to the cognitive section of the survey (questions 11-20). The correct answers to each question are shown to the right of the table and the body of the table shows how subjects responded in terms of frequency and percent.

Table 10. Cognitive response/attitude table (N=112)

Question	"A" Frequency	"A" % of N	"B" Frequency	"B" % of N	"C" Frequency	"C" % of N	Correct Answer Letter
11	111	99.1	1	0.9	0	0.0	A
12	7	6.3	102	91.9	2	1.8	B
13	13	11.8	0	0.0	97	88.2	C
14	1	0.9	1	0.9	110	98.2	C
15	2	1.8	109	98.2	0	0.0	B
16	31	29.0	4	3.7	72	7.3	C
17	74	69.2	31	29.0	2	1.9	A
18	20	18.5	88	81.5	0	0.0	B
19	76	74.5	16	15.7	10	9.8	B*
20	1	0.9	102	94.4	5	4.6	B

The statistics presented in the preceding table show that the majority of the sample selected the correct answer in all questions except question 19. Question 19 asked educators to select one of the following characteristics to describe the visually impaired: a) average social skills b) poor social skills c) low academic ability. Question 11 showed the highest percentage of correct answers at 99.1%. Question 19 showed the lowest percentage of correct answers at 15.7%.

For the remaining two sections of attitudinal questions (behavioral and affective), a Kruskal-Wallis test was used. For each section, the test was run twice. The first test used content area (band, vocal, general music, strings) as the grouping variable. The

second test used teaching level as the grouping variable. Teaching level included three sections: elementary, middle school/junior high and high school.

Table 11. Behavioral and affective response/attitude table (N=112)

Question #	<u>Content Area</u>			<u>Teaching Level</u>		
	Chi Square	df	p	Chi Square	df	p
21	17.580	3	0.001**	3.255	2	0.196
22	3.446	3	0.328	0.606	2	0.738
23	12.720	3	0.005**	5.158	2	0.076
24	5.753	3	0.124	7.468	2	0.024*
25	4.264	3	0.234	7.534	2	0.023*
26	3.701	3	0.296	5.887	2	0.053
27	17.423	3	0.001**	5.056	2	0.080
28	11.270	3	0.010*	0.944	2	0.624
29	15.661	3	0.001**	1.837	2	0.399
30	3.767	3	0.288	3.289	2	0.193
31	18.032	3	0.000**	3.075	2	0.215
32	14.359	3	0.002**	2.785	2	0.248
33	10.734	3	0.013*	3.467	2	0.117
34	9.384	3	0.025*	2.904	2	0.234
35	5.973	3	0.113	2.411	2	0.300
36	4.454	3	0.216	0.234	2	0.890
37	20.041	3	0.000**	11.133	2	0.004**
38	3.588	3	0.310	1.716	2	0.424
39	11.854	3	0.008**	3.634	2	0.163
40	3.386	3	0.336	1.476	2	0.478

** p<.01

* p<.05

As a result of the Kruskal-Wallis Test, the following questions had a significant value when Content Area was used as the grouping label: questions 21, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32,

33 and 34. With Teaching Level as the grouping variable, questions 24, 25, and 37 showed significant results. In order to determine the nature of the significance, both content area and teaching level were further delineated to investigate the results of their responses. For example, the content area was subdivided to compare the responses of individual groups.

Table 12 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' willingness to teach mentally retarded students (question 21).

Table 12. Willingness to teach mentally retarded students by content area (in percents)

Content Area	very unwilling	unwilling	neutral	willing	very willing
Band	6.1	12.1	39.4	39.4	3.0
Vocal	0.0	16.7	13.3	36.7	33.3
Strings	0.0	11.1	77.8	11.1	0.0
General Music	5.4	8.1	8.1	37.8	40.5

Significance for this question was .001 with $p < .01$. Upon further analysis of this question, it was found that band and string educators showed high percentages of unwillingness and neutrality in their willingness to teach mentally retarded students. Vocal and general music educators responded with much higher percentages on the "willing" to "very willing" options in teaching mentally retarded students.

Table 13 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' willingness to teach hearing impaired students (question 23).

Table 13. Willingness to teach hearing impaired students by content area (in percents)

Content Area	very unwilling	unwilling	neutral	willing	very willing
Band	0.0	9.1	33.3	45.5	12.1
Vocal	10.0	10.0	16.7	46.7	16.7
Strings	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3	0.0
General Music	2.6	2.6	10.5	50.0	34.2

Significance for this question was .005 with $p < .01$. As in the previous question, band and string educators showed high levels of neutrality when compared to vocal and general music educators. Band directors showed a higher percentage of willingness to teach hearing impaired students than in the previous question. General music educators' willingness to teach hearing impaired students was 84.2%, compared to string educators at 33%. The trend is continued from the previous question in that vocal and general music educators are more willing to teach students with these specific disabilities.

Table 14 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' willingness to teach learning disabled students (question 27).

Table 14. Willingness to teach learning disabled students by content area (in percents)

Content Area	very unwilling	unwilling	neutral	willing	very willing
Band	0.0	6.1	21.2	60.6	12.1
Vocal	0.0	3.3	3.3	63.3	30.0
Strings	0.0	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0
General Music	0.0	0.0	10.5	50.0	36.8

Significance for this question was .001 with $p < .01$. Band instructors showed a higher percentage of willingness to work with students with learning disabilities. In all areas, except strings, there was a high percentage of “willing” to “very willing” responses. String educators’ willingness to teach learning disabled students was 30% to 50% less than all other areas.

Table 15 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators’ willingness to teach students with physical disabilities (question 28).

Table 15. Willingness to teach students with physical disabilities by content area (in percents)

Content Area	very unwilling	unwilling	neutral	willing	very willing
Band	0.0	3.1	9.4	65.6	21.9
Vocal	0.0	0.0	6.7	60.0	33.3
Strings	0.0	11.1	55.6	22.2	11.1
General Music	0.0	2.6	7.9	52.6	36.8

Significance for this question was .01 with $p < .05$. Band directors showed another increase in willingness to teach a specific disability type. Band directors’ “willing” and “very willing” responses combined percentage for this question was 87.5%. This was 14.8% higher than their willingness to teach learning disabled students and 29.9% higher than willingness to teach hearing impaired students. As in the previous question, all areas except strings had high percentages of willingness.

Table 16 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' willingness to teach visually impaired students (question 29).

Table 16. Willingness to teach visually impaired students by content area (in percents)

Content Area	very unwilling	unwilling	neutral	willing	very willing
Band	0.0	0.0	18.8	62.5	18.8
Vocal	0.0	0.0	6.7	63.3	30.0
Strings	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3	0.0
General Music	0.0	5.3	7.9	44.7	42.1

Significance for this question was .001 with $p < .01$. For this question, band, vocal and general music educators showed high percentages of willingness to teach students with visual impairments. String educators again showed high levels of unwillingness and neutrality in teaching this disability type, students with visual impairments.

Table 17 shows the distribution of responses by teaching level for music educators' willingness to teach students with Attention Deficit Disorder (question 24).

Table 17. Willingness to teach students with Attention Deficit Disorder by teaching level (in percents)

Teaching Level	very unwilling	unwilling	neutral	willing	very willing
Elementary	0.0	10.8	18.5	60.0	10.8
Middle	0.0	6.7	20.0	56.7	16.7
High School	0.0	26.7	33.3	40.0	0.0

Significance for this question was .024 with $p < .05$. When studying the significance of questions 24 and 25, there is strong similarity in which the grade levels responded. In both cases, elementary and middle school music educators responded with high percentages of willingness. High school music educators responded in both questions with higher levels of unwillingness and neutrality.

Table 18 shows the distribution of responses by teaching level for music educators' willingness to teach hyper-active students (question 25).

Table 18. Willingness to teach hyper-active students by teaching level (in percents)

Teaching Level	very unwilling	unwilling	neutral	willing	very willing
Elementary	1.5	9.2	18.5	61.5	9.2
Middle	0.0	9.7	22.6	51.6	16.1
High School	6.7	13.3	46.7	33.0	0.0

Significance for this question was .023 with $p < .05$.

Significance in Affective Attitude Responses

Table 19 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' responses on their like or dislike of teaching mentally retarded students (question 31).

Table 19. Like/Dislike teaching mentally retarded students by content area (in percents)

Content Area	most like	like	neutral	dislike	most dislike
Band	0.0	9.1	54.5	30.3	6.1
Vocal	6.7	43.3	36.7	10.0	3.3
Strings	0.0	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1
General Music	18.4	31.6	31.6	10.5	7.9

Significance for this question was .000 with $p < .01$. This question showed significance in both the behavioral and affective sections of the survey. As in the behavioral section, band and string educators showed high levels of neutrality and negative responses in their willingness to teach mentally retarded students. In both areas of attitude, vocal and general music educators showed a willingness to teach mentally retarded students.

Table 20 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' responses on how much they like or dislike teaching "gifted and talented" students (question 32).

Table 20. Like/Dislike teaching "gifted & talented" students by content area (in percents)

Content Area	most like	like	neutral	dislike	most dislike
Band	48.5	42.4	9.1	0.0	0.0
Vocal	30.0	50.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Strings	88.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
General Music	26.3	63.2	7.9	2.6	0.0

Significance for the question was .002 with $p < .01$. The significance in this response was most likely a result of all areas showing high percentages of liking to teach students who are gifted and talented.

Table 21 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' responses on how much they like or dislike teaching hearing impaired students (question 33).

Table 21. Like/Dislike teaching hearing impaired students by content area (in percents)

Content Area	most like	like	neutral	dislike	most dislike
Band	0.0	21.2	69.7	9.1	0.0
Vocal	6.7	40.0	33.3	13.3	6.7
Strings	0.0	22.2	44.4	22.1	11.1
General Music	16.2	40.5	32.4	8.1	2.7

Significance for this question was .013 with $p < .05$. The responses to this question were similar to responses to the same question in the previous section regarding hearing impaired students. Band and string educators showed high percentages of neutrality and dislike in teaching students with this disability.

Table 22 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' responses on how much they like or dislike teaching students with Attention Deficit Disorder (question 34).

Table 22. Like/Dislike teaching students with Attention Deficit Disorder by content area (in percents)

Content Area	most like	like	neutral	dislike	most dislike
Band	0.0	12.1	45.5	36.4	3.0
Vocal	0.0	31.1	51.7	13.8	3.4
Strings	0.0	11.1	33.3	55.6	0.0
General Music	2.6	34.2	36.8	18.4	7.9

Significance for this question was .025 with $p < .05$. The significance in this response was most likely the result of band and string educators showing higher percentages of dislike in teaching students with attention deficit disorders.

Table 23 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' responses on how much they like or dislike teaching learning disabled students (question 37).

Table 23. Like/Dislike teaching learning disabled students by content area (in percents)

Content Area	most like	like	neutral	dislike	most dislike
Band	0.0	27.3	51.5	18.2	3.0
Vocal	3.3	53.3	36.7	6.7	0.0
Strings	0.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	0.0
General Music	10.5	57.9	31.6	0.0	0.0

Significance for this question was .000 with $p < .01$. High percentages of neutrality among band and string educators most likely caused significance in this question.

Table 24 shows the distribution of responses by content area for music educators' responses on how much they like or dislike teaching visually impaired students (question 39).

Table 24. Like/Dislike teaching visually impaired students by content area (in percents)

Content Area	most like	like	neutral	dislike	most dislike
Band	6.1	21.2	66.7	6.1	0.0
Vocal	3.4	65.5	31.0	0.0	0.0
Strings	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
General Music	10.5	47.4	31.6	10.5	0.0

Significance for this question was .008 with $p < .01$. As in several other questions, band and string educators showed high levels of neutrality and dislike of teaching students with disabilities.

Table 25 shows the distribution of responses by teaching level for music educators' responses on how much they like or dislike teaching learning disabled students (question 37).

Table 25. Like/Dislike teaching learning disabled students by teaching level (in percents)

Teaching Level	most like	like	neutral	dislike	most dislike
Elementary	6.2	53.8	33.8	6.2	0.0
Middle	3.2	35.5	54.8	6.5	0.0
High School	0.0	20.0	53.3	20.0	6.7

Significance for this question was .004 with $p < .01$. High percentages of neutrality and dislike among high school music educators most likely caused significance in this question.

The final section of the survey (question 41) provided an open forum for the subjects to express their positive and/or negative experiences with special education students. The content of responses was analyzed and placed into categories. The following five categories were each found in ten percent or more of the returned surveys:

Adapted Environment and Impact of Class Size

Staff Cooperation and Communication

Behavior Problems

Student Desire and Teacher Encouragement

Need for training

Each category is discussed further in order from highest percentage to lowest percentage of total responses.

Adapted Environment and Class Size

Adapted environment refers to responses that focused on modifications or lack of modifications in music curriculum and class size. Within the returned surveys (n=112), 33% of the subjects wrote responses that were placed into the category of Adapted environment and Class Size. The following statements are examples found in this category.

- * I can usually involve all students in some capacity. Make them a contributing member of the ensemble.
- * I would like my inclusion students ability-grouped, instead of age-grouped. It is difficult to modify for these students in a 30-minute class period while continuing to monitor other students.
- * In a self-contained classroom, I feel I can devote more individual attention to student needs.
- * I would like special education students alone for one class and put together for the second class of the week.
- * As a music therapist/educator, I have enjoyed working in the self-contained classroom.
- * Often special education students do not have the reading ability to participate in music activities.
- * One on one, behavior students do okay, but not in a group.

Staff Cooperation and Communication

The next category receiving more than 10% was the area of staff cooperation and communication. Nineteen percent of the returned surveys wrote comments that fit into

this category. Staff cooperation and communication refers to the ability or inability of school staffs to work cooperatively through the process of inclusion, including the IEP process. The following list provides examples of responses that were placed into this category.

- * Inclusion should be made after consulting with the classroom teacher.
- * Teacher or para-educator support is necessary for special education students to be successful.
- * Lack of para-professional assistance has caused negative experiences
- * Special education students are more comfortable having someone there who is a constant.
- * Administration slow to remove Behavior-Disordered students.
- * Most negative experiences in inclusion classes are where I have not been given background information.
- * Special Education teachers are not complete in detailing specific needs of students.

Behavior Problems

Equal in response (19%) to the previous category was the impact of negative behaviors on the teaching and learning in an inclusive class. The subject Behavior Problems refers to the impact of these negative behaviors on the teaching and learning in an inclusive music class.

- * Students with behavior disorders have a difficult time with group rehearsals.

- * I think mainstreaming is a wonderful thing, if the student can handle the class. By this I mean knowing socially acceptable classroom behaviors and rules.
- * Behavioral kids are very challenging and can be impossible in a large group situation (100+ individuals in marching band, for example).
- * I get most frustrated with BD kids who have no interest and are forced to take my class.

Student Desire and Teacher Encouragement

In 11.4% of the responses, the subjects wrote comments that fit into the category of Student Desire and Teacher Encouragement. This subject refers to the impact of desire and encouragement on the success of special education students in the music classroom.

- * Students can be successful if they want to learn and be part of the group
- * I have found special education students to be determined to succeed if encouraged.
- * It is great to see kids succeed in music that struggle in other classes.
- * I use a variety of teaching techniques to find ways for everyone to succeed.

Training

The final category receiving 10% or more responses was the issue of adequate training in the area of working with special education students. The subject of Training refers to responses regarding the impact or lack of training in special education curriculum and resources.

- * No special training, which makes it difficult at times to choose methods of presentation.
- * The problem with inclusion is that we have no trained personnel to whom we can refer our special needs students.
- * I am a music therapist with the skills necessary to teach special needs students.
- * Nebraska educators need much more information on music therapy.
- * Our district offers no curriculum for special needs students, so it is very difficult to know how to meet their needs.

Chapter V - Conclusions

The results provided in the present study sought to track current trends in music educators' attitudes toward inclusion of special education students. The survey used in the study was constructed in three sections. The first section solicited demographic information from the subjects. The second section contained three sub-sections aimed at gathering attitudinal responses at three levels (cognitive, behavioral and affective). For the purposes of this discussion, cognitive attitude responses will be discussed separately from behavioral and affective attitude responses. The rationale for this decision is based on the statistical procedures used to analyze the data. Cognitive responses were tallied using frequencies, due to the fact that these questions had correct answers. The behavioral and affective responses were entered using a Kruskal-Wallis Test for significance. Discussion of the results will conclude with the third section of the survey which solicited written comments of music educators in regards to positive and negative experiences with special education students and inclusion.

Demographics

The survey for this study was sent to music educators in five Omaha-metropolitan area school districts. These districts included District 66, Millard Public Schools, Omaha Public Schools, Papillion-LaVista and Ralston Public Schools. One hundred twelve (N=112) of 194 surveys were returned for a return rate of 57.7%. Although this was not an extremely high percentage of returned surveys, there was a representative sample based on district involvement, area of teaching, and level of teaching. Even so, one district (Bellevue Public Schools) and one grade level (Junior High) that were originally to be part of the study were not included in the end due to lack of surveys from Bellevue and the fact that Papillion-LaVista was the only remaining district which had junior high

schools as opposed to middle schools. The one junior high in the Papillion-La Vista portion of the sample was then merged with the middle school data.

Questions 4 through 10 in the demographic section provide insight into current music educators' experiences with special education students and previous research. In the current study, over 70% of the subjects had been teaching 10 or more years. It can be assumed that many of these subjects received undergraduate degrees prior to the inclusion of special education coursework as a requirement. Results of this study showed that over half of the subjects had received training or taken coursework in special education. This percentage (50.9%) is about the same as the 1994 study in which Frisque, Niebur and Humphreys reported 40% or more of their subjects had received training in special education. In the current study, 47 out of 55 subjects responding to not having training are teachers with 10 or more years of experience. Only one response in the 0 to 3 years experience category responded that they had no training in special education. This shows that newer teachers are receiving training and that there may be a need for post-graduate training in the area of special education as it relates to music education. This is supported by a study of Maine music educators (N=111) in which 92% had received special education training. (Atterbury, 1998). The states of Maine and Nebraska have a required special education course for all teacher certification and re-certification.

The issue of special education training is also an important issue when considering Question 6, which asks music educators if they currently have special education students included in their classrooms. Music educators are seeing greater numbers of special education students and will need varieties of strategies to teach these students. Further discussion relating to the need for music educator training in special education can be found in the fourth section of this chapter.

Cognitive Analysis

The subjects are to be commended for their responses to the questions in this section of the survey. In 9 of the 10 cognitive questions, correct responses were given by the majority of the subjects (see Table 10). This suggests that teachers may be able to successfully identify student disabilities based on individual student characteristics.

Behavioral and Affective Attitudes

Using a series of Kruskal-Wallis tests, several questions in the behavioral attitude and affective attitude sections of the survey showed significant results with regard to the grouping variables of content area and teaching level (see Table 11). When using "Content Area" as the grouping label, questions 21, 23, 27, 28 and 19 showed significance in the behavioral section (21-30). In the affective section (31-40), questions 31,32,33,34,37 and 39 showed significance. Using "Teaching Level" in the behavioral section, questions 24 and 25 showed significance. "Teaching Level" in the affective section showed significance in question 37. A discussion of each question with significance follows.

Significance in regards to content area and teaching level

Question 21. Willingness to teach mentally retarded students

Upon further analysis of this question, it was found that band and string educators showed high percentages of unwillingness and/or neutrality in their willingness to teach mentally retarded students. This information suggests an unwillingness and/or indifference among band and string educators in teaching mentally retarded students. Potential reasons for these results could be related to the nature of the activity. Perhaps

band and string educators show unwillingness because the skills and techniques needed are not always possessed by these students. There is no previous research that states band and string educators have negative attitudes toward mentally retarded students. This would be an area where future research could confirm the data presented in this study.

Question 23 - Willingness to teach hearing impaired students

As in the previous question, band and string educators showed high levels of neutrality when compared to vocal and general music educators. The trend is continued from the previous question in that vocal and general music educators are more willing to teach students with these specific disabilities. The information found here does not relate to any previous research. Further research is needed to support these findings.

Question 27 - Willingness to teach learning disabled students

In all areas, except strings, there was a high percentage of “willing” to “very willing” responses. String educators’ willingness to teach learning disabled students was 30% to 50% less than all other areas. The results indicate an unwillingness among string educators to work with special education students. In the five previous questions, string educators showed no higher than 45% willingness to work with special education students. Further research is needed to study causes of these attitudes. This trend continues for questions 28 and 29 regarding the difference in educators’ willingness to work with special needs students.

Questions 24 and 25 - Willingness to teach students with Attention Deficit Disorders and Students with Hyper-Activity

When studying the significance of questions 24 and 25, there was a strong similarity in which the grade levels responded. In both cases, elementary and middle school music educators responded with high percentages of willingness. High school music educators responded in both questions with higher levels of unwillingness and neutrality. This indicates an unwillingness in high school music educators to work with attention-deficit disordered and hyperactive students. A reason for this may be that the nature of high school groups is to be oriented towards performance and competition. Within these groups a high level of discipline is required.

Significance in Affective Attitude Responses

Question 31 - Like or Dislike Teaching Mentally Retarded Students

This question showed significance in both the behavioral and affective sections of the survey. As in the behavioral section, band and string educators showed high levels of neutrality and negative responses in teaching mentally retarded students. These combined data strongly indicate an unwillingness in band and string educators to welcome mentally retarded students into their classrooms. In both areas of attitude, vocal and general music educators showed more willingness to teach mentally retarded students.

Question 32 - Like or Dislike of teaching Gifted/Talented

The significance in this response was most likely a result of all areas showing high percentages of liking to teach students who are gifted and talented. Gifted and

talented students are generally welcomed by educators due to their high levels of ability and achievement. There is no research cited in this study which supports this finding.

Question 34 - Like or Dislike of teaching students with Attention Deficit Disorder

The significance in this response was most likely the result of band and string educators showing higher percentages of dislike in teaching students with attention deficit disorders. These results, combined with band and string educators' responses in the behavioral section of the survey, strongly suggest a negative attitude towards students with Attention Deficit Disorders.

Summary of Behavioral and Affective Questions

In analyzing the significance levels of the previous questions, a few trends become apparent. First, in both the Behavioral and Affective sections, string music educators showed negative and/or neutral attitudes in teaching students with a variety of disabilities. Second, vocal and general music educators generally have a more positive attitude towards students with special needs. Band educators showed a wide range of willingness, with particularly high levels of unwillingness to teach mentally retarded students. Finally, in regards to teaching level, high school music educators generally have more negative attitudes in teaching students with special needs.

Perhaps the trend shown by the string and band educators could be due in part to the level of study required to play a band or string instrument. Playing a string instrument is much more specialized than playing in a band, where modifications may be more easily accommodated with a variety of instruments. A band setting allows for greater amounts of modification due to the variety of instruments. Band directors have

more choices in finding instruments to fit varying disabilities. String educators are limited to one type of instrument which may make modification difficult at best.

The trend of high school music educators to be less willing to teach students with disabilities may be a result of the activity. Generally, high school music is geared towards performance and competition. Students with disabilities may take time away from the group that the director cannot justify. It may also be that not all students should be in performance groups and that alternative music offerings may be needed. Referring to Frisque (1994), effective music instruction does not exist because mainstreaming is often the only music placement for special education students. Often the only music option for special education students is performing groups. Perhaps, an adaptive music setting is needed to meet the needs of special education students.

Summary of Positive and Negative Experiences in Teaching Special Education Students

In the final section of the survey, the subjects were asked to share written comments about positive and negative experiences with special education students. In analysis of this data, five areas of experience became apparent. The five areas are adapted environment and class size, staff cooperation and communication, behavior problems, student desire and teacher encouragement and special education training and coursework. A brief summary of each area is as follows.

Adapted Environment and Class Size

Adapted environment and class size responses focused on teachers manipulating their classroom activities in order to be more inclusive of special education students. Positive experiences were often cited when being able to involve all students in an

activity. Teachers in self-contained music classrooms cited the benefits of smaller class size and being more individualized in their instruction. Negative experiences were cited when class sizes were too large, there was a wide variety of abilities and not enough time to work with all students. Teachers also cited lack of time with classes as a problem in involving all students. One teacher mentioned that the schedule allowed one half hour a week with each class. With only 30 students, that allows just one minute per student. If one student requires ten minutes of individual attention, it is only logical that this will severely limit the effectiveness of the limited time with other students.

Staff Cooperation and Communication

Staff cooperation and communication focused on the need for a good system of distributing information. Responses included the importance of the whole staff being involved in the inclusion process. Darrow (1990) states “experience, knowledge and the best strategies cannot compensate for the lack of teacher involvement in the placement of special education students.” It is necessary for music educators to take an active role in the IEP process since they are the experts in the field of music and how to best meet the musical needs of the student. Music educators need to be there to ask the question as to the goal of inclusion. Are the goals for that student related to music, or are the goals of inclusion non-musical in orientation? As Frisque, et al (1994) found, only 3% of surveyed music educators felt that musical achievement was the goal of inclusion of their special education students. This shows the need for communication between staff when considering inclusion. Responses repeatedly stressed the need for open and honest dialogue between administration, teachers, and support staff. Negative experiences most often cited a lack of communication and not receiving background information about students. Again, the best remedy is involvement in the process. MENC (1986) states the

best way for music educators to approach inclusion is to be actively involved in the process.

Behavior Problems

The response area of behavior problems focused on behaviors effecting group dynamics. Responses were generally more negative when class size was an issue. As an example, a band director stated “Behavior disorder students can be impossible in a large group situation in which 100 or more students are participating.” Difficulties arose when behavior problems occurred in large ensemble settings. Teachers often cited the ability of one special education student to hinder the success of the entire class.

Student Desire and Teacher Encouragement

Responses in the area of student desire and teacher encouragement focused on two areas. Teachers responded that students who want to learn and participate often have success. The second area showed that success is often determined by the ability of the teacher to provide a variety of teaching strategies. This suggests a need to provide more educational opportunities for music educators to learn a variety of techniques and strategies for working with special needs students.

Special Education Training and Coursework

In general, teachers that responded in this area do not feel they have adequate training in special education. This is confirmed by Frisque, et al (1994) in which 40% or more of the participating music educators had no training in the area of special education. These teachers expressed a desire to learn techniques to meet the needs of special education students. It also appears that this lack of training causes anxiety within many of the music educators.

Implications of the Survey Data and Research Questions

When this study began, several questions were posed regarding music educators attitudes and the inclusion of special education students. Based on the data collected, analyzed and summarized, answers were suggested for most of the research questions with further implications for additional research being raised. The research questions with discussion specific to the results of this study follows.

Question One - What are music educators' attitudes towards the inclusion of special education students?

In the demographic section, respondents were asked whether they saw inclusion of special education students as problematic in their district. Roughly 36% responded in the affirmative. Two-thirds were at least uncomfortable with, if not in disagreement with the statement that inclusion was a problem. This response is similar to the 62% of surveyed music educators in the Gfeller, et al (1990) study that stated inclusion was successful. The current study differs from results of Atterbury (1998) in which 46% of the surveyed music teachers felt inclusion was successful. This could be a result of more teachers having training and a realization that student needs are not being met. The responses to the behavioral and affective portion of the survey show that in most cases, music educators have a willingness to work with special education students. The exception is that string educators showed neutral to negative responses in all questions showing significance. Significantly, the comments by educators also expressed a willingness to teach special education students. Educators varied on how best to meet the needs of these students, whether it meant inclusion in all classes with teachers needing to be creative and resourceful in ways to include them, or whether it would be best to create a separate class for students that could focus more on their needs. It appears

that music educators are not questioning whether to include special education students in the music curriculum, just the best method of doing so. Perhaps a solution to the problem of inclusion would be to develop guidelines within districts on how to best serve students with special needs in music classes this is also an area for MENC to address at the national level.

Question Two - Is there a significant difference in music educators' attitudes based on grade level taught?

Data from this study show that in a few cases, grade level does carry significance. For example, high school music educators show significantly higher unwillingness and neutrality in teaching Attention Deficit Disorder and hyper-active students. High school music educators also showed significantly higher levels of neutrality and dislike in working with learning disabled students. Attention Deficit Disorder, hyper-active, and learning disabled students can all take a significant amount of attention when in large group settings, which may explain why high school teachers are reluctant to have them included in their performance groups.

Related to this question, the study found a significant impact not only by grade level taught, but also by content area taught. Band and string educators were significantly less willing to teach students with mental retardation and hearing impairment. String educators were also much more resistant to teaching students with learning disabilities and physical disabilities. An initial hypothesis for explaining this division is that instruments, especially string instruments, require complicated physical skills involving fine motor skills and muscle coordination. It is perhaps easier for the vocal music educator and general music educator to find ways to include students with special needs.

Further research could be used in this area to determine if this phenomenon is true for a larger population of band and string educators and to offer some alternative explanations.

Question 3 - Are special education students receiving an appropriate music education?

There is no statistical data collected from this survey to definitively answer this question. However, music educator responses to the final question in the survey give anecdotal evidence to suggest that not all special education students are receiving an appropriate music education. Large class sizes, varying ability levels within a class and inadequate teacher training were most often cited as contributing to negative experiences in inclusion of special education students. One can assume that a negative experience for a teacher would also be a less than ideal experience for the student. Significantly, in this survey section, teachers often stated that their frustration with inclusion was mutual for teacher and student. Even with these comments from music educators on negative experiences, there were also many comments detailing the rewards of working with special education students, especially when the teacher sees them achieve. With the right conditions, special education students can receive an appropriate music education, according to this anecdotal evidence.

Question 4 - Are music educators willing to modify grades for special education students?

The question in the demographic section asked if educators grade differently in general for their special education students. Roughly half of the teachers responding stated that they grade on a pass/fail or modified scale for their students. The other half do not. This indicates that educators may feel by grading these students differently, they are doing the students a disservice. Gfeller (1989) states, 63% of music educators

expected the same objectives, but only 32% reported that they graded on the same standards. Others may feel that they grade them according to their abilities, therefore they use a modified scale. Research in this area is recommended.

Question 5 - Have music educators taken coursework in special education?

Data from this survey shows that slightly more than 50% of the subjects have training in special education. This is most likely due to the fact that the majority of the subjects have 10 or more years of experience. However, their responses about their training indicated a disparity among teachers. There were several educators who indicated they had music therapy or 36+ hours of special education training. Others indicated the three hours they received as undergraduates. There is a large percentage of music educators that do not have any special education training. It is evident from music teachers' responses to the final question of the survey that more training is needed, confirming MENC (1986). These responses show a willingness to receive training. Therefore, opportunities need to be provided.

Implications for Education

Prior to conducting the survey research for this study, three areas of concentration were apparent in the related literature regarding special education and music. These three areas included 1) appropriate placement, 2) staff communication and 3) teacher professional development. In each of these areas, a deficit often resulted in ineffective inclusion practices (Frisque, 1994; Gfeller, 1990). The current study also shows results that focus on the three areas considered critical to successful inclusion of special education students in music classrooms.

In placing special education students, selecting the Least Restrictive Environment is a difficult task. According to Gfeller (1989), mainstreaming may be the “most restrictive environment” if placement is not based on achievement and aptitude in music. Several responses in the current survey suggest that alternatives are needed besides inclusion in all cases. One option is to teach self-contained music classes. The benefits to this option would be working with a smaller group of students and being able to pay closer attention to individual needs. Inclusion is a worthy goal, and if self-contained classes are too restrictive, there are other options. One subject offers the option of taking one class a week in a self-contained environment and then mainstream the student for the second class each week. Another subject suggests at the secondary levels of creating a class that de-emphasizes performance and stresses experience.

Recommendations

The author of this study would suggest a curriculum that allows for inclusion and meets the needs of the special education student. An example of such a program would be to have regular education students participate in an Adaptive Music Classroom which presents music activities at ability level. The regular education students would serve as models/mentors for the special education students.

This current study also shows the need for communication between and among staff. Teachers cited many negative experiences when students were placed without the music educator knowing about their conditions or backgrounds. According to Music Educators National Conference (1986), the best way for music educators to approach inclusion is to be actively involved in the process. This current study also suggests the need to be involved in the process. Music educators need to be involved in the planning

of goals for special education students so that there is a realistic expectation of obtaining goals related to music.

A final area that impacts current music educators is the need for training in the area of special education. Upon further analysis, the largest portion of music educators responding to this survey who had no training in special education were the educators with 10 or more years of experience. All but one music educator in the 0 to 3 year category have had some special education coursework. The question arises if a survey undergraduate course provides enough background into special education and its relation to music. The author suggests that undergraduate and graduate curriculum be developed in the area of special education and music. The reluctance of band and string educators toward the inclusion of students with certain types of disabilities supports this notion. Most undergraduate survey courses on special education include some practice at adapting a typical classroom experience for the special education student. General music classes most resemble these “typical” experiences which are designed around core curriculum classes such as math, English and science. Performance-based classes bear little to no resemblance of this type of structure and thus present a unique challenge to the educator as to adaptation for the special needs students. Participants in this study have shown high percentages of willingness to teach special education students. However, these same teachers’ cite a lack of appropriate strategies to use in meeting the needs of special education students.

Implications for Further Research

Future research is recommended in the following areas:

1. It is suggested that research look further into the significance of string educators’ attitudes and special education students. Was this a one-time

phenomenon? If not, what about string specialization makes these educators less willing to work with certain types of disabilities?

2. Develop a way to research grading procedures of special education students in music.
3. Compare attitudes in a larger area or between regions, such as urban and rural.
4. Survey music teacher involvement in the placement process of special education students. Include special education teachers and counselors as to their attitudes regarding the placement of special education students in music classrooms.
5. Observe if attitudes change with additional training in special education.

References

- Alley, J. (1979). Music in the IEP. Journal of Music Therapy, 16, 111-127.
- Antonak, R. & Larrivee, B. (1995). Psychometric analysis and revision of the opinions relative to mainstreaming scale. Exceptional Children, 62, 139-149.
- Atterbury, B. (1998). Music teacher preparation and special education and the effect on mainstreaming. Update, 16, 29-32.
- Baron, R.A. & Byrne, D. (1977). School Psychology. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bernstorf, E.D. & Welsbacher, M. (1986). Helping students in the inclusive classroom. Music Educators Journal, 81, 21-26.
- Darrow, A.A. (1990). Beyond mainstreaming. Music Educators Journal, 85, 36-39.
- Featherstone, W.B. (1932). The curriculum of the special class: Its underlying principles. Contributions to Education (No. 544) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Frisque, J., Niebur, L. & Humphreys, J. (1994). Music mainstreaming practices in Arizona. Journal of Research in Music Education, 42, 94-104.
- Gall, M., Borg, W., & Gall, J. (1996). Educational Research: An Introduction (Sixth Edition). White plains, NY: Longman Publishers USA.
- Gfeller, K. (1989). Behavior disorders: Strategies for the music teacher. Music Educators Journal, 84, 28-31.
- Gfeller, K., Darrow, A.A., & Hedden, J.K. (1990). Perceived effectiveness of mainstreaming in Iowa and Kansas schools. Journal of Research in Music Education, 38, 90-101.
- Gilbert, G.P., & Asmus, E.P. (1980). Mainstreaming: Music educators' participation and professional needs. Journal of Research in Music Education, 29, 31-37.

- Graham, R. (1975). Music for the exceptional child. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Hannah, M. & Pliner. (1982). Teacher attitudes toward handicapped children: A Review and synthesis. School Psychology Review, 12, 12-25.
- Hock, M., Hasazi, S. & Patten, A. (1990). Collaboration for learning. Music Educators Journal, 85, 44-48.
- Hoskins, J. (1988). Use of music to increase verbal response of preschool language delayed children. Journal of Music Therapy, 25, 73-84.
- Hune, M. (1987). A Mandate to Educate. Alexandria, VA: Education Research Group.
- Humpal, M.E. & Dimmick, J.A. (1995). Special learners in the music classroom. Music Educators Journal, 90, 21-23.
- Jellison, J. (1985). An investigation of the factor structure of a scale for the measurement of childrens' attitudes towards handicapped peers within regular music environments. Journal of Research in Music Education, 33, 166-179.
- Johnson, C.M., Darrow, A.A. (1997). The effect of positive models of inclusion on band students' attitudinal statements regarding the integration of students with disabilities. Journal of Research in Music Education, 45, 173-184.
- Krauss, T. (1982). Melodic intonation therapy with language delayed apraxic children. Journal of Music Therapy, 19, 102-113.
- Nebraska Special Education Statistical Report. (1995). Lincoln, NE. Special Education Office.
- Nielsen, L. (1997). The Exceptional Child in the Regular Classroom. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Palardy, R. (1969). What teachers believe - what children achieve. Elementary School Journal, 40, 370-374.

- Rosenthal, R. & Jacobsen, L. (1966). Teachers' expectancies. Psychological Reports, 19, 113-118.
- The school music program: description and standards. (1986). 2ed (Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference) 19-26,42-52.
- Smith, D. & Luckasson, R. (1995). Introduction to Special Education: Teaching In An Age of Challenge (Second Edition). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Solomon, A. (1980). Music in special education before 1930: Hearing and speech development. Journal of Research in Music Education,28, 236-242.
- Thompson, K. (1990). Working toward solutions in mainstreaming. Music Educators Journal, 85, 30-35.
- Title 92, Nebraska Administrative Code, Chapter 51. Nebraska Department of Education, 1992.
- Wolman, B.B. (Ed.). (1973). Dictionary of behavioral science. New York, NY: Van Nostrand of Reinhold Company.
- Winzer, M. (1993). The History of Special Education: From Isolation to Integration. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Young, M. (1916.) The Mentally Defective Child. New York: Paul B. Hueber.

Tim Keller
5844 Lafayette Avenue
Omaha, NE 68132

Dear Music Colleague,

The attached survey concerning music educators' attitudes toward inclusion is part of a research project being written to fulfill requirements for a Masters in Music Education degree from the University of Nebraska at Omaha. This project is concerned specifically with determining the attitudes of music educators in the Omaha- Metro area toward inclusion of special education students in their respective classrooms.

I look forward to obtaining your response because of your experience as a music educator. As a fellow music educator at LaVista Junior High School, I know that your time is valuable. The survey has been tested and revised in order to make it possible to obtain all the necessary data while requiring the minimum of your time.

Please complete the enclosed survey prior to April 2nd and return it in the provided stamped, self-addressed envelope. Other phases of this research cannot be carried out until analysis of the survey data has been completed. Please make special note that your responses will be highly valued and held in strictest confidence. Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,



Tim Keller

Survey of Music Educator Attitude Towards Inclusion of
Special Education Students in Music Classrooms

Directions: Circle all that apply for each question

1. What grade level do you teach?
a. elementary b. middle school c. junior high school d. high school
2. What is your content area?
a. band b. vocal c. strings d. general music
3. In which school district do you teach?
a. BPS b. District 66 c. MPS d. OPS e. PLPS f. RPS
4. How many years of teaching experience do you possess?
a. 0 to 3 years b. 4 to 6 years c. 7 to 9 years d. 10 + years
5. Rate your level of Special Education training:
a. None b. Very little c. Some d. extensive e. very extensive
6. Have you taken any hours of Special Education coursework/training? YES NO
If yes, how many hours? _____
7. Do you currently have special education students included in regular classes?
a. Yes b. No c. Do not know
8. At the time of this survey, what type of disabilities do you see in your classes (circle all that apply)
a. learning disabilities b. behavior disabilities c. mental disabilities
d. other health impairments e. None
9. Does your district have self-contained music classes for special education students?
a. Yes b. No
10. How do you grade special education students?
a. same as other students b. pass/fail c. a modified scale

For the following ten questions (11-20), circle the answer that best describes students with the given label.

11. **Mentally Retarded**
a. below average intelligence b. average intelligence c. hyperactivity
12. **Gifted/Talented**
a. average intelligence b. problem-solver c. learns through drill/routine
13. **Hearing-Impaired**
a. normal language development b. no language development c. slow language development
14. **Attention-Deficit Disorder**
a. poor muscle coordination b. below average intelligence c. hyperactivity
15. **Hyper-Active**
a. low academic ability b. impulsive c. below average intelligence
16. **Behavior Disorder**
a. inattentive b. low academic ability c. aggressive
17. **Learning Disabled**
a. inattentive b. average academic ability c. poor muscle coordination
18. **Physical Disability**
a. average academic skills b. poor muscle coordination c. aggressive
19. **Visually Impaired**
a. average social skills b. poor social skills c. low academic ability
20. **Speech and Language Impaired**
a. hyperactivity b. poor expression skills c. low academic ability

For the following ten questions (21-30), circle the response that best describes your willingness to teach students with varying disabilities using the scale provided.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|---------|---------|--------------|
| 21. | Mentally Retarded
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |
| 22. | Gifted/Talented
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |
| 23. | Hearing-Impaired
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |
| 24. | Attention-Deficit Disorder
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |
| 25. | Hyper-Active
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |
| 26. | Behavior Disorder
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |
| 27. | Learning Disabled
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |
| 28. | Physical Disability
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |
| 29. | Visually Impaired
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |
| 30. | Speech and Language Impaired
very unwilling | unwilling | neutral | willing | very willing |

For the following ten questions (31-40), rank your preference related to teaching the following types of students:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---------------|---------|------------------|---------------------|
| 31. | Mentally Retarded
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |
| 32. | Gifted/Talented
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |
| 33. | Hearing Impaired
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |
| 34. | Attention-Deficit Disorder
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |
| 35. | Hyper-Active
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |
| 36. | Behavior Disorder
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |
| 37. | Learning Disabled
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |
| 38. | Physical Disability
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |
| 39. | Visually Impaired
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |
| 40. | Speech and Language Impaired
most like to teach | like to teach | neutral | dislike to teach | least like to teach |

How would you describe your experiences in teaching special education students? (Use space provided)