



7-1996

A Survey of the Special Learner Training of Music Educators in Ohio

Dorianne J. Nicholson
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Music Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Nicholson, Dorianne J., "A Survey of the Special Learner Training of Music Educators in Ohio" (1996).
Masters Theses. 5305.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/5305

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**A SURVEY OF THE SPECIAL LEARNER TRAINING
OF MUSIC EDUCATORS IN OHIO**

by

Dorianne J. Nicholson

**A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Master of Music
School of Music**

**Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 1996**

Copyright by
Dorianne J. Nicholson
1996

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Brian Wilson, Dr. Delores Gauthier, and Dr. David Sheldon for their support, assistance and patience during this process. Your knowledge and encouragement were invaluable.

Thank you to all of the music educators who participated in this study. Your willingness, interest and dedication to your profession made this research possible.

To my parents, Katherine and Arthur, who have given me years of love, humor, and never-ending encouragement. I am truly blessed to have you both as my parents.

A very special thank you to Liana Smith, Sara Roberts, and Helen Lukan-Kavanaugh for your unconditional love and endless support in every part of my life. Thank you also to Nicole Razey, Aaron McEvers and Kristin Blanchard for years of friendship.

Thank you to all of my "little" friends at Blackhawk Area Education Center in Moline IL for sharing a special part of themselves. Music and laughter by a child is one of the beautiful things in this world.

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my grandmother, Doris Vaughn, who always believed in me and will forever be my hero.

Dorianne J. Nicholson

A SURVEY OF THE SPECIAL LEARNER TRAINING OF MUSIC EDUCATORS IN OHIO

Dorianne J. Nicholson, M.M.

Western Michigan University, 1996

Music educators from the Ohio Music Educators' Association were surveyed to investigate the special learner training received in undergraduate and graduate programs. The survey was designed to provide demographic data and information about course settings for special learner training, observations, "hands-on" experiences, topics covered in both undergraduate and graduate courses, and the need for additional training.

Of the 200 surveys sent to Ohio music educators, 83 usable responses were returned. Twenty-four percent ($n=19$) of the respondents reported having special learner training in their undergraduate programs. Of these 19, 42% were required to participate in observations, and 24% were required to have "hands-on" experiences. Fifteen percent ($n=9$) of 61 respondents reported having special learner training in their graduate programs. Of these 9, 3 were required to participate in observations, and 2 were required to have "hands-on" experiences. Implementations regarding undergraduate and graduate training programs in music education are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Purpose	2
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	3
Legislative and Regulatory Issues.....	3
Philosophical/Theoretical Constructs.....	5
Mainstreaming	6
Regular Education Initiative	7
Inclusion.....	8
Music Education and Mainstreaming.....	9
Attitude of Educators Towards Special Learners	10
Effects of Special Learners on Students Without Disabilities.....	14
Administrative Support.....	16
Special Learner Training of Music Educators	17
Statement of Hypotheses	20
Limitations of the Study.....	22
III. METHOD	23
Participants.....	23
Instrument.....	23
Consent and Approval.....	24

Table of Contents-continued

CHAPTER

Design and Procedure.....	24
Analysis.....	25
IV. RESULTS.....	26
Undergraduate Special Learner Training	30
Graduate Special Learner Training.....	38
Discussion.....	60
Recommendations for Further Study.....	67
APPENDICES	
A. Special Learner Training Pilot Study Survey	69
B. Special Learner Training Pilot Study Cover Letter.....	75
C. Special Learner Training Final Survey.....	77
D. Special Learner Training Final Survey Cover Letters.....	83
E. Approval Form for the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.....	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY	88

LIST OF TABLES

1. Sex of Respondents	26
2. Age of Respondents.....	27
3. Number of Years Teaching.....	27
4. Areas of Education	28
5. Percentage of Students With Disabilities Seen by Respondents This Year	29
6. Number of Students Receiving Special Education Services	30
7. Types of Disabilities Seen by Respondents	31
8. Type of Undergraduate Degree Pursued by Respondents.....	32
9. Type of Undergraduate College/University Attended by Respondents.....	33
10. Size of Undergraduate College/University Attended by Respondents.....	33
11. Undergraduate Special Learner Training of Respondents.....	34
12. Undergraduate Educational Settings of Respondents Who Received Special Learner Training.....	34
13. Undergraduate Observation Settings of Respondents Who Received Special Learner Training.....	35
14. Undergraduate "Hands-on" Settings of Respondents Who Received Special Learner Training.....	36
15. Topics Related to Special Learner Training Which Were Discussed in Undergraduate Courses.....	37
16. Topics Related to Special Learner Training Which Respondents Feel Should Have Been Discussed in Undergraduate Courses.....	38
17. Type of Graduate Degree Pursued by Respondents.....	39
18. Type of Graduate College/University Attended by Respondents.....	40
19. Size of Graduate College/University Attended by Respondents.....	41
20. Graduate Special Learner Training of Respondents	41

List of Tables-continued

21. Graduate Educational Settings of Respondents Who Received Special Learner Training.....	42
22. Graduate Observation Settings of Respondents Who Received Special Learner Training.....	43
23. Graduate "Hands-on" Settings of Respondents Who Received Special Learner Training.....	43
24. Topics Related to Special Learner Training Which Were Discussed in Graduate Courses.....	44
25. Topics Related to Special Learner Training Which Respondents Feel Should Have Been Discussed in Graduate Courses.....	45
26. Age of Respondents and Undergraduate Special Learner Training	46
27. Age of Respondents and Graduate Special Learner Training.....	47
28. Undergraduate Special Learner Training Based on the Sex of the Respondent.....	48
29. Graduate Special Learner Training Based on the Sex of the Respondent.....	49
30. Undergraduate Special Learner Training in Regards to Teaching Experience (1-10 Years)	49
31. Graduate Special Learner Training in Regards to Teaching Experience (1-10 Years)	50
32. Undergraduate Special Learner Training in Regards to Teaching Experience (11-20 Years).....	50
33. Graduate Special Learner Training in Regards to Teaching Experience (11-20 Years).....	51
34. Undergraduate Special Learner Training in Regards to Teaching Experience (20+ Years)	51
35. Graduate Special Learner Training in Regards to Teaching Experience (20+ Years)	52
36. Type of Undergraduate College/University Attended by Respondents and Relationship to Special Learner Training.....	52
37. Type of Graduate College/University Attended by Respondents and Relationship to Special Learner Training.....	53

List of Tables - continued

38. Difference in Special Learner Training of Music Educators With No Advanced Degree and Educators With Both Undergraduate and Graduate Degrees in Music.....	54
39. Difference in Special Learner Training of Music Educators With Undergraduate and Graduate Degrees in Music and Educators With an Undergraduate Degree in Music and a Graduate Degree in a Non-Music Area	54
40. Undergraduate Special Learner Training Between Elementary and Secondary Educators.....	56
41. Graduate Special Learner Training Between Elementary and Secondary Educators.....	57
42. Difference in Undergraduate and Graduate Special Learner Training Based on Required and Non-Required Observations.....	58
43. Difference in Undergraduate and Graduate Special Learner Training Based on Required and Non-Required "Hands-on" Observations.....	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the passage of P. L. 94-142, there has been an increase in the number of special learners integrated into the public school system. Music education, as a non-academic subject, has been a primary area in which to integrate those with special needs. With the addition of these students into the regular classroom, music educators are faced with challenges which may not have arisen with typical learners. Some of these challenges may include lowered or atypical social skills, decreased language or motor development, and atypical behaviors. Depending on the classroom or performance medium (i.e. general music, choral music, or instrumental music) students with special needs may change the structure of the class. It is necessary for music educators to be appropriately trained to most efficiently meet the needs of special learners.

Several studies have been developed by music therapists and music educators to address teacher attitudes towards special learners (White, 1981/82; Jellison & Duke, 1994; Robinson, 1994; Sideridis & Chandler, 1995, Wilson & McCrary, 1996), student attitudes toward special learners (Jellison, Brooks, & Huck, 1984; Atterbury, 1985; Darrow & Johnson, 1994); and mainstreaming practices (Force, 1983; Atterbury, 1986; Gfeller, Darrow & Hedden, 1990; Darrow, 1993; Darrow & Johnson, 1994; Ellett, 1993; Frisque, Neibur, & Humphreys, 1990). Despite an extensive research base, there are still questions which remain unanswered in regards to the special learner training of music educators. Is there a difference in special learner training between educators with less than ten years of experience,

eleven to twenty years of experience and educators with more than twenty years of experience? Is there a difference in special learner training among those who teach elementary general music, secondary choral music, and secondary instrumental music? Is there a difference in special learner training between those educators with undergraduate degrees in music and no advanced degree and those with both undergraduate and advanced degrees in music? Is there a difference in special learner training between those educators with both undergraduate and graduate music degrees and those with an undergraduate music degree and a graduate degree in a non-music area? Is there a difference in special learner training between those educators who received training at a public or private university? Is there a difference in special learner training based on the age of the respondent? Do music educators feel that their special learner training was more adequate with or without required observations? Do music educators feel that their special learner training was more adequate with or without hands-on observations?

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate the amount and types of special learner training received by music educators in their undergraduate and graduate programs.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Legislative and Regulatory Issues

In the past twenty-five years, federal legislation has impacted special education services for children with disabilities. In 1975, P. L. 94-142, also known as the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA), was passed by Congress guaranteeing the rights of children with special needs to receive a free and appropriate education (Atterbury, 1985; Smith & Luckasson, 1992; Shea & Bauer, 1994). Primary reasons for the passage of P. L. 94-142 included an increase in the number of children with disabilities and special needs in the United States, a need for successful educational experiences, a need for equal educational experiences for all children regardless of their disability, and a need to provide free education for children within the public school system (Smith & Luckasson, 1992). These educational services are appropriate to individual needs and have been identified as an obligation of the school, regardless of cost (Alley, 1977). In addition to the need for free, appropriate public education (FAPE), P. L. 94-142 also included mandatory service plans for each child, and confidentiality of records and progress.

Since the passage and implementation of P. L. 94-142, amendments have been made to provide more effective educational services to those students with disabilities. In 1983, P. L. 98-199 was added to P. L. 94-142 to address major education and transition difficulties confronting young adults receiving special education services (Shea & Bauer, 1994). This amendment focused on the increased

development of post-secondary education and employment options. P. L. 99-457 (1986) was implemented to extend the rights of children with disabilities ages three to five. In addition to this early education intervention system, Individual Family Services Plans (IFSP) were added to provide family services to children from birth to age two. Funding was appropriated by state and federal grant programs (Shea & Bauer, 1994).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was passed in 1990 as an amendment to P. L. 94-142. IDEA emphasized the importance of using "person first" language and added rehabilitation counseling, transition services and social work to related services. Autism, defined under a separate law (P. L. 101-456) and Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) were also added to the list of disabilities which qualify for services. Services developed and previously stated in P. L. 94-142 are redefined and expanded in the four major provisions of IDEA (Smith & Luckasson, 1992).

The first provision states that free and appropriate public education (FAPE) is to be provided at no extra cost to families of those children with disabilities. Services may be provided in the regular education classroom or in special education classrooms. This provision also states that the education must be appropriate to meet the individual needs of the child. A second provision (Smith & Luckasson, 1992) requires the inclusion of other related services, if necessary, into the child's special education program. These services may include occupational and physical therapy, speech/language pathology, transportation, recreational services, and medical and counseling services.

A third provision requires Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) for each child receiving special education services. The IEP is designed to develop a tailored program to meet the individual needs of each student with disabilities (Smith & Luckasson, 1992). These plans include goals and objectives which relate to the

child's educational development. Members of the child's IEP team include a qualified representative of the local education agency, the child's current teacher, the prospective special education teacher, the child, parents, and any other support staff (i.e. occupational therapist, physical therapist, speech pathologist) which may take part in the child's academic development. This may also include the music educator or music therapist, if these services are available and necessary (Smith & Luckasson, 1992).

The last provision outlines the need for mainstreaming and education in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The LRE clause calls for schools to integrate more students with disabilities into the regular public schools than had been served prior to the passage of P. L. 94-142 (Biklen, 1992). This integration decreases the need for special school and institutions for students with disabilities and allows for children with disabilities to interact with peers without handicaps. The LRE allows for parents and professionals to provide services as close to normal as possible (Smith & Luckasson, 1992). It is important to remember that the student should be placed in the environment which will provide the most effective educational experience. P. L. 94-142 does not state that children with disabilities will automatically be placed in a regular education classroom. The LRE was implemented to better serve all students with disabilities, especially those who require greater than usual educational support.

Philosophical/Theoretical Constructs

There are three primary theoretical constructs which will be discussed: mainstreaming, Regular Education Initiative (REI), and inclusion. Placement in one of these educational environments depends on the specific needs of the student. Despite the benefits of these three services, some students are more effectively

educated in a school for special education or through home schooling. Regardless of placement, it is important to provide the student with education in the least restrictive environment.

Mainstreaming

With the passage and development of P. L. 94-142 and subsequent amendments, children with disabilities are to receive their education in the environment which is most beneficial for the individual. While the term "mainstreaming" was not used in the development of P. L. 94-142, it is used to define the process of integrating exceptional students into the regular classroom and represents an educational philosophy based on human dignity, individual rights, and desegregation (Darrow, 1990). If a child is mainstreamed, he/she is included in the regular classroom for all or some of the academic day (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). In this setting, the child works on the same assignments as those who are receiving regular education and is expected to achieve the same academic level as his peers. Goals and objectives taken from the child's IEP are specifically designed to assist the special learner in the regular classroom. Assignments and work may be adapted to provide a positive and successful learning experience.

One of the problems in mainstreaming is the global use of the term "handicapped" (Darrow, 1990). This term tends to group all children with disabilities into one category, when in fact, there are some children, such as those with emotional and behavioral disorders (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987) and those with hearing impairments (Gfeller, Darrow, Hedden, 1990) which are reported to be more difficult to mainstream than others (Hannah & Pliner, 1983).

Regular Education Initiative

Advocates of the Regular Education Initiative (REI) suggest that instructional services for children with disabilities be delivered within the regular classroom environment (Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991). Effective instruction for students can be appropriately implemented for all children and can accommodate their individual differences (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991). The primary difference between mainstreaming and REI is that in mainstreaming, the special learner is expected to achieve the same academic goals as their peers without disabilities. Primary instruction is still provided by the regular education teacher, but the amount of assistance given to the student varies depending on individual needs. Assistance provided may include teacher aides, special educators, and adaptive and computerized equipment. Teacher aides and special educators function as consultants to the special learner within the regular classroom environment (Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991).

REI is an educational reform movement which provides special learners with the same educational experiences as typical learners (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). While it is considered to be a full-inclusion mode of delivery for all students, there are both advantages and disadvantages with this inclusion model (Kubicek, 1994). Full-inclusion essentially eliminates the concept of a dual delivery system, where special education and regular education are seen separately. Supporters of REI also contend that separate programming is unequal and immoral (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1995). While the concept of dual delivery may be beneficial for some students with more severe disabilities, those with mild disabilities may in fact be better served in the regular classroom achieving the same academic goals as those without disabilities. However, some opponents of REI contend if students with mild disabilities are placed

in regular classes on a full-time basis it may have adverse effects on the achievement level of students without mild disabilities (Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991). In other cases, if no assistance is available, teachers may be required to provide increased instructional time to those students with disabilities.

Since REI eliminates the need for special education labels (Kubicek, 1994), proponents believe that the lack of labels may be beneficial for the student in decreasing stereotypes developed by both teachers and peers. On the other hand, labels may be necessary for school funding and financially supporting special education. Frequently, students without a special education label are not eligible for support services such as occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech therapy, and music therapy. These services may be a necessary component of the child's curriculum in order to provide the most effective education. Despite opposing views on the effectiveness of REI, it still remains a viable educational option for students with special needs.

Inclusion

Inclusion as a general concept means that all children, regardless of the severity of their disability should have access to and participate in all aspects of the community (Wolery, Werts, Caldwell, Snyder, & Lisowski, 1995). In educational settings, inclusion is defined as the development of a school-based education model that is student centered and that bases educational placement and service provision on the needs of each student (Vaughn & Schumm, 1995). Students with disabilities attend the same schools as their peers without disabilities in age-appropriate grade levels and classes (Sailor, 1995). Self-contained special education classes are nonexistent in the inclusion model and special education services are provided in

general education and other integrated learning environments (Sailor, cited in York & Tundidor, 1995). Despite the degree of disability, all students, including those with severe and profound disabilities and those with complex medical issues, receive special services in the regular classroom with their peers without disabilities.

As with other service delivery models, inclusion in an educational setting has both positive and negative aspects. Positive aspects include better teamwork and collaboration between regular and special educators (York & Tundidor, 1995), increased awareness of disabilities by typical students, and greater educational equality for all students regardless of disability (Vaughn & Schumm, 1995). Barriers to successful inclusion include a lack of resources for staffing and materials (York & Tundidor, 1995), insufficient training of regular educators to work with students with disabilities (Yell, 1995), and the rigid expectations and demands found in regular education curriculums (York & Tundidor, 1995).

Music Education and Mainstreaming

Music educators have become increasingly involved in the mainstreaming and inclusion of children with special needs in their classrooms. The least restrictive environment provision of P.L. 94-142 has been the basis for the integration of students with disabilities into music classes (Atterbury, 1990). Because of the impact of mainstreaming in many music classrooms, music educators have become more active participants in decisions affecting placement of children with disabilities. In addition to the musical growth and experiences of the child, the educational and social development must be taken into consideration. It may be that the child's socialization is not mature enough for his grade level. Music educators, as well as administrators and regular education teachers, must be aware that (a) the "least restrictive environment" may not be the most effective learning environment

for some children with disabilities, (b) the law does not say that every child must be mainstreamed into music, and (c) the law does not say that entire groups of children with disabilities are to be mainstreamed into music (Atterbury, 1990). Special learners are frequently placed in music, art and physical education classes along with their peers without disabilities. Music, art and physical education teachers are likely to have students with disabilities included in their schedules (Elliot & Sins, 1982/83). It may also be that mainstreaming is the only music placement option for special learners in many schools (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994).

Three factors have been identified as critical to the success of mainstreaming in music education: adequate preparation of teachers who work with students with handicaps; adequate administrative support, including participation in placement decisions; and the ability to focus on musical objectives within the classroom (Gfeller & Darrow, 1987). Overall, music educators opinions vary widely on the effectiveness of mainstreaming in music (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990). It has been suggested that many issues contribute to this effectiveness including teacher attitude, experience with special learners, administrative support and previous educational training.

Attitude of Educators Toward Special Learners

P.L. 94-142 brought about changes in the genre of research questions and methodological practice for all professionals concerned with the well-being of individuals with disabilities (Jellison & Flowers, 1991). Despite the fact that P.L. 94-142 has been in effect for more than two decades, there are still a large number of music educators who are reluctant to mainstream students with disabilities into their classrooms. This reluctance is primarily directed towards those with moderate to severe disabilities, especially those who affect classroom management, require

extraordinary teaching skills, or require extensive classroom support (Hawkins, 1992).

In the regular education setting, students with emotional and behavioral disorders are the most difficult to integrate into the regular education class (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Hughes, Kauffman & Wallace, cited in Hannah & Pliner, 1983). Those students who are most frequently considered by teachers and administrators for mainstreaming and easiest to mainstream are those who are physically challenged, have learning disabilities, or have mild to moderate mental impairments (Pilotte, 1990; Hannah & Pliner, 1983; Moore & Fine, 1978). Services for children with learning disabilities have shown the largest growth in recent years and by reports have been the easiest to integrate (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987). Teachers have also reported responding more positively to children with hearing and visual impairments than to other handicapping conditions (Hannah & Pliner, 1983).

In the regular education classroom, elementary teachers were shown to have more positive attitudes than secondary teachers (Morris & McCauley, cited in Hannah & Pliner, 1983). One reason for this may be the secondary teachers' focus on more specific curriculum and their inability to provide enough individualized attention to a student with a disability. It has also been suggested that primary and middle grade elementary teachers were more willing to work with children with handicaps than junior high grade teachers (Stephens & Braun, 1980). This may also be related to the difficulty in providing individualized attention at the junior high school level. It has also been suggested that those teachers who have had pleasant interaction with students with disabilities also exhibit positive attitudes (Hannah & Pliner, 1983).

The type of music educational setting may affect the view of educators regarding students with disabilities. In past studies, general music educators,

instrumental music educators, and choral music educators have had varying opinions on the success of mainstreaming students in their respective classrooms (Gilbert & Asmus, 1981; White, 1981; Frisque, Neibur, & Humphreys, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow & Hedden, 1990; Robinson, 1994; Jellison & Duke, 1994; Sideridis & Chandler, 1995). Sideridis and Chandler (1995) found that general music teachers were more positive toward integrating students with learning disabilities and physical disabilities into the classroom than those with behavioral and emotional impairments. The integration of children with developmental disabilities, multiple impairments, behavior disorders and emotional impairments resulted in a negative attitude from general music teachers as these disabilities are seen as difficult to manage in a regular classroom. In another study, music educators were most positive toward children with speech impairments and health impairments (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990). Similar results were reported in a recent study by Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990), identifying behavior disorders and hearing impairments as disabilities contributing to a more negative attitude in the general music classroom. Results indicate that the degree of disability combined with a lack of preparation has an effect on teacher attitude (Sideridis & Chandler, 1995). In two separate studies, music educators stated that they taught too many mainstreamed students (Atterbury, 1986; Gilbert & Asmus, 1981). Fifty percent of music educators in one study suggested that the needs of special learners are better met in special classes (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990).

In some cases, it is difficult to teach music to the child with disabilities when there is an absence of social skills. Results of a survey (Jellison & Duke, 1994) sent to elementary music educators and future elementary music educators indicated that social behaviors were an important prerequisite to the success of students with disabilities in the regular music class. A significant number of respondents stated

that social behaviors were more important for students with disabilities, while music behaviors were more important to the student without a disability. Overall, elementary music educators were more likely to accept a student with a disability if the social behavior of the child was appropriate.

General and elementary music educators are more likely to have contact with students with disabilities than secondary educators (Jellison & Duke, 1994; Sideridis & Chandler, 1995; Jellison & Wolfe, 1987; Jellison, Brooks, & Huck, 1984). This may be due to the fact that, in most instances, children are required to participate in the public school general music program, while those programs in instrumental and choral music education are generally considered to be optional.

Robinson (1994) investigated choral music educators' beliefs regarding the causes of success and failure of mainstreamed students into music classes and found that music teachers with more experience attributed the success of mainstreamed students to the influence of non-handicapped peers more frequently than did less experienced teachers. Results of this study also suggested that most unfavorable and nonproductive situations (54%) in the choral music setting were attributed to the mainstreamed students themselves. Conversely, if rehearsals and performances were successful, teachers credited their own special teaching styles.

Students with severe physical or mental disabilities are often overlooked for mainstreaming placement in secondary choral and instrumental music programs because of their extensive impairments. In secondary instrumental and choral programs, instrumental music teachers appear to be more favorable toward mainstreaming than are choral teachers (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; White, 1981). A lack of instructional support (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990) may result in a more negative attitude in choral and general music educators.

Effect of Special Learners on Students Without Disabilities

Several studies have investigated whether the learning of students without handicaps may be affected by the inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular music classroom or in music situations (Darrow & Johnson, 1994; Jellison & Gainer, 1992; Gfeller, Darrow & Hedden, 1990; Madsen, Smith, & Feeman, 1988; Jellison, Brooks, & Huck, 1984; Force, 1983; Elliot & Sins, 1982). There has been an increase in research which addresses issues related to the impact of inclusion on the social/interpersonal relationships among students and the impact of inclusion on the acquisition of knowledge (Jellison & Gainer, 1992). Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) found that 61% of educators feel that students with disabilities hamper the learning of those without handicaps. Those respondents may be unclear about P.L. 94-142 and its indication that mainstreaming should be provided for students only if it delivers adequate educational support (Elliot & Sins, 1982/83; Force, 1983; Jellison, Brooks, & Huck, 1984; Madsen, Smith, & Feeman, 1988; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990).

Force (1983) compared a mainstreamed first grade music class to a class of typical first graders to determine if the presence of students with disabilities affected the musical learning of typical children and found no significant difference in the learning of the typical children in either classroom. Results of this study suggest that the musical learning of children without disabilities is not noticeably affected by the presence or absence of children with disabilities. These results are significant because researchers have become increasingly concerned about the utilization of time for learning for typical students and the importance of students' time on task (Jellison & Gainer, 1992). The most significant finding of the Force (1983) study was that, regardless of classification, both groups increased significantly from pre to

posttest.

Jellison, Brooks, and Huck (1984) investigated the use of small groups and music reinforcement to facilitate positive interactions and acceptance of students with severe disabilities in the regular music education classroom. Results of this study indicate that successful social interaction between disabled and non-disabled peers was not a result of music classroom experiences or music alone, but rather on the degree of music reinforcement provided to non-handicapped students for these interactions. Students without disabilities were more likely to interact with those with disabilities when music was provided as a reinforcement or reward.

Madsen, Smith, and Feeman (1988) investigated the use of music in cross-age tutoring within special education settings. In this study, students with behavior disorders worked with typical kindergartners on spelling, color identification, and counting skills. Music listening was used as a reward for the students with behavior disorders for appropriate behavior after each session. Special educators working with those students with behavior disorders reported more appropriate behavior in their own educational setting as the study progressed. At posttest, the students with behavioral disorders were perceived by their special education teachers as "gifted, on-task, positive, socially appropriate, and behaviorally normal". This study suggests that the inclusion of students with behavior disorders into a regular classroom with typical younger students may be beneficial and positive for both types of students.

Studies have been conducted to investigate the attitudes of both junior high and high school students regarding the presence of peers with disabilities (Elliot & Sins, 1982; Darrow & Johnson, 1994). Attitudes of middle school music students towards peers with disabilities in a general music class was investigated by Elliot and Sins (1982). The majority of students who participated in this study responded

positively, with more females appearing more positive than males. Positive attitudes also progressed by age and grade. Similar results were obtained from Darrow and Johnson (1994) who identified senior high school students as being more accepting of persons with disabilities than junior high school students and females more accepting than males. Results from this study also indicated that attitudes were also affected by the severity of the disability with the most acceptable being visible scars, heart conditions and deafness. The least acceptable disabilities were AIDS, paralysis and blindness. Parents, administrators, and educators continue to be concerned about the lack of available research on the effects of interaction between students with and without handicaps (Force, 1983). Further research is still needed.

Administrative Support

Since the passage of P.L. 94-142, school administrators have frequently advocated the mainstreaming of students with disabilities in music classes (Atterbury, 1985). It has been suggested that the implementation of P.L. 94-142 has had a positive impact on the music program in some public schools, with increased administrative and educator assistance as well as increased peer acceptance (Johnson, 1990). Administrators, as well as educators, are responsible for developing and facilitating a positive learning environment, as well as assisting in increasing the academic achievement and quality of education received by those with disabilities (Force, 1983). For successful mainstreaming and integration of special learners to occur, it is necessary for the school administration to be involved in both the placement process and the education of the child.

The extent of administrative support for instructional purposes seems to influence the effectiveness of mainstreaming (Darrow & Gfeller, 1991). Results of a study by Atterbury (1986) indicate that mainstreaming decisions and placements in

elementary music are presently not supported by appropriate administrative assistance. Forty-six percent of music educators surveyed report that they received no information on each mainstreamed child from an administrator or the child's regular education teacher. Fifty-one percent report receiving a moderate amount of information. This data may suggest a lack of adequate training of administrators to work with special learners. No data was collected in this survey which address the support of secondary school administrative assistance. Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) indicated limited resources in terms of aides, extra preparation time, and consultation. An increase in these resources for students with disabilities could be facilitated by more administrative support with regards to disabilities.

Special Learner Training of Music Educators

In order for effective teaching to occur, music educators must be knowledgeable about specific disabilities (Gfeller & Darrow, 1987). Several studies have briefly addressed the issues music educators face when working with students with disabilities (Frisque, Neibur, & Humphreys, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Atterbury, 1986; Gilbert & Asmus, 1981). Results of these studies suggest that music educators are not receiving proper training for their work with students with disabilities and are becoming frustrated at managing these students in the music classroom. Music educators may have difficulty determining appropriate educational objectives for children with disabilities without the proper training (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990). In Cassidy and Sims' (1991) study, results suggest that when educators have appropriate training of a student's disability, this knowledge affected their ratings of special education students' performances. In many instances, music educators are attempting to meet the educational needs of students with disabilities with little or no educational preparation, even though research has

indicated that prior educational preparation results in more effective mainstreaming practices (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990).

In terms of preparation, music educators who work with students receiving special education services should receive some supplemental training in special education (Gfeller & Darrow, 1987). In one survey, Frisque, Neibur, and Humphreys (1994) found that forty percent of respondents had received no training in special education. Results of another study reported that only twenty-five percent of respondents had received only one college course related to teaching children with disabilities (Gfeller, Darrow, Hedden, 1990).

Wilson and McCrary (1996) investigated the effect of special learner training on graduate level music education students. After completing a course in music education for special learners, participants reported feeling more capable to work with individuals with disabilities, but were less comfortable and less willing to do so. Multiple and emotional impairments were rated as the disabilities which were most difficult to integrate into the music classroom. This information supports previous research which found that students with emotional impairments were the most difficult to integrate in both the regular education setting (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Hughes, Kauffman & Wallace, cited in Hannah & Pliner, 1983) and music education classrooms (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Hawkins, 1992).

Darrow and Gfeller (1991), in a follow-up to their 1990 study, found that there was a lack of appropriate skills and training by music educators of students with hearing impairments. Educators relied on a "trial and error" method of teaching, leaving students with hearing impairments with a lack of structured curriculum (Darrow & Gfeller, 1991). To date, little information has been found which investigates educators' training with other than hearing impairments. Adequate educational preparation is essential for the music educator working with

students with all types of disabilities.

In developing special learner training at the secondary level, university music educators need to determine which information regarding special learners is the most beneficial. It has been suggested that academic preparation should include courses in classroom management and behavior modification procedures for students with severe behaviors disorders, inservices to teach basic sign language skills, different instructional strategies for working with various populations (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990), and hands-on experiences with students with disabilities for music educators (Wilson & McCrary, 1996). Another study (Gilbert & Asmus, 1981) indicated that there should be less emphasis on teaching techniques and an increased focus on related factors within the music education environment that have an impact on, or are affected by, special learners. These factors may include social interactions between students with and without handicaps, determination of appropriate placement, and development of Individual Education Plan (IEP) goals and objectives. Atterbury (1986) found that 84% of respondents in one study had not participated in IEP development.

Overall, there are areas in the special learner training of music educators which need to be further addressed. Areas which have been identified include work and familiarity with specific types of disabilities (Hawkins, 1992; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Hughes, Robbins, & King, 1988), training among different types of music educators, i.e., elementary, instrumental, choral (Robinson, 1994; Frisque, Neibur, & Humphreys, 1994; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990), integration of the special learner in music classes (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Force, 1983), and IEP development (Atterbury, 1986). As music educators become more involved in the educational development of children with disabilities, it is necessary to look at the special learner training required and needed by music educators to successfully

teach these children in the music classroom. While several studies have addressed the attitudes and perceptions of educators toward special learners in both the regular classroom setting (Hannah & Pliner, 1983; Moore & Fine, 1978) and the music classroom (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Hughes, Robbins, & King, 1988), there is still a need to investigate the classroom and observational learning in undergraduate and graduate music education programs.

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is: (a) a difference in special learner training between educators with less than ten years of experience, eleven to twenty years of experience and educators with more than twenty years of experience; (b) a difference in special learner training among those who teach elementary general music, secondary choral music, and secondary instrumental music; (c) a difference in special learner training between those educators with undergraduate degrees in music and no advanced degree and those with both undergraduate and advanced degrees in music; (d) a difference in special learner training between those educators with both undergraduate and graduate music degrees and those with an undergraduate music degree and a graduate degree in a non-music area; (e) a difference in special learner training between those educators who received training at a public or private university; (f) a difference in special learner training based on the age of the respondent; (g) a difference in music educators' special learner training with or without required observations and (h) a difference in music educators' special learner training with or without "hands-on" observations

Statement of Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study are as follows:

1. There will be no discernible difference in special learner training

based on the age of the respondent.

2. There will be no discernible difference in special learner training based on the sex of the respondent.

3. There will be no discernible difference in special learner training among educators with less than ten years of experience, eleven to twenty years of experience and educators with more than twenty years of experience.

4. There will be no discernible difference in undergraduate special learner training among those educators who received training at state, private, or religious-affiliated universities.

5. There will be no discernible difference in graduate special learner training among those educators who received training at state, private, or religious-affiliated universities.

6. There will be no discernible difference in special learner training between those educators with undergraduate degrees in music and no advanced degree and those with both undergraduate and graduate degrees in music.

7. There will be no discernible difference in special learner training between those educators with both undergraduate and graduate music degrees and those with an undergraduate music degree and a graduate degree in a non-music area.

8. There will be no discernible difference in undergraduate special learner training between elementary and secondary educators.

9. There will be no discernible difference in graduate special learner training between elementary and secondary educators.

10. There will be no discernible difference in undergraduate special learner training based on required or non-required observations.

11. There will be no discernible difference in graduate special learner training based on required or non-required observations.

12. There will be no discernible difference in undergraduate special learner training based on required or non-required "hands-on" observations.

13. There will be no discernible difference in graduate special learner training based on required or non-required "hands-on" observations.

Limitations of the Study

A limitation of the study was that the study was sent to a small sample of a population in Ohio. Results of this study may or may not generalize to other populations of music educators.

A limitation of the study was that many questions could only be answered by those respondents who had special learner training.

A limitation of the study was the possibility of a small number of surveys being returned by respondents, thus decreasing the validity of the study. This may have an effect on percentage outcomes.

A limitation of the study was that some respondents, especially those who were older and/or with more the twenty years of experience, may not remember special learner training experiences during their university training.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

A random sample of music educators currently teaching in Ohio and who belong to the Ohio Music Education Association served as participants for this study. Participants in the survey were from five regions in Ohio as designated by the Ohio Music Educators' Association. A list of members belonging to this organization was obtained prior to subject selection. Those individuals who were retired, college educators, had no K-12 teaching experience, or were teaching in private schools were eliminated from the list prior to subject selection. Systematic sampling with a random start (Babbie, 1990) was the procedure used to select subjects. Every fourth name from the edited list was chosen ($n = 200$), beginning at random with the fourth name.

Instrument

A survey used to address issues regarding music educators' special learner training was developed by the researcher. Prior to final implementation, a pilot study was conducted by the researcher (See Appendix A). The pilot survey was sent to six elementary and secondary music educators to obtain information regarding the validity of the instrument. A cover letter (See Appendix B) and a self-addressed stamped envelope was included with each survey. Due to the limited response to the

first pilot survey (n=2), the researcher sent a second mailing (n=6) to different educators; 5 surveys were returned. Comments and suggestions on the content and accuracy of questions from the total seven music educators who responded were reflected in the final copy of the instrument. This form was reviewed and approved by the thesis committee before being used to collect data (See Appendix C).

The final revised survey containing 29 items, a cover letter (See Appendix D) and a self-addressed stamped envelope were sent to 200 Ohio music educators. The first section of the questionnaire asked for demographic information (i.e. age, sex, number of years as a music educator, number of students with disabilities with whom they currently work). The second part of the survey asked questions related to educational training (i.e. type of college institution attended, type of degree, and areas of music education certification). The special learner training information section addressed questions related to special learner training settings, experiences in music education training, participation in observations, and special learner information covered in the college classroom.

Consent and Approval

This research project required approval from the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The proposal was reviewed and approved by the Board (See Appendix E).

Design and Procedure

Surveys were sent to 200 preselected music educators in Ohio. Along with the survey, a cover letter, instructions for completion and a self-addressed stamped envelope were included to encourage participant response. In the first mailing, 70 surveys (35%) were completed and returned by the specified date. Twenty surveys

(10%) were returned with incorrect addresses. A second mailing was sent in order to increase the total number of usable surveys. One hundred and ten surveys were re-sent to those educators who did not respond to the first mailing. The second mailing, which was mailed four weeks after the first mailing, elicited 13 more usable responses. In both mailings, there were no surveys returned with incomplete information. After two mailings, 83 (41.5%) completed surveys had been received.

Analysis

Response frequencies were tabulated for each survey question by determining percentage and number of respondents for each item. Those items in which the respondent was asked to check all that apply to his or her current situation were also classified according to most frequent response. Relationships between certain variables (i.e. age and special learner training, college/university experience and special learner training) were also determined and analyzed. For the purposes of this research, "discernible difference" was defined as a 20% or greater difference between 2 sets of responses. Microsoft Word %.1 and a scientific calculator were used to analyze the data.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Of the 200 surveys mailed, a total of 83 surveys (41.5%) were returned that contained completed demographic, undergraduate and graduate information.

Demographic information was collected regarding sex and age of respondents, teaching experience, educational experience, and current teaching situations. Fifty-one percent of respondents ($n=42$) were male and 49% ($n=41$) were female (see Table 1). Fourteen percent of respondents were ages 22-30 ($n=12$), 30% were ages 31-40 ($n=25$), 41% were ages 41-50 ($n=43$), 14% were ages 51-60 ($n=12$), and 1% of respondents were over 60 ($n=1$) (see Table 2).

Table 1
Sex of Respondents

Sex of Respondents	n	% of Respondents
Male	42	51 %
Female	41	49 %

In regards to teaching experience, the majority of respondents (42%, $n=34$) had 20 or more years of experience. Twenty-four respondents had 1-10 years (28%), and 25 respondents had 11-20 years of experience (30%) (see Table 3). Respondents were employed in all areas of music education (see Table 4). The

majority of respondents were currently teaching elementary general music (47%, $n=39$). Forty percent ($n=33$) taught middle school/junior high school

Table 2
Age of Respondents

Age of Respondents	n	% of Respondents
22-30 years old	12	12%
31-40 years old	25	30%
41-50 years old	34	41%
51-60 years old	12	14%
60+ years old	1	1%

Table 3
Number of Years Teaching

Number of Years	n	% of Respondents
1-10 years	24	28%
11-20 years	25	30%
20+ years	34	42%

instrumental music, 35% ($n=29$) taught high school instrumental, 33% ($n=27$) taught high school choral, and 24% ($n=20$) taught middle school/junior high school general music (see Table 4). A small number of educators (6%, $n=6$) taught elementary (5%, $n=5$) and choral (1%, $n=1$) music. Most of the educators (77.1%, $n=64$) who participated in this survey taught in more than one discipline

(i.e. general and instrumental, choral and instrumental, elementary and secondary).

Table 4
Areas of Education

Areas	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Elementary General Music	39	47%
Middle School/Jr. High School General Music	20	24%
Middle School/Jr. High School Instrumental Music	33	40%
High School Instrumental Music	29	35%
High School Choral Music	27	33%
Other	6	6%
Elementary Instrumental	5	5%
Elementary Choral	1	1%

The vast majority of respondents (94%) reported having taught students with disabilities in their music classrooms in the past school year. Of that number, 55% (n=48) reported that of the students in their classroom, 5% or less had a disability. Twenty percent (n=17) of respondents reported that students with disabilities made up 6-10% of their total students, 8% (n=7) reported 11-20% of students had a disability, and 2% (n=2) reported that 21-30% of their students had a disability. Five respondents (6%) stated that they did not know if any of their students had a disability (see Table 5). Of those teachers who had students with disabilities in their classrooms, 43% of respondents (n=36) reported that all received special education services (see Table 6). Fourteen percent (n=12) did not know if their students received special services. Twelve percent (n=10) reported that 7-8 of their

students received special services, 11% ($n=9$) reported that 1-2 students received services, 10% ($n=8$) reported that 3-4 of their students received services, and 3% ($n=2$) did not receive any special education services at all.

Table 5
Percentage of Students with Disabilities
Seen by Respondents This Year

Percentage of Students	n	% of Respondents
0 - 5 %	48	55%
6 - 10 %	17	20%
11 - 20 %	7	8%
21 - 30 %	2	2%
Don't know if students have disabilities	5	6%

Respondents reported having students with various types of disabilities in their music classroom (see Table 7). The disabilities most frequently seen in special learners were learning disabilities ($n=69$, 83%) and Attention Deficit Disorder ($n=66$, 80%). Fifty-one percent of respondents ($n=42$) had students with emotional impairments in their classrooms, 47% ($n=39$) had students with mental impairments, 42% ($n=35$) had students with hearing impairments, 22% ($n=18$) had students with visual impairments, 17% ($n=14$) had students with cerebral palsy, 16% ($n=12$) have students with autism, 7% ($n=6$) had students with spina bifida, and 5% ($n=4$) had students with cystic fibrosis. Other disability types which were only mentioned once included cancer, multiple sclerosis, severe behavior disorder, muscular dystrophy, severe multiple impairment, dwarfism, and

osteogenesis imperfecta.

Table 6
Number of Students Receiving
Special Education Services

Number of Students	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
None	2	3%
1-2 Students	9	11%
3-4 Students	8	10%
5-6 Students	4	5%
7-8 Students	10	12%
All Students	36	43%
Don't know if they receive services	12	14%

Undergraduate Special Learner Training

All 83 (100%) respondents had undergraduate music degrees (see Table 8). Fifty-five respondents (66.7%) received a Bachelor of Music degree, 11 (13%) had a Bachelor of Arts degree, and 11 (13%) had a Bachelor of Music Education degree. Other degrees held by respondents include Bachelor of Fine Arts (1%), Bachelor of Science in Education (6%), and Juris Doctor (1%). Eighty-one respondents were certified to teach grades K-12, one was certified to teach only grades 5-12, and another was certified to teach only grades 7-12.

Eighty-three percent of respondents (n=69) obtained their undergraduate education from a state college or university. Sixteen respondents (19%) received

degrees from private colleges and universities, and 8 (8%) received degrees from

Table 7
Types of Disabilities Seen by Respondents

Type of Disability	Most Freq.	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Learning Disability	1	69	83%
Attention Deficit Disorder	2	66	80%
Emotional Impairment	3	42	51%
Mental Impairment	4	39	47%
Hearing Impairment	5	35	42%
Visual Impairment	6	18	22%
Cerebral Palsy	7	14	17%
Autism	8	12	16%
Spina Bifida	9	6	7%
Cystic Fibrosis	10	4	5%
Cancer	*		
Multiple Sclerosis	*		
Severe Behavior Disorder	*		
Muscular Dystrophy	*		
Severe Multi. Impairment	*		
Dwarfism	*		
Osteogenesis Imperfecta	*		

The symbol (*) indicates those responses which were only mentioned once.

Table 8
Type of Undergraduate Degree Pursued
by Respondents

Type of Degree	Most Freq.	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Bachelor of Music	1	55	66%
Bachelor of Music Ed.	2	11	13%
Bachelor of Arts	2	11	13%
Bachelor of Science	3	5	6%
Juris Doctor	*		
Bachelor of Fine Arts	*		

The symbol (*) indicates those responses which were only mentioned once.

colleges and universities with a religious affiliation (see Table 9). The student population of undergraduate schools varied: 10,000-19,999 students-30% of respondents (n=25), 0-4,999 students-29% (n=24), 30,000+-18% (n=16), 20,000-29,999-14% (n=12), and 5,000-9,999-7% (n=5) (see Table 10).

Those respondents who received undergraduate music degrees were asked about specific special learner training that they were offered in undergraduate education. Of the 83 respondents, only 24% (n=19) had any special learner training. The remaining 75.9% (n=63) reported no special learner training (see Table 11).

Those respondents who reported that they had special learner training (n=19) were then asked a series of specific questions. The first addressed the educational setting in which the special learner training took place. The most frequently identified setting was Music Education Methods reported by 56% (n=10)

Table 9

Type of Undergraduate College/University
Attended by Respondents

Type	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
State	69	83%
Private	16	19%
Religious Affiliation	8	8%

Table 10

Size of Undergraduate College/University
Attended by Respondents

Size	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
0-4,999	24	29%
5,000-9,999	5	7%
10,000-19,999	25	30%
20,000-29,999	12	14%
30,000+	16	18%

of respondents (see Table 12). Special Education classes were identified by 5 of the respondents (28%). Music Therapy classes were identified by 2 respondents (10%). Settings that were mentioned only once included a class designed to teach music to the special learner, a regular education class, employment at a school for special learners, and self-teaching.

Table 11
Undergraduate Special Learner Training
of Respondents (N=83)

Training	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Yes	19	24%
No	63	75.9%

Respondents were then asked if they had observed students with special needs as a requirement for special learner training classes. Of the 19 who had special learner training, 11 (57.9%) were not required to do observations. Eight respondents (42.1%) completed observations under the following situations: Music education (n=4, 50%), Music at a school for students with disabilities (n=2, 25%), Music therapy (n=2, 25%), and Special education (n=1, 12.5%) (see Table 13). Some respondents reported observations in more than one setting.

Table 12
Undergraduate Educational Settings of Respondents Who
Received Special Learner Training (N=19)

Setting	Most Freq.	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Music Education Methods	1	10	56%
Special Education Class	2	5	28%
Music Therapy Class	3	2	10%
Music for the Special Learner	*		
Regular Education Class	*		

Table 12-continued

Setting	Most Freq.	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Self-teaching	*		
Employment at School for Special Learners	*		

The symbol (*) indicates those responses which were only mentioned once.

Table 13

Undergraduate Observation Settings of Respondents Who Received Special Learner Training

Setting	Most Freq.	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Music Education Methods	1	4	50%
Music at a Special School	2	2	25%
Special Education Class	3	1	12.5%
Music Therapy Class	3	1	12.5%
Music Therapy Clinical	3	1	12.5%
No Observations Required		11	57.9%

Respondents with undergraduate special learner training were then asked if they had received "hands-on" training with special learners. Of those who were enrolled in classes which addressed the needs of special learners ($n=19$), 14 (73.6%) were not required to participate in "hands-on" observations. Of those respondents who had special learner training, experience occurred in the following areas: Music education setting ($n=3$), Special education setting ($n=1$),

Individual/pullout session ($n=1$), and Music therapy clinical setting ($n=1$) (see Table 14). One of the respondents had "hands-on" experience in 2 different areas.

Table 14
Undergraduate "Hands-on" Settings of Respondents Who
Received Special Learner Training

Setting	Most Freq.	n	% of Respondents
Music Education Class	1	3	60%
Special Education	2	1	20%
Individual Session	2	1	20%
Music Therapy Clinical	2	1	20%
No "Hands-on" Required		14	73.6%

Respondents who had special learner training ($n=19$) were then asked what topics related to special learners were discussed in undergraduate courses (see Table 15). Respondents were given a list of topics and instructed to circle all that apply. The most frequently discussed topic was "Aspects of Different Disabilities" ($n=14$, 76.3%). Other frequently discussed topics included "Adaptations and Strategies for the Music Educator" ($n=11$, 57.9%), "Classroom Management Techniques" ($n=10$, 52.6%), and "Medical Concerns of Students with Disabilities" ($n=10$, 52.6%). Other topics which respondents reported less frequently were "Writing IEPs" ($n=7$, 36.8%), "Writing Goals and Objectives" ($n=7$, 36.8%), and "Development of P. L. 94-142" ($n=6$, 31.5%). One respondent could not remember which topics had been covered. The same respondents were also asked to report on any topics which should have been covered in undergraduate coursework, but were not. Again, respondents

were given a list and instructed to circle all that apply. The most frequent topic which needed to be addressed was "Medical Concerns" ($n=13$, 68.4). "Adaptations and Strategies for the Music Educator" ($n=11$, 57.9%) was ranked second, and "Aspects of Different Disabilities" ($n=10$, 52.6%) was ranked third. Other topics which respondents felt needed to be addressed included "Classroom Management" ($n=9$,

Table 15
Topics Related to Special Learner Training Which Were
Discussed in Undergraduate Courses

Topic	Most Freq.	n	%
Aspects of Different Disabilities	1	14	73.6%
Adaptations/Strategies for Music Ed.	2	11	57.9%
Classroom Management Techniques	3	10	52.6%
Medical Concerns	3	10	52.6%
Writing IEPs	4	7	36.8%
Writing Goals and Objectives	4	7	36.8%
Development of P. L. 94-142	5	6	31.5%
Don't Remember Topics Covered	6	1	5.2%

47.3%), "Writing IEPs" ($N=8$, 42.1%), "Writing Goals and Objectives" ($n=7$, 36.8%), and "Development of P. L. 94-142" ($n=6$, 31.5%) (see Table 16). All respondents with special learner training ($n=19$) responded to these questions with more than one response.

Table 16

Topics Related to Special Learner Training Which
Respondents Feel Should Have Been Discussed
in Undergraduate Courses

Topic	Most Freq.	<u>n</u>	%
Medical Concerns	1	13	68.4%
Adaptations/Strategies for Music Ed.	2	11	57.9%
Aspects of Different Disabilities	3	10	52.6%
Classroom Management	4	9	47.3%
Writing IEPs	5	8	42.1%
Writing Goals and Objectives	6	7	36.8%
Development of P. L. 94-142	7	6	31.5%

Graduate Special Learner Training

Sixty-one respondents (73.4%) received graduate training in music or a related field (see Table 17). Twenty-eight percent ($\underline{n}=19$) held degrees in Master of Music Education. Twenty-six percent ($\underline{n}=16$) held degrees in Master of Music. Forty-six percent ($\underline{n}=28$) of respondents held degrees in another related field. These degrees include Master of Education ($\underline{n}=7$, 12%), Master of Educational Administration ($\underline{n}=3$, 5%), Master of Arts ($\underline{n}=3$, 5%), and Master of Elementary Education ($\underline{n}=2$, 3.2%). Three respondents (5%) were currently enrolled in non-degree graduate courses which were education-related. Degrees which were only mentioned once included Master of Economic Education, Equivalency degree in Education, Computer Science, Reading Specialist, Counseling, Business Administration, and Juris Doctor. The majority of respondents with a graduate

education received their training from a state college or university ($n=43$, 70.4%). Private colleges and universities and those with a religious affiliation were both attended by 14.7% of respondents ($n=9$), respectively (see Table 18). The size of the graduate college or university attended by respondents was fairly evenly distributed with 29% ($n=18$) attending a school with a population of 10,000-19,999; 18% ($n=11$) attending a school with a population of 0-4,999; 18% ($n=11$) attending a school with a population of 20,000-29,999; 18% ($n=11$) attending a school with a population of 30,000 and 16% ($n=10$) attending a school with a population of 5,000-9,999 (see Table 19).

Those respondents who held graduate degrees ($n=61$) were asked if they had received special learner training in any of their graduate courses (see Table 20). Eighty-five percent of respondents ($n=52$) reported that they had not received special learner training in any of their graduate courses. Fifteen percent ($n=9$) had received special learner training and were asked another series of questions.

Table 17
Type of Graduate Degree Pursued by Respondents (N=61)

Type of Degree	Most Freq.	n	% of Respondents
Master of Music Ed.	1	19	28%
Master of Music	2	16	26%
Master of Education	3	7	12%
Ed. Administration	4	3	5%
Master of Arts	4	3	5%
Non-degree courses	4	3	5%
Master of Elem Ed.	5	2	3.2%

Table 17-continued

Type of Degree	Most Freq.	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Master of Econ. Ed.	*		
Equivalency in Ed.	*		
Juris Doctor	*		
Computer Science	*		
Reading Specialist	*		
Counseling	*		
Business Admin.	*		

The symbol (*) indicates those responses which were only mentioned once.

Table 18

Type of Graduate College/University
Attended by Respondents

Type	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
State	43	70.4%
Private	9	14.7%
Religious Affiliation	9	14.7%

Respondents with graduate special learner training ($n=9$) were asked which courses provided special learner training (see Table 21). The most frequent setting was the special education class ($n=3$). Music therapy classes provided information about special learners for 2 respondents. Those settings which were only mentioned once were music education methods courses, a course designed to teach music for

Table 19
Size of Graduate College/University
Attended by Respondents

Size	n	% of Respondents
0-4,999	11	18%
5,000-9,999	10	16%
10,000-19,999	18	29%
20,000-29,999	11	18%
30,000+	11	18%

Table 20
Graduate Special Learner Training of Respondents

Training	n	% of Respondents
Yes	9	15%
No	52	85%

the special learner, regular education classes, and tutoring. No respondents received special learner training in more than one class or academic setting. Respondents were also asked if observations of special learners were required (see Table 22). Six of the nine respondents who had received special learner training in the college classroom were not required to observe special learners. Those who did observe special learners saw these students in special education classes, general education classes, and a music therapy class. Those who did observe were only required to do so

in one class setting.

Table 21
Graduate Educational Settings of Respondents Who
Received Special Learner Training (N=9)

Setting	Most Freq.	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Special Education Class	1	3	33%
Music Therapy	2	2	22%
Music Education Methods	3	1	11%
Music for the Special Learner	3	1	11%
Regular Education Class	3	1	11%
Tutoring	3	1	11%

The symbol (*) indicates those responses which were only mentioned once.

Graduate "hands-on" experience with special learners was only required of 2 respondents. Students with special needs were seen in a music education class (n=1) and an individual education setting (n=1). Seventy-eight percent (n=7) of graduate respondents who had some special learner training were not required to participate in "hands-on" observations (see Table 23).

All respondents who had some graduate special learner training (n=9) were asked to report on the topics that were covered in graduate courses (see Table 24). They were directed to circle all topics that applied to their educational situation. The most frequently discussed topic was "Aspects of Different Disabilities" (n=7). "Classroom Management" was reported to be the second most frequently discussed (n=6). Other topics that were reported by 4 respondents were "Medical Concerns", "Adaptations and Strategies for Music Education", "Writing Goals and Objectives",

Table 22

Graduate Observation Settings of Respondents Who
Received Special Learner Training

Setting	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Special Education Class	1	11%
General Education Class	1	11%
Music Therapy Class	1	11%
No Observations Required	6	67%

Table 23

Graduate "Hands-on" Settings of Respondents Who
Received Special Learner Training

Setting	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
Music Education Class	1	11%
Individual Educ. Session	1	11%
No "Hands-on" Required	7	78%

"Development of P. L. 94-142", and "Writing IEPs". One respondent reported that state-specific laws (in Ohio) were discussed in her graduate class. All respondents answered this question with more than 3 answers. These same respondents were also asked to report on the topics that should have been discussed in their graduate training, circling all that apply. The two most frequently identified topics (n=8) which should have been discussed but were omitted were "Adaptations and Strategies for Music Education" and "Writing Goals and Objectives". (see Table 25). "Classroom

Management" was ranked second ($n=7$). Sixty-six percent of respondents ($n=6$) felt that "Medical Concerns", "Aspects of Different Disabilities", and the "Development of P. L. 94-142" should have been discussed. Only five respondents reported on the importance of "Writing IEPs". All respondents also answered this question with more than 3 responses.

Table 24
Topics Related to Special Learner Training Which
Were Discussed in Graduate Courses (N=9)

Topic	Most Freq.	n	%
Aspects of Different Disabilities	1	7	77.7%
Classroom Management	2	6	66.6%
Medical Concerns	3	4	44.4%
Adaptations/Strategies for Music Ed.	3	4	44.4%
Developing Goals and Objectives	3	4	44.4%
Development of P. L. 94-142	3	4	44.4%
Writing IEPs	4	2	22.2%
State-specific Laws	5	1	11.1%

All music educators that completed the survey were asked if they felt that they had received adequate special learner training. They were asked to rate their training on a Likert scale with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 10 being "strongly agree". Of the seventy-six respondents that answered this question, 37 % ($n=28$) of respondents chose 1 and strongly disagreed that their special learner training was

Table 25

Topics Related to Special Learner Training Which Respondents
Feel Should Have Been Discussed in Graduate Courses

Topic	Most Freq.	<i>n</i>	%
Adaptations/Strategies for Music Ed.	1	8	88.8%
Developing Goals and Objectives	1	8	88.8%
Classroom Management	2	7	77.7%
Medical Concerns	3	6	66.6%
Aspects of Different Disabilities	3	6	66.6%
Development of P. L. 94-142	3	6	66.6%
Writing IEPs	4	5	55.5%

adequate. Overall, 86% of the total respondents reported their special learner training was less than adequate (with a rating of less than 5). Fourteen percent of respondents reported that their special learner training was adequate or more than adequate (with a rating of 5-10). The highest rating on the Likert Scale was 9, reported by a respondent who began undergraduate training as a music therapist.

Hypothesis one, "There will be no discernible difference in special learner training based on the age of respondents," was partially rejected (see Tables 26 and 27). Of those respondents age 22-30 years old who held undergraduate degrees (*n*=12), 75% (*n*=9) had special learner training and 25% (*n*=3) did not have special learner training. Of those in this age group that also had graduate degrees (*n*=8), 13% (*n*=1) had special learner training and 87% (*n*=7) did not. In the 31-40 year old age group, of those with undergraduate degrees (*n*=25), 20% (*n*=5) had special learner training and 80% (*n*=20) did not have training. Of those with

graduate degrees ($n=17$), 18% had special learner training and 82% ($n=14$) did not. Of those respondents ages 41-50 ($n=34$), 9% ($n=3$) had special learner training and 91% ($n=31$) did not have training. Of those with graduate degrees ($n=28$), 11% ($n=3$) had special learner training and 89% ($n=25$) did not. Of those respondents

Table 26
Age of Respondents and Undergraduate
Special Learner Training

Age of Respondents	Training Yes/No	n	% of Respondents
22-30 ($n=12$)	Yes	9	75%
	No	3	25%
31-40 ($n=25$)	Yes	5	20%
	No	20	80%
41-50 ($n=34$)	Yes	3	9%
	No	31	91%
51-60 ($n=11$)	Yes	2	18%
	No	9	82%
60+ ($n=1$)	Yes	1	100%

ages 51-60 ($n=11$), 18% ($n=2$) had special learner training and 82% ($n=9$) had no training. Twenty-five percent ($n=2$) of those with graduate degrees ($n=8$) had special learner training and 75% ($n=6$) did not have any training. There was one respondent in the 60+ age group who had undergraduate special learner training, but no graduate training.

Table 27
Age of Respondents and Graduate
Special Learner Training

Age of Respondents	Training Yes/No	<u>n</u>	% of Respondents
22-30 (n=8)	Yes	1	13%
	No	7	87%
31-40 (n=17)	Yes	3	18%
	No	14	82%
41-50 (n=28)	Yes	3	11%
	No	25	89%
51-60 (n=8)	Yes	2	25%
	No	6	75%
60+ (n=0)			

Hypothesis two, "There will be no discernible difference in special learner training based on the sex of the respondents," was accepted (see Tables 28 and 29). In special learner training in undergraduate education, males ($\underline{n}=42$) and females ($\underline{n}=41$) had 21% and 24% training, respectively. Educational settings were similar for both of the groups. In graduate education, 12% ($\underline{n}=4$) of males received special learner training, while 18% ($\underline{n}=5$) of females had training. In graduate training, males had more training in special education classes. Female experiences included tutoring and a class designed to teach music to the special learner.

Hypothesis three, "There will be no discernible difference in special learner training among educators with less than ten years of experience, eleven to

Table 28
Undergraduate Special Learner Training Based on the
Sex of the Respondent (N=83)

Sex	n	Special Learner Training? Yes, setting?/ No	% of Respondents
Male	42	Yes, n=9 Music Ed (n=5) Special Ed (n=4) Music Therapy (n=1)	21%
		No, n=33	79%
Female	41	Yes, n=10 Music Ed (n=6) Special Ed (n=1) Music Therapy (n=1) Music for Sp. Lrnr (n=1) Special Ed School (n=1)	24%
		No, n=31	76%

twenty years of experience, and educators with more than twenty years of experience," was partially rejected. Respondents who taught 1-10 years had a higher percentage of special learner training in their undergraduate education (see Table 30,32,34). In all other age groups, the majority of respondents had no special learner training in undergraduate degrees (see Tables 32 and 34). In regards to graduate training, there was no age group which showed a discernible difference in special learner training (see Tables 31,33, and 35).

Hypothesis four, "There will be no discernible difference in undergraduate special learner training between those educators who received training at public, private, or religious-affiliated schools," was accepted. All respondents (N=83) received undergraduate degrees from either a state, private, or religious-affiliated

Table 29

Graduate Special Learner Training Based on the
Sex of the Respondent (N=61)

Sex	n	Special Learner Training? Yes, setting?/ No	% of Respondents
Male	34	Yes, n=4 Special Ed (n=2) General Ed (n=1) Music Therapy (n=1) No, n=30	12% 88%
Female	28	Yes, n=5 Music Ed (n=) Special Ed (n=1) Music Therapy (n=1) Music for Sp. Lrnr (n=1) Tutoring (n=1) No, n=23	18% 82%

Table 30

Undergraduate Special Learner Training (n=24) in
Regards to Teaching Experience (1-10 years)

Undergrad. Special Learner Training? Yes/No	n	% of Response	Settings
Yes	14	58%	Music Education, Special Education Music Therapy
No	10	41.6%	

college or university. Of those 51 respondents (71%) who attended state universities or colleges, only 27% (n=16) had special learner training in their

Table 31

Graduate Special Learner Training (n=16) in Regards
to Teaching Experience (1-10 years)

Graduate Special Learner Training? Yes/No	<u>n</u>	% of Response	Settings
Yes	2	12%	Special Education General Education
No	14	88%	

undergraduate programs. Of the 16 respondents (19%) who attended private universities or colleges, only 31.2% ($n=5$) had special learner training. Eight respondents (9.6%) attended religious-affiliated universities or colleges, and 25% ($n=2$) had special learner training (see Table 36).

Table 32

Undergraduate Special Learner Training (n=25) in Regards
to Teaching Experience (11-20 years)

Undergrad. Special Learner Training? Yes/No	<u>n</u>	% of Response	Settings
Yes	2	8%	Music Education
No	23	92%	

Hypothesis five, "There will be no discernible difference in graduate special learner training between those educators who received training at a state, private, or religious-affiliated universities," was accepted. Sixty-one respondents (73.4%) had

Table 33

Graduate Special Learner Training (n=20) in Regards
to Teaching Experience (11-20 years)

Graduate Special Learner Training? Yes/No	<u>n</u>	% of Response	Settings
Yes	2	10%	Tutoring Music for the Special Learner
No	18	90%	

Table 34

Undergraduate Special Learner Training (n=34) in Regards
to Teaching Experience (20+ years)

Undergrad. Special Learner Training? Yes/No	<u>n</u>	% of Response	Settings
Yes	4	12%	Music Education Music Therapy Special Education
No	30	88%	

graduate degrees or graduate experience. Of those 43 respondents (70.4%) who attended state universities or colleges, only 23.2% (n=10) had special learner training in their undergraduate programs. Of the 9 respondents (14.7%) who attended private universities or colleges, 44.4% (n=4) had special learner training. Nine respondents (14.7%) attended religious-affiliated universities or colleges, and 33.3% (n=3) had special learner training (see Table 37).

Table 35

Graduate Special Learner Training (n=27) in Regards
to Teaching Experience (20+ years)

Graduate Special Learner Training? Yes/No	n	% of Response	Settings
Yes	5	19%	Music Therapy Special Education Music Education
No	22	81%	

Table 36

Type of Undergraduate College/University Attended by Respondents (N=83)
and Relationship to Special Learner Training

Type of School	Those With Special Learner Training	% of Respondents
State (n=59)	16	27%
Private (n=16)	5	31.2%
Religious (n=8) Affiliation	2	25%

Hypothesis six, "There will be no discernible difference in special learner training between those educators with undergraduate degrees in music and no advanced degree and those with both undergraduate and graduate degrees in music," was accepted. Twenty-two of those respondents had only an undergraduate music degree; of that number, 27% (n=6) had special learner training. Seventy-three percent

Table 37

Type of Graduate College/University Attended by Respondents (N=61)
and Relationship to Special Learner Training

Type of School	Those With Special Learner Training	% of Respondents
State (n=43)	10	23.2%
Private (n=9)	4	44.4%
Religious (n=9) Affiliation	3	33.3%

($n=16$) did not have any special learner training in their undergraduate degree. Of those with both undergraduate and graduate degrees in music ($n=37$), 21.6% ($n=8$) had special learner training, and 78.3% ($n=29$) did not have any special learner training (see Table 38).

Hypothesis seven, "There will be no discernible difference in special learner training between those educators with both undergraduate and graduate music degrees and those with an undergraduate music degree and a graduate degree in a non-music area," was accepted. Of those respondents with undergraduate and graduate music degrees ($n=37$), 21.6% ($n=8$) had special learner training. Seventy-eight percent ($n=29$) did not have any special learner training in their undergraduate degree. Of those with an undergraduate degree in music and a graduate degree in a non-music area ($n=24$), 37.5% ($n=9$) had special learner training, and 62.5% ($n=15$) did not have any special learner training (see Table 39).

Hypothesis eight, "There will be no discernible difference in undergraduate special learner training between elementary and secondary educators," was accepted. Nineteen total respondents (24%) had special learner training in their

Table 38

Difference in Special Learner Training of Music Educators With No Advanced Degree (n=22) and Educators With Both Undergraduate and Graduate Degrees in Music (n=37)

Degree Type(s)	Special Learner Training? Yes/No	<u>n</u>	% of Response
Undergraduate Music Only	Yes	6	27%
	No	16	73%
Undergraduate and Graduate Degrees In Music	Yes	8	21.6%
	No	29	78.3%

Table 39

Difference in Special Learner Training of Music Educators With Undergraduate and Graduate Degrees in Music (n=37) and Educators With Undergraduate Degrees in Music and Graduate Degrees in a Non-Music Area (n=24)

Degree Type(s)	Special Learner Training? Yes/No	<u>n</u>	% of Response
Undergraduate and Graduate Degrees in Music	Yes	8	21.6%
	No	29	78.3%
Undergraduate Degree in Music and Graduate Degree in a Non-Music Area	Yes	9	37.5%
	No	15	62.5%

undergraduate education. Of those with special learner training that were currently teaching elementary music (n=5), 4 were teaching general music. One respondent with special learner training was teaching instrumental music. There were no

elementary choral respondents with special learner training. Of those with special learner training that were currently teaching secondary music ($n=5$), all were teaching middle school/junior high school instrumental music. Five secondary educators with special learner training were also teaching high school instrumental music. There was 1 respondent in the each of the following categories that had special learner training: middle school/junior high school general music, middle school/junior high school choral music, and high school choral music. Of those with special learner training that were currently teaching both secondary and elementary music ($n=9$, 47.3%), 9 respondents were involved in elementary general music, 4 in both middle school/ junior high school instrumental and choral, 3 in both high school instrumental and choral, and 2 in middle school/junior high school general music (see Table 40).

Hypothesis nine, "There will be no discernible difference in graduate special learner training between elementary and secondary educators," was accepted. Nine of 61 total respondents (14.7%) had special learner training in their graduate education. Of those with special learner training that were currently teaching elementary music ($n=3$), 2 of these were teaching general music. One with special learner training was teaching instrumental music. There were no elementary choral respondents with graduate special learner training. Of those with special learner training that were currently teaching secondary music ($n=4$), 4 were teaching middle school/junior high school and high school instrumental music. There was 1 respondent in the each of the following categories that had special learner training: middle school/junior high school general music, middle school/junior high school choral music, and high school choral music. Of those with special learner training that were currently teaching both secondary and elementary music ($n=2$), two respondents were involved in elementary general music. There was one respondent in

Table 40

Undergraduate Special Learner Training Between
Elementary and Secondary Educators (N=19)

Teaching Area	% of Respondents
<hr/>	
Elementary	
Had Special Learner Training (n=5)	26.3%
General (n=4)	
Instrumental (n=1)	
Did Not Have Special Learner Training (n=14)	73.7%
Secondary	
Had Special Learner Training (n=5)	26.3%
Middle/Jr. High Inst. (n=5)	
High School Inst. (n=5)	
Did Not Have Special Learner Training (n=14)	73.7%
Elementary/Secondary	
Had Special Learner Training (n=9)	47.3%
Elementary General (n=9)	
Middle/Jr High General (n=2)	
Middle/Jr High Inst. (n=4)	
Middle Jr. High Choral (n=4)	
High School Inst. (n=3)	
High School Choral (n=3)	
Did Not Have Special Learner Training (n=10)	52.7%
<hr/>	

each of the following categories: high school instrumental and high school choral (see Table 41).

Hypothesis ten, "There will be no discernible difference in undergraduate special learner training based on required or non-required observations," was accepted. Of those 19 respondents who received special learner training in their undergraduate degrees, only 8 (42.1%) were required to participate in observations

Table 41
Graduate Special Learner Training Between Elementary
and Secondary Educators (N=9)

Teaching Area	Special Learner Training Yes/No	% of Respondents
Elementary		
Had Special Learner Training (n=3)		33.3%
General (n=2)		
Instrumental (n=1)		
Did Not Have Special Learner Training (n=14)		66.6%
Secondary		
Had Special Learner Training (n=4)		44.4%
Middle/Jr. High Inst. (n=4)		
High School Inst. (n=4)		
Did Not Have Special Learner Training (n=14)		55.5%
Elementary/Secondary		
Had Special Learner Training (n=2)		22.2%
Elementary General (n=1)		
High School Inst. (n=1)		
High School Choral (n=1)		
Did Not Have Special Learner Training (n=10)		77.7%

of students with special needs (see Table 42). Undergraduate observations occurred in the following settings: music education class ($n=4$), school for special education ($n=3$), special education class, and a music therapy clinical ($n=1$). Some respondents were required to do observations in more than one setting. Twelve (57.9%) were not required to participate in observations.

Hypothesis eleven, "There will be no discernible difference in graduate special learner training based on required or non-required observations," was accepted. Of those 9 respondents who received special learner training in their graduate degrees,

only 3 were required to participate in observations of students with special needs (see Table 42). Graduate observations occurred in the following settings: music education class ($\underline{n}=2$) and special education class ($\underline{n}=1$). Six were not required

Table 42
Difference in Undergraduate and Graduate Special Learner Training
Based on Required and Non-Required Observations

Level of Education	Required/Non-Req. (\underline{n})	Percentage	Setting
Undergraduate ($N=19$)	Required, $n=8$	42%	Music Ed ($n=4$) Spec. Ed School ($n=3$) Special Ed ($n=2$) Music Therapy ($n=1$)
	Non-Req., $n=11$	58%	
Graduate ($N=9$)	Required, $n=3$	33%	Music Ed ($n=1$) Special Ed ($n=1$) Music Therapy ($n=1$)
	Non-Req., $n=6$	66.6%	

to participate in observations.

Hypothesis twelve, "There will be no discernible difference in undergraduate special learner training based on required or non-required "hands-on" observations," was accepted. Of those 19 respondents who received special learner training in their undergraduate degrees, only 5 were required to participate in "hands-on" observations of students with special needs (see Table 43). Undergraduate "hands-on" observations occurred in the following settings: music education class ($\underline{n}=3$) individual education session ($\underline{n}=1$), and a music therapy

clinical ($n=1$). Fourteen (73.6%) were not required to participate in "hands-on" observations.

Hypothesis thirteen, "There will be no discernible difference in graduate special learner training based on required or non-required "hands-on" observations," was accepted. Of those 9 respondents who received special learner training in their graduate degrees, only 2 (22.2%) were required to participate in "hands-on" observations of students with special needs (see Table 43). Graduate "hands-on" observations occurred in the following settings: music education class ($n=1$) and special education class ($n=1$). Seven(77.7%) were not required to participate in observations.

Table 43

Difference in Undergraduate and Graduate Special Learner Training
Based on Required and Non-Required "Hands-on" Observations

Level of Education	Required/Non-Req. (n)	Percentage	Setting
Undergraduate ($N=19$)	Required, $n=5$	26.3%	Music Ed ($n=3$) Individual Session ($n=1$) Music Therapy ($n=1$)
	Non-Req., $n=14$	73.6%	
Graduate ($N=9$)	Required, $n=2$	22.2%	Music Ed ($n=1$) Music Therapy ($n=1$)
	Non-Req., $n=7$	77.7%	

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the undergraduate and graduate special learner training of a sampling of Ohio music educators. The researcher also examined various aspects of the respondents' education such as type and size of school attended, amount of observation and "hands-on" experiences, and special education topics covered in undergraduate and graduate classrooms to see if these variables had any correlation with special learner training. Respondents were also asked to report on demographic information such as age, teaching experience, percentage and number of students with disabilities in their classrooms, types of disabilities seen, and areas of educational involvement (i.e. general, instrumental, choral). The number of males and females who participated in this survey, number of years of teaching, and areas of educational employment were fairly well-distributed among respondents. All age groups were represented.

Although the majority of respondents reported seeing very few students with disabilities in their music classrooms, the largest number of respondents worked in settings in which students with disabilities represented less than 5% of the classroom population. While this number is small, it is also possible that some respondents had students with disabilities in their classrooms but were unaware of their disabilities. This lack of awareness may be due to an absence of the students' special education labels or a lack of appropriate administrative support to provide music educators with information regarding students with disabilities. There may or may not be circumstances in which music educators are even told of a student's disability. Administration might feel that either the music educator is not an active part of the student's IEP team or has received information regarding the student's disability from the special educator.

Students are often not diagnosed with a disability and labeled as "special education" immediately upon entering the public school system. Special education labels may provide educators with information regarding a specific student's disability to more efficiently meet the student's needs. A potential drawback to special education labels is possible bias by the music educator or by other students in the classroom. Past research has suggested that music educators perceive that the music learning of students without disabilities may be negatively affected by special learners (Darrow & Johnson, 1994; Jellison & Gainer, 1992; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990; Force, 1983; Jellison, Brooks, & Huck, 1984; Elliot & Sins, 1981/82). This opinion of music educators may or may not influence the attitudes of students without disabilities.

According to prior research, administrative support is also critical to the success of mainstreaming in music education (Gfeller & Darrow, 1987). While administrators have advocated the need for music mainstreaming for students with disabilities (Atterbury, 1985), music educators are often not supported by administration in facilitating these placement decisions (Atterbury, 1986). Research supports the need for administrative support when special learners are included in the music classroom (Elliot & Sins, 1982/83; Force, 1983; Jellison, Brooks, & Huck; Madsen, Smith, & Feeman, 1988; Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990). Forty-three percent of respondents in the current study reported that all of their students with disabilities received special services. In effect, the larger the number of students provided with special services, the larger the number of special educators and support service personnel that should be available to the music educators without any special education background.

According to the respondents, students with learning disabilities (83%, n=69) were most frequently seen in the music classroom. Prior research has

indicated that those with learning disabilities are considered to be the easiest to integrate (Sideridis & Chandler, 1995). Music educators may possibly find this report encouraging as classroom adaptations and teaching strategies for students with learning disabilities might be less challenging than adaptations for students with more severe disabilities. It has also been suggested that elementary general music educators are more positive than secondary educators towards integrating students with learning disabilities into the music class (Sideridis & Chandler, 1995). Studies which addressed the attitudes of regular educators towards students with learning disabilities yielded similar results (Moore & Fine, 1987; Hannah & Pliner, 1983; Pilotte, 1990).

Respondents reported that students with Attention Deficit Disorder (80%, n=66) and emotional impairments (51%, n=42) were also frequently seen in the music classroom. Characteristics of these disabilities (e.g. refusal to participate and cooperate with others, shortened attended span, and consistently being off-task) may be misinterpreted as inappropriate classroom behaviors. Prior research has indicated that music educators (Hawkins, 1992; Wilson & McCrary, 1996) as well as regular educators (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987) are reluctant to include those students whose behavior adversely affects classroom management.

Respondents also reported that students with mental impairments (47%), and hearing impairments (42%) were often seen in the music classroom. Of these three, students with mental impairments may pose the greatest challenge in regards to communication. With a student with mental impairments, it is important to understand the students' means of communication (i.e. verbal, sign language, communication boards, picture symbols), medical concerns (i.e. seizures, prescribed medication), and approximate age at which the student is functioning mentally. This later factor is essential since most children with disabilities are placed in classrooms

according to their chronological age, not their mental age. Communication also is a potential concern with a child that has a hearing impairment. Does s/he use sign language? American Sign Language or Signed Exact English? Does s/he lip read? According to the information reported by respondents, 42% teach music to students with hearing impairments.

Many educators reported that, in special learner training, they would like to see more of an emphasis on medical concerns, adaptation and strategies for teaching the special learner, aspects of different disabilities, and developing goals and objectives. According to the current study, respondents reported working with students with visual impairments, spina bifida, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, and autism. Adaptations and strategies and aspects of these types of disabilities could be covered in a course or workshop specifically designed to assist the music educator in teaching those with special needs. A course which stresses the learning of special educators may help the educator and specifically address some of the special education issues which arise in the classroom.

The majority of respondents held Bachelor of Music or Bachelor of Music Education degrees (79%) and Master of Music or Master of Music Education degrees (54%) from a large state university. Only 24% of undergraduate respondents and 15% of graduate respondents had any special learner training. Given the trend toward more inclusive placements, especially in music, these seem to be low percentages. There are more students with disabilities mainstreamed and included in public school classrooms than ever before, and there needs to be more of an attempt to educate those specialists (i.e. music, physical education, art) who have an active role in educational planning on the characteristics and qualities of students with special needs. Prior research suggests that educators respond more positively to students with disabilities when they are knowledgeable about the student's disabilities

(Cassidy & Sims, 1991; Wilson & McCrary, 1996). Rather than face issues regarding special learners once the educator has begun professional work, music educators and other specialists may benefit from special learner training in their undergraduate and graduate programs.

Of those educators who did have special learner training, the majority of respondents reported learning about the needs of special learners in music education methods classes. Some respondents also learned about special learners in special education classes. Depending on the curriculum structure of the university program, these classes may have been chosen as electives. Courses in music for the special learner, music therapy-related courses, and tutoring a special learner may also have been electives or areas of interest to the respondent, even though few reported training in these areas. Of the 19 respondents who had undergraduate special learner training, only 9 were required to do observations of special learners and only 5 were required to participate in "hands-on" observations. At the graduate level, only 9 of the 61 respondents with graduate degrees had special learner training, 3 were required to observe and 2 were required to participate in "hands-on" experiences. Since it may be more beneficial to include observations and "hands-on" experience in all special learner training rather than only presenting material in a university classroom environment, music education students may benefit from actively participating with special learners. Prior research has also suggested the importance of hands-on experiences in working with special learners (Wilson & McCrary, 1996). Since many types of students have their own unique characteristics, it would be helpful to provide pre-service educators with practica to understand the difference in disabilities and to assist them in developing teaching strategies and adapting material for the special learner.

In addition to completing the formal survey, several respondents provided

comments regarding their experiences with special learner training. One respondent reported that she learned much about special learners at a school for special learners. This respondent spent an entire day with a music therapist, aiding and working "hands-on", and learned more in that one day than in any college course. This opinion might further support the need for increased interaction between music educators and music therapists. Another respondent expressed frustration about over-loaded schedules, with very little time to meet the special needs of these students. Prior research suggested a need for extra preparation time to more effectively adapt materials for special learners (Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990). This respondent reported that students with special needs are in her general music class for social reasons only. Jellison and Duke (1994) suggested that social behaviors were an important prerequisite to the success of students with disabilities in the regular music class. Another respondent reported that it was frustrating to have special learners put in a large class where it is impossible to give them individual help without compromising the integrity of the class, especially in a performance-oriented class. Results of one study (Robinson, 1994) support this opinion, stating that most unfavorable and nonproductive situations (54%) in a secondary choral setting were attributed to students with disabilities. The same respondent felt that it would be beneficial to have a classroom or one-to-one aide for these students to better serve their needs. According to prior research, additional assistance from support personnel and teacher aides was found to be limited. Two respondents learned about the special needs of specific students from the special educators in their school districts. Another respondent learned about working with special learners as an instructor in the military. S/he also received additional information from a nurse who was able to provide information with the abilities or limitations of a particular disability.

Eight-six percent of respondents surveyed feel that their special learner training in either undergraduate and graduate degrees was inadequate. Fourteen percent of respondents reported that their special learner training was adequate or more than adequate. All of the respondents (n=12) who reported more positively to their special learner training had training in undergraduate and graduate programs. The most positive rating on the Likert Scale was 9, reported by a respondent who began undergraduate training as a music therapist. The results of this study indicate that there is still a need to increase music educators' knowledge of special learners through observations, "hands-on" experiences, and courses geared toward special learner topics.

Results should be interpreted with caution since the number of completed responses was small. Therefore, the findings may not be representative of the majority of educators in the Ohio Music Educators' Association, other music educators in Ohio or in any other state. In addition, some modification of the survey instrument might possibly have yielded different results. Future researchers may wish to rephrase questions regarding special learner training so that they may be answered by all respondents. All respondents might have responded to a question which addressed topics which should have been covered in training programs. If respondents had been asked to report on areas of special learner training which could be addressed in future programming (i.e. location of observations, types of students with disabilities to observe, needed amount of observation and "hands-on" experience), respondents might have been able to provide the investigator with future research options. The investigator did not survey the respondents about other types of special learner training. Future researchers may wish to include a section which addresses workshop, seminar and conference special learner training. There may or may not have been respondents in the current study who received special learner training in

other than undergraduate or graduate settings.

Recommendations for Further Study

This survey was designed to provide information about special learner training and to generate ideas for future research. There are some areas which need continued investigation and may be the basis for other research.

One area which needs further exploration is the relationship between the public school music therapist and the music educator. How can the music therapist assist the music educator in integrating some of these students with special needs? Could consulting with a music therapist provide some useful information in a music education setting? An investigation into the co-leading and/or support of music educators and music therapists is recommended.

Another possible area of exploration is the development of college and university courses which provide information on special learners. Specifically, which colleges and universities have special learner training in their music education curriculum? Which programs require special education courses in addition to regular education courses as part of the music education curriculum?

Another potential survey topic is continuing education and workshop special learner training. Seminars or workshops may provide information on specific topics such as behavior management, writing goals and objectives for the student's IEP, and other topics which were addressed in this survey. There seems to be a need for new classroom approaches in integrating the child with special needs into a typical classroom environment.

Another beneficial area of research would regard the support of special services in public education. How can special services (i.e. music education, music therapy, special education, speech pathology, art and physical education) create a

more team-oriented approach in working with students with special needs? This type of focus would provide not only knowledge of different special learning styles, but would provide a more cohesive, supportive environment for both students and staff.

There appears to be a definite need for an increase in special learner training among music educators. Only through further research and continued professional development, will music educators be able to successfully meet the needs of all children, regardless of disability.

Appendix A
Special Learner Training Pilot Survey

Survey of Music Educators' Special Learner Training

Demographic Information (circle the appropriate answer)

1. Circle sex.

A. Male	B. Female
---------	-----------

2. Circle age.

A. 22-30	D. 51-60
B. 31-40	E. Over 61
C. 41-50	

3. Number of years teaching:

A. Less than 1 year	D. 10-20 years
B. 1-5 years	E. More than 20 years
C. 5-10 years	

4. Circle the areas of education in which you are involved.

A. Elementary general music (K-6)
B. Middle/Jr. high school general music (7-8)
C. Middle/Jr. high school instrumental music
D. Middle/Jr. high school choral music
E. High school instrumental music
F. High school choral music

5. Reflecting over your music classes that you taught this year, what percentage of your students had a disability?

A. 0-5%	D. 21-30%
B. 6-10%	E. Don't know
C. 11-20%	

6. Indicate the types of disabilities that the children have. Check all that apply to your current teaching situation.

__ Mental impairment __ Attention Deficit Disorder __ Emotional disturbances __ Visual impairments __ Spina bifida __ Other _____ __ Don't know	__ Cerebral palsy __ Autism __ Hearing impairments __ Cystic fibrosis __ Learning disabilities
---	--

7. Of those children with disabilities, how many of them are receiving special education services?

A.	None	E.	7 - 8
B.	1 - 2	F.	All
C.	3 - 4	G.	Don't know if they receive services
D.	5 - 6		

PART I- UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING INFORMATION

8. From what type of college/university did you receive your undergraduate education?

A. State B. Private C. Church

9. What was the approximate size of the school?

A.	up to 4,999	D.	20,000-29,999
B.	5,000-9,999	E.	30,000+
C.	10,000-19,999		

10. Circle degree type(s) that you received.

A. Bachelor of Music (BM)
 B. Bachelor of Arts (BA)
 C. Other _____

11. Areas of certification:

A.	Grades K-6	D.	Grades K-12
B.	Grades K-8	E.	Not certified to teach music
C.	Grades 5-12		

Special Learner Training

12. Did you receive any training for working with special learners during your undergraduate education?

A. Yes (Please answer Questions 13-18)
 B. No (Go to Part II, Question 19)

13. In what undergraduate setting did this training occur? (Circle all that apply)

A. Special education class
 B. Music education methods class
 C. Music therapy class
 D. Class designed to teach music to the special learner
 E. Other (Please specify) _____

14. Were observations of students with disabilities required?
- A. Yes B. No
15. If you answered Yes to Question #14, in what setting were the observations held?
- A. Music education class (i.e. general music, performing group, etc.)
 B. Special education class (i.e. self-contained, remedial instruction, etc.)
 C. Music therapy session
 D. Other (Please specify)_____
-
16. Were "hands on" experiences with students with disabilities required?
- A. Yes B. No
- Check type of setting:
 ___ Music education class
 ___ Special education class
 ___ Individual session (pull-out from classroom)
17. What information was covered in undergraduate coursework? (Circle all that apply).
- A. Classroom management techniques
 B. Aspects of different disabilities
 C. Writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs)
 D. Medical concerns of those with disabilities (i.e. seizure information, medication information, etc.)
 E. Adaptations and strategies for the music education setting
 F. Developing goals and objectives for the special learner
 G. Development and implementation of P.L. 94-142
 H. Other (Please specify)_____
18. What classes or topics related to special learners do you feel should have been included in your undergraduate training? Please check each that you feel should have been included.
- A. Classroom management techniques
 B. Aspects of different disabilities
 C. Writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs)
 D. Medical concerns of those with disabilities (i.e. seizure information, medication information, etc.)
 E. Adaptations and strategies for the music education setting
 F. Developing goals and objectives for the special learner
 G. Development and implementation of P.L. 94-142
 H. Other (Please specify)_____

PART II- GRADUATE TRAINING INFORMATION

Please complete the following questions if you have taken any graduate coursework or have completed a graduate degree. If you have not taken any graduate classes, please skip to Question #29.

19. From what type of college/university did you receive your graduate education?
- A. State B. Private C. Church
20. What was the approximate size of the school?
- A. up to 4,999 B. 5,000-9,999 C. 10,000-19,999
- D. 20,000-29,999 E. 30,000+
21. Circle degree type(s) that you have received or are currently pursuing.
- A. Master of Music Education (MME)
- B. Master of Music (MM)
- C. Other advanced degrees (Please specify) _____

Special Learner Training

22. Did you receive any training for working with special learners in your graduate coursework?
- A. Yes (Please complete rest of questionnaire)
- B. No (Go to Question #29)
23. In what graduate setting did this training occur? (Circle all that apply)
- A. Special education class
- B. Music education methods class
- C. Music therapy class
- D. Class designed to teach music to the special learner
- E. Other (Please specify) _____
24. Were observations of students with disabilities required?
- A. Yes B. No
25. If you answered Yes to Question #24, in what setting were the observations held?
- A. Music education class (i.e. general music, performing group, etc.)
- B. Special education class (i.e. self-contained, remedial instruction, etc.)
- C. Music therapy session
- D. Other (Please specify) _____

26. Were "hands on" experiences with students with disabilities required?

A. Yes

B. No

Check type of setting:

___ Music education class

___ Special education class

___ Individual session (pull-out from classroom)

27. What information was covered in graduate coursework? (Circle all that apply).

A. Classroom management techniques

B. Aspects of different disabilities

C. Writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs)

D. Medical concerns of those with disabilities (i.e. seizure information, medication information, etc.)

E. Adaptations and strategies for the music education setting

F. Developing goals and objectives for the special learner

G. Development and implementation of P.L. 94-142

H. Other (Please specify) _____

28. What classes or topics related to special learners do you feel should have been included in your graduate training? Please check each that you feel should have been included.

A. Classroom management techniques

B. Aspects of different disabilities

C. Writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs)

D. Medical concerns of those with disabilities (i.e. seizure information, medication information, etc.)

E. Adaptations and strategies for the music education setting

F. Developing goals and objectives for the special learner

G. Development and implementation of P.L. 94-142

H. Other (Please specify) _____

29. Overall, I feel as though I received adequate training in regards to special learners.

Strongly disagree

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Strongly agree

10

Appendix B

Special Learner Training Pilot Study Cover Letter



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

August, 1995

Dear Music Educator:

As the number of children with disabilities in the music classroom increases, there is growing interest regarding the special learner training of music educators.

As part of my graduate coursework at Western Michigan University, I am interested in learning more about the special learner training of music educators at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Prior to sending out a formal survey, I want to pilot test one on a small number of music educators. Please take a few minutes to complete the pilot survey and in addition, provide feedback on the clarity, content and comprehension of questions asked. This information will assist me in making the formal survey more effective. The survey will eventually provide information on educational training, experience with special learners, and areas of education which need to be further addressed. Please return the pilot survey on or before August 25, 1995 in the stamped envelope provided.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (309) 762-2548. Thank you for your time and willingness to assist me. It is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dorianne J. Nicholson, BMed, RMT

Appendix C
Special Learner Training Final Survey

Survey of Music Educators' Special Learner Training

Demographic Information (circle the appropriate answer)

1. Circle sex.

A. Male	B. Female
---------	-----------

2. Circle age.

A. 22-30	D. 51-60
B. 31-40	E. Over 61
C. 41-50	

3. Number of years teaching:

A. Less than 1 year	D. 10-20 years
B. 1-5 years	E. More than 20 years
C. 5-10 years	

4. Circle the areas of education in which you are involved.
 - A. Elementary general music (K-6)
 - B. Middle/Jr. high school general music (7-8)
 - C. Middle/Jr. high school instrumental music
 - D. Middle/Jr. high school choral music
 - E. High school instrumental music
 - F. High school choral music

5. Reflecting over your music classes that you taught this year, what percentage of your students had a disability?

A. 0-5%	D. 21-30%
B. 6-10%	E. Don't know
C. 11-20%	

6. Indicate the types of disabilities that the children have. Check all that apply to your current teaching situation.

___ Mental impairment	___ Cerebral palsy
___ Attention Deficit Disorder	___ Autism
___ Emotional disturbances	___ Hearing impairments
___ Visual impairments	___ Cystic fibrosis
___ Spina bifida	___ Learning disabilities
___ Other _____	
___ Don't know	

7. Of those children with disabilities, how many of them are receiving special education services?
- | | |
|----------|--|
| A. None | E. 7 - 8 |
| B. 1 - 2 | F. All |
| C. 3 - 4 | G. Don't know if they receive services |
| D. 5 - 6 | |

PART I- UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING INFORMATION

8. From what type of college/university did you receive your undergraduate education?
- A. State B. Private C. Religious Affiliation
9. What was the approximate size of the school?
- | | |
|------------------|------------------|
| A. up to 4,999 | D. 20,000-29,999 |
| B. 5,000-9,999 | E. 30,000+ |
| C. 10,000-19,999 | |
10. Circle degree type(s) that you received.
- A. Bachelor of Music (BM)
 B. Bachelor of Arts (BA)
 C. Other _____
11. Areas of certification:
- | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| A. Grades K-6 | D. Grades K-12 |
| B. Grades K-8 | E. Not certified to teach music |
| C. Grades 5-12 | |

Special Learner Training

12. Did you receive any training for working with special learners during your undergraduate education?
- A. Yes (Please answer Questions 13-18)
 B. No (Go to Part II, Question 19)
13. In what undergraduate setting did this training occur? (Circle all that apply)
- A. Special education class
 B. Music education methods class
 C. Music therapy class
 D. Class designed to teach music to the special learner
 E. Other (Please specify) _____

14. Were observations of students with disabilities required?
- A. Yes B. No
15. If you answered Yes to Question #14, in what setting were the observations held?
- A. Music education class (i.e. general music, performing group, etc.)
 B. Special education class (i.e. self-contained, remedial instruction, etc.)
 C. Music therapy session
 D. Other (Please specify)_____
16. Were "hands on" experiences with students with disabilities required?
- A. Yes B. No
- Check type of setting:
 ___ Music education class
 ___ Special education class
 ___ Individual session (pull-out from classroom)
17. What information was covered in undergraduate coursework? (Circle all that apply).
- A. Classroom management techniques
 B. Aspects of different disabilities
 C. Writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs)
 D. Medical concerns of those with disabilities (i.e. seizure information, medication information, etc.)
 E. Adaptations and strategies for the music education setting
 F. Developing goals and objectives for the special learner
 G. Development and implementation of P.L. 94-142
 H. Other (Please specify)_____
18. What classes or topics related to special learners do you feel should have been included in your undergraduate training? Please check each that you feel should have been included.
- A. Classroom management techniques
 B. Aspects of different disabilities
 C. Writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs)
 D. Medical concerns of those with disabilities (i.e. seizure information, medication information, etc.)
 E. Adaptations and strategies for the music education setting
 F. Developing goals and objectives for the special learner
 G. Development and implementation of P.L. 94-142
 H. Other (Please specify)_____

PART II- GRADUATE TRAINING INFORMATION

Please complete the following questions if you have taken any graduate coursework or have completed a graduate degree. If you have not taken any graduate classes, please skip to Question #29.

19. From what type of college/university did you receive your graduate education?
- A. State B. Private C. Religious Affiliation
20. What was the approximate size of the school?
- A. up to 4,999 B. 5,000-9,999 C. 10,000-19,999
- D. 20,000-29,999 E. 30,000+
21. Circle degree type(s) that you have received or are currently pursuing.
- A. Master of Music Education (MME)
 B. Master of Music (MM)
 C. Other advanced degrees (Please specify) _____

Special Learner Training

22. Did you receive any training for working with special learners in your graduate coursework?
- A. Yes (Please complete rest of questionnaire)
 B. No (Go to Question #29)
23. In what graduate setting did this training occur? (Circle all that apply)
- A. Special education class
 B. Music education methods class
 C. Music therapy class
 D. Class designed to teach music to the special learner
 E. Other (Please specify) _____
24. Were observations of students with disabilities required?
- A. Yes B. No
25. If you answered Yes to Question #24, in what setting were the observations held?
- A. Music education class (i.e. general music, performing group, etc.)
 B. Special education class (i.e. self-contained, remedial instruction, etc.)
 C. Music therapy session
 D. Other (Please specify) _____

26. Were "hands on" experiences with students with disabilities required?

A. Yes

B. No

Check type of setting:

___ Music education class

___ Special education class

___ Individual session (pull-out from classroom)

27. What information was covered in graduate coursework? (Circle all that apply).

A. Classroom management techniques

B. Aspects of different disabilities

C. Writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs)

D. Medical concerns of those with disabilities (i.e. seizure information, medication information, etc.)

E. Adaptations and strategies for the music education setting

F. Developing goals and objectives for the special learner

G. Development and implementation of P.L. 94-142

H. Other (Please specify) _____

28. What classes or topics related to special learners do you feel should have been included in your graduate training? Please check each that you feel should have been included.

A. Classroom management techniques

B. Aspects of different disabilities

C. Writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs)

D. Medical concerns of those with disabilities (i.e. seizure information, medication information, etc.)

E. Adaptations and strategies for the music education setting

F. Developing goals and objectives for the special learner

G. Development and implementation of P.L. 94-142

H. Other (Please specify) _____

29. Overall, I feel as though I received adequate training in regards to special learners.

Strongly disagree

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Strongly agree

10

Appendix D
Special Learner Training Final Survey Cover Letters



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

November, 1995

Dear Music Educator:

As the number of children with disabilities in the music classroom increases, there is a growing interest in the special learner training of music educators.

As part of my graduate coursework at Western Michigan University, I am interested in learning more about the special learner training of music educators at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The enclosed survey is designed to provide information on educational training, experience with special learners, and areas of education which need to be further addressed. It will take only a few minutes to complete. Please return the questionnaire on or before November 25, 1995 in the stamped envelope provided.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (309) 762-2548 or Brian Wilson, Director of Music Therapy, at (616) 387-4679. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at (616) 387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at (616) 387-8298 with any concerns that you may have. Thank you for your time and willingness to assist me. It is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dorianne J. Nicholson, BME, RMT



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

January, 1996

Dear Music Educator:

Several weeks ago, you received a survey which addressed the special learner training of music educators. This survey is designed to provide information on educational training, experience with special learners, and areas of education which need to be further addressed. The greater the number of surveys returned, the more valid the results of the study will be.

I have enclosed another copy of the survey which was mailed in November. Please take a few minutes to complete it and return it in the envelope provided by January 25, 1996.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (309) 762-2548 or Brian Wilson, Director of Music Therapy, at (616) 387-4679. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at (616) 387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at (616) 387-8298 with any concerns that you may have. Thank you for your time and willingness to assist me. It is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dorianne J. Nicholson, BME, RMT

Appendix E

Approval Form for the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Date: May 8, 1995

To: Nicholson, Dorianne J.

From: Richard Wright, Interim Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 95-05-06

Richard A. Wright

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "A survey of music educators' special learner training" has been **approved** under the **exempt** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you must seek specific approval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: May 8, 1996

xc: Wilson, Brian, MUS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alley, J. M. (1977). Education for the severely handicapped: The role of music therapy. Journal of Music Therapy, 14(2), 50-57.
- Alley, J. M. (1979). Music in the IEP: Therapy/Education. Journal of Music Therapy, 16(3), 111-127.
- Atterbury, B. (1985). Musical differences in learning disabled and normal achieving readers, aged seven, eight, and nine. Psychology of Music, 13(2), 114-123.
- Atterbury, B. (1986). A survey of present mainstreaming practices in the southern United States. Journal of Music Therapy, 23(4), 202-207.
- Atterbury, B. (1990). Mainstreaming exceptional learners in music. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Babbie, E. R. (1990). (2nd Ed.) Survey research methods. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Biklen, D. (1992). Schooling without labels. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cassidy, J. W. & Sims, W. L. (1991). Effects of special education labels on peers' and adults' evaluations of a handicapped youth choir. Journal of Research in Music Education, 39(1), 23-34.
- Darrow, A. A. (1990, Fall/Winter). Research on mainstreaming in music education. Update MENC, 35-37.
- Darrow, A. A. (1993). The role of music in deaf culture: Implications for music educators. Journal of Research in Music Education, 41(2), 93-110.
- Darrow, A. A., & Gfeller, K. (1991). A study of public school music programs mainstreaming hearing impaired students. Journal of Music Therapy, 28(1), 23-39.
- Darrow, A. A., & Johnson, C. M. (1994). Junior and senior high school music students' attitudes toward individuals with a disability. Journal of Music Therapy, 31(4), 266-279.
- Ellett, L. (1993). Instructional practices in mainstreamed secondary classrooms. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 26(1), 57-64.

- Elliot, C. A., & Sins, N. J. (1982/83). Attitudes and opinions of middle school music students toward the presence of handicapped peers in music classes. Contributions to Music Education, 9, 48-59.
- Force, B. (1983). The effects of mainstreaming on the learning of nonretarded children in an elementary music classroom. Journal of Music Therapy, 20(1), 2-13.
- Frisque, J., Neibur, L., & Humphreys, J. T. (1994). Music mainstreaming: Practices in Arizona. Journal of Research in Music Education, 42(2), 94-104.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (1995). Counterpoint: Special education- ineffective? Immoral? Exceptional Children, 61(3), 303-306.
- Gfeller, K., & Darrow, A.A. (1987). Ten years of mainstreaming: Where are we now?. Music Educators' Journal, 74(2), 27-30.
- Gfeller, K., Darrow, A. A., & Hedden, S. K. (1990). Perceived effectiveness of mainstreaming in Iowa and Kansas schools. Journal of Research in Music Education, 38(2), 90-101.
- Gilbert, J. P. & Asmus, E. P. (1981). Mainstreaming: Music educators' participation and professional needs. Journal of Research in Music Education, 29(1), 31-37.
- Hannah, M. E., & Pliner, S. (1983). Teacher attitudes toward handicapped children: A review and syntheses. School Psychology Review, 12(1), 12-25.
- Hawkins, G. (1992). Attitudes toward mainstreaming students with disabilities among regular elementary music and physical educators. Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 3245A.
- Hughes, J. E., Robbins, B. J., & King, R. J. (1988). A survey of perception and attitudes of exceptional student educators toward music therapy services in a county-wide school district. Journal of Music Therapy, 25(4), 216-222.
- Jellison, J. A., Brooks, B. H., & Huck, A. M. (1984). Structuring small groups and music reinforcement to facilitate positive interactions and acceptance of severely handicapped students in the regular music classroom. Journal of Research in Music Education, 32(4), 243-264.
- Jellison, J. A., & Duke, R. A. (1994). The mental retardation label: Music teachers' and prospective teachers' expectations for children's social and music behaviors. Journal of Music Therapy, 31(3), 166-185.
- Jellison, J. A., & Flowers, P. J. (1991). Talking about music: Interviews with disabled and nondisabled students. Journal of Research in Music Education, 39(4), 322-333.

- Jellison, J. A., & Gainer, E. W. (1992). Into the mainstream: A case study of a disabled child's participation in music therapy and music education. Texas Music Education Research, 38-46.
- Jellison, J. A. & Wolfe, D. E. (1987). Educators' ratings of selected objectives for severely handicapped or gifted students in the regular music classroom. Contributions to Music Education, 14, 36-41.
- Johnson, C. L. (1990). How well does mainstreaming work? Music Educators' Journal, 76(8), p. 50.
- Kubicek, F. C. (1994). Special education reform in light of select state and federal court decisions. Journal of Special Education, 28(1), 27-42.
- Madsen, C. F., Smith, D. S., & Feeman, C. C. (1988). The use of music in cross-age tutoring with special education settings. Journal of Music Therapy, 25(3), 135-144.
- Moore, J., & Fine, M. J. (1978). Regular and special class teachers' perceptions of normal and exceptional children and their attitudes toward mainstreaming. Psychology in the Schools, 15(2), 253-259.
- Pilotte, D. (1990). How well does mainstreaming work? Music Educators' Journal, 76(8), p. 52.
- Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53, 391-398.
- Robinson, C. R. (1994, November). Choral music educators' beliefs about the causes of success and failure of mainstreamed students in music. Paper presented at the National Association for Music Therapy Conference, Orlando, FL.
- Sailor, W., Gee, K., Graham, N., Goetz, L. (1995). Use of integrated, general education, and community settings as primary contexts for skill instruction for students with severe, multiple disabilities. Behavior Modification, 19(1), 33-58.
- Semmel, M. I., Abernathy, T. V., Butera, G., & Lesar, S. (1991). Teacher perceptions of the regular education initiative. Exceptional Children, 58(1), 9-24.
- Shea, T. M., & Bauer, A. M. (1994). Learners with Disabilities. Madison: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.
- Sideridis, G. D., & Chandler, J. P. (1995). Attitudes and characteristics of general music teachers toward integrating children with developmental disabilities. Update, 11-15.

- Smith, D. D., & Luckasson, R. (1992). Introduction to Special Education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Smith, D. D., & Luckasson, R. (1995). Introduction to Special Education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Stephens, T. M., & Braun, B. L. (1980). Measures of regular classroom teachers' attitudes toward handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 46, 292-294.
- Vaughn, S., & Schumm, J. S. (1995). Responsible inclusion for students with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28(5), 264-270.
- White, L. D. (1981/82). Study of the attitudes of selected public school music educators toward the integration of handicapped students into music classes. Contributions to Music Education, 9, 36-47.
- Wilson, B. & McCrary, J. (1996). The effect of instruction on music educators' attitudes towards students with disabilities. Journal of Research in Music Education, 44(1), 26-33.
- Wolery, M., Werts, M. G., Caldwell, N. K., Snyder, E. D., & Lisowski, L. (1995). Experienced teachers' perceptions of resources and support for inclusion. Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 30(1), 15-26.
- Yell, M. L. (1995). Least restrictive environment, inclusion, and students with disabilities: A legal analysis. Journal of Special Education, 28(4), 389-404.
- York, J. & Tundidor, M. (1995). Issues raised in the name of inclusion: Perspectives of educators, parents, and students. Journal of the Association for Persons With Severe Handicaps, 20(1), 31-44.