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THE CHANGE IN THE STATUS OF THE SPECIAL MUSIC
TEACHER IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF
CALIFORNIA - 1966 to 1971

Abstract of Dissertation

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to determine whether the status
of the Elementary Special Music Teacher (ESMT) had changed during the 5
year period, 1966 to 1971, and to identify possible pressures that had
effects upon that change.

Procedures: In order to determine change in status, a 1966 survey con­
ducted by Dr. Lawrence McQuerrey of the University of the Pacific was
replicated in 1971 for comparison purposes. In order to determine possible
pressures affecting change, data were obtained through an extension of the
1966 questionnaire form. The survey population included all unified and
non-unified school districts of 200 ADA or more in the state of California.
The population was divided into four size categories as follows: districts
containing 1 to 5 schools, districts containing 6 to 15 schools, districts
containing 16 to 30 schools, and districts containing 31 or more schools.

A ten percent sample, stratified by size category, was interviewed by tele­
phone to validate the responses to the questionnaire and to probe further
into the reasons for change. Findings and conclusions were based on a 78
percent return of the total population of which 83 percent was replicated.

Findings and Conclusions: 1. Between 1966 and 1971, the data showed an
overall decrease of 4.7 percent in the number of school districts that em­
ployed ESMT's. School districts in the 6-15 size category showed a 9 per­
cent decrease.

The overall decrease of 4.7 percent, while moderate, is serious enough to
indicate the need of careful monitoring in the future. School districts
in the 6-15 size category with a 9 percent decrease appear to have special
problems.

2. Between 1966 and 1971, the data showed that 11.5 percent more
school districts reported that ESMT's were teaching all elementary grades
(K-6).

Considering the apparent decrease in the number of ESMT's and the increase
in the number of grades serviced, there appears to be a danger that ESMT's
are being spread too thinly.

3. Between 1966 and 1971, the data showed an 8 percent decrease
in the overall number of districts reporting a district-wide policy re­
garding the amount of music instruction per week. More of the 6-15 size
category districts had a district-wide policy than all other size categories
combined.
Abstract of Dissertation Cont'd.

4. Between 1966 and 1971, the data showed an 8 percent decrease in the districts, and a 20 percent decrease in the actual number of music supervisors employed. This represents a rather serious loss of music supervisory personnel and should have immediate attention.

More than half (56 percent) of the districts reporting the employment of music supervisors were in the 6-15 size category. The various findings in the 6-15 size category only imply a possible trend toward music instruction by classroom teachers with music supervisory help.

Extension and Interview Data: 1. Sixty-five percent of the districts reported that financial pressures were the major factor affecting the employment of the ESMT. Three other factors were reported by approximately one-fourth of the districts. They included pressures by community groups (30 percent), change or loss of music personnel (27 percent), and legislation (23 percent).

Community pressure groups provide a strong impact on administrator's decisions in music and support the need for a strong public relations program at the community level. Attrition and personality factors in music personnel affect administrative decision and require careful attention. Legislation affects administrative decisions in music and suggests the need for continued communication between music educators and legislators.

2. The interview data supported and agreed with the data obtained from the responses to the questionnaires and indicated a high validity to questionnaire responses.

3. Specialist teachers in art, drama, and P.E. were subjected to the same pressures and were in approximately the same employment status as were the ESMT's.

The data from the total study indicate that the status of the ESMT is slightly weaker in 1971 than it was in 1966.
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Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

INTRODUCTION

"Music is of the essence of humanness, not only because man creates it, but also because he creates his relationship to it."¹

Man has special human qualities. Characteristic of these qualities is man's unique ability to function beyond the limits of animal adaptation, hence man needs additional fulfilment and gratification beyond basic subsistence levels. The human nervous system serves the function of receiving, sorting and monitoring certain impulses and stimuli. It serves to synthesize man's daily experiences into aesthetic constructs. Man cannot escape aesthetic constructs,² having a natural predilection for organizing the environment into an aesthetically significant order. He is forced to perceive things, rather than merely utilize them and pass on to the next experience without reaction and synthesis.

The aesthetic experience is one of the devices that man uses in adjusting and adapting to his environment.³ It allows man to mentally manipulate the conditions under which he has to function. He can rearrange or reject certain stimuli and can select the manner in which he


²Ibid. ³Ibid.
wishes to respond.

Music has order and predictability to satisfy the need to comprehend the tonal beauty that man hears. It appeals to man's need for the gratification which can be derived from a feeling of accomplishment and mastery. This gratification is further increased as man's capacity to control the availability of aesthetic richness through music is increased. Part of the continuing developmental process is man's need to grow, to have new experiences, to derive a sense of satisfaction from increased control over the environment and those elements that comprise the environment.

Along with the other fine arts, music can reach close to the social, psychological and physiological roots of man in his search for identity and self-realization. This means that music is a social art. It brings listener and performer together and enables them to share a common experience, each deriving from it that which he is able and prepared to receive. Music provides release, fulfillment and stimulus. Release is derived from the opportunity one is provided through expression. Fulfillment comes from the satisfaction and gratification derived from accomplishments and mastery. Stimulus is provided when a person is motivated towards greater accomplishments as the result of previous successes and fulfillment.

---


Instruction in music affords a continuity with the aesthetic tradition in man's history. Consequently, it becomes educational when succeeding generations are assisted in becoming critically intelligent about musical form and style; about the organization and design of sounds; and about the social, emotional and physical phenomena which characterize music as an art form.\(^7\) Music can contribute much to the goal of building personal identity, the art of living, in nurturing creativity, and since these are the major goals of education, music should be placed in the core of the school curriculum.\(^8\)

There is another justification for music. Music, in itself, is an intellectual activity and it serves a further purpose of contributing to the major goals of education. As Nye and Nye suggest, since music has as much intellectual content as any other area of education, it can serve intellectual development equally as well.\(^9\) Nye and Nye consider music to be qualified as an educational subject whenever it provides with clarity more of what the learner needs than he is able to absorb informally from his environment.\(^10\)

Participants in the Tanglewood Symposium had some additional thoughts regarding the function of music in society, namely, that the increased hours of non-work, coupled with the lengthening of human life and the higher level of education of adults, would provide a background for continuing education in the arts. Furthermore, the increased specialization in occupations and the relative anonymity of modern life

---

\(^7\)McMurray, loc. cit.

\(^8\)Nye and Nye, op. cit., p. 6.

\(^9\)Ibid.

\(^10\)Ibid., p. 4.
afford greater opportunity for the arts to serve in helping the individual find meaning in human life.\textsuperscript{11} Therefore, the role of music in the life of adults and in society in general seems clear.

Ellison suggests that children need music because their full growth and development depend in part on a vital experience in the area of creative arts.\textsuperscript{12} Leonhard and House support this contention when they say that music provides an important creative medium for children's expression, making it necessary in their day-to-day development. According to them, all children need music. Therefore, music should be available to every child in the elementary school because of its universal appeal to everyone's aesthetic sense.\textsuperscript{13} Reimer concurs. He suggests that children universally respond to creative motivation and that the gratification of this need for creativity is essential. He further advises that the successful music education program address itself to these needs, which means that the music education program then serves a dual obligation to society, and it must serve to develop the aesthetic sensitivity to music of all people.\textsuperscript{14}

Reimer points out the fact that the key to effective aesthetic education is the teacher. The teacher "opens the door" to greater


musical awareness, in a sense, unlocking the doors to the world of music. However, there is considerable controversy over who should teach music in the elementary school. Reimer concludes his point by declaring that to be an effective aesthetic educator in music requires aesthetic and pedagogical insight and expertise far beyond the casual amateur-musician level. The musically unsophisticated will encounter difficulty in guiding the aesthetic development of the school child. Since the music teacher has the responsibility of helping the child learn to understand music, the teacher must be artistically competent and have developed the necessary skills for working with students.

As Leonhard and House state, the music teacher must be able to instruct his student in technical points and make the student aware of subtleties of interpretation. This requires that the teacher have achieved considerable skill in performance.

Leonhard and House further suggest that the teacher must have the background of theoretical and historical understanding which he can use in revealing music to his students, and that the actual preparation for teaching music is a massive undertaking and should be considered strongly vocational, undertaken only after a wide musical background has been developed.

15 Ibid.
16 Ibid., p. 111.
17 Leonhard and House, op. cit., p. 167.
18 Ibid.
Reference to "strongly vocational preparation" for elementary music teaching, suggests that a specific preparation and training for specialization in elementary music teaching is needed. Nye\textsuperscript{19} concurs with the belief that a strong specialization in elementary school music teaching is necessary. However, in California, such specialization was uncommon at the time that the 1971 survey was conducted. Most elementary music teachers were teaching with either the Special Secondary in Music credential or with the Standard Elementary credential. The Special Secondary in Music credential authorized the teaching of music at both the elementary and secondary school levels. Further, as in the cases explained by Nye\textsuperscript{20} most music teacher training curricula do not allow for specialization at the elementary level.

An additional deterrent to the availability and subsequent proper utilization of the elementary music specialist in California is the fact that the State of California did not subsidize the elementary special music teacher. As McQuerrey put it, any teachers employed in this capacity were employed at the option of the local school district and had to be paid from local school district funds.\textsuperscript{21} Likewise, the state did not set standards for, or accept responsibility for, how much music was to be taught at the elementary level.


\textsuperscript{20}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{21}Lawrence H. McQuerrey, "The Status of the Special Music Teacher in the Elementary Schools of California" (unpublished study conducted by the Department of Music Education, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California, 1966), p. 1.
Teacher training institutions for elementary music educators had no counterpart to relate to vis-a-vis manpower training requirements at the State Board of Education level. In order to fulfill their responsibilities to the profession regarding adequate training for elementary general music teachers, music teacher training institutions started to develop training programs for elementary general music teachers, and began advising potential music majors to take the program. However, as McQuerrey pointed out, some vital questions were apparent for both the colleges who develop the supply, and for the public schools who create the demand. Two of the vital questions were as follows: (1) what was the 1966 status of the elementary special music teacher (ESMT) in the elementary schools of California, and (2) what was the reason for the 1966 status of the elementary special music teacher?

To answer the first vital question, the Department of Music Education at the University of the Pacific conducted a survey of the unified and non-unified school districts of California in 1966. The survey was designed to determine the status of the ESMT in the unified and non-unified school districts of California. The mail questionnaire method was used to obtain information from the districts. Specific questions were asked to determine the number of ESMT's employed by the districts, the manner in which the teachers were being used; and the district's future plans for utilizing elementary special music teachers.

The conclusion of the McQuerrey study was that, in 1966 the ESMT was being used enough to justify limited recruitment and training by supply agencies, although, nearly one-third of California school programs

\[22\text{Ibid.} \quad 23\text{Ibid.}\]
could be considered musically deprived. 24

This study is a follow-up study. The purpose of this follow-up study is to determine the current status of elementary special music teachers.

Additionally, this study will survey the unified and non-unified school districts of California to determine the reasons for the current status of the ESM teacher.

The Problem

The problem of this study is to determine whether or not there have been changes in the status of the ESMT as defined in the 1966 study by McQuerrey and ascertain the reason for these changes.

Sub-problems. The sub-problems of this study are as follows:

1. To determine whether there was a change in the status of the ESMT in the unified and non-unified school districts of California between 1966 and 1971.

2. If any change is noted, to make a determination regarding the nature of the change, the extent of the change, and the reason for the change.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

This study is important for teacher training institutions and for school districts. Teacher training institutions will be able to determine whether or not there is a demand for the services of ESM teachers and will

24 Ibid., p. 16.
be able to obtain indications of ways in which these ESM teachers are used. Since much criticism has been leveled at teacher training institutions for being out of touch with the day-to-day situations in which their "products" are expected to function, this study will provide some much needed feedback to these institutions regarding the quantity and quality of the people whom they train.

School districts will receive some information regarding the utilization of their ESM teachers and will gain some insights into the patterns of utilization employed throughout the state. The results will also provide an opportunity to compare an individual school district's methods and extent of utilization of ESM teachers with that of other districts.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The following terms are used in this study as they are defined below:

**Elementary Special Music Teacher (ESMT).** One who teaches only general music to elementary school children. It does not refer to instrumental (band or orchestra) teachers. It does not refer to music supervisors or coordinators who do not teach. It does not refer to classroom teachers who teach their own music.25

**Classroom Teacher.** A teacher assigned all of the responsibilities for instruction in a self-contained classroom.

**Specialists.** Professional personnel serving the school who do

not reduce class size in any way. Included are special teachers, e.g., art, music, and physical education, who teach another teacher's regular class part of the time, but do not reduce class size.26

Elementary Schools. These are schools having grades K-6 and K-8 depending upon the organization of the school district.

General Music. An essentially non-performance oriented, sequential offering of exploratory musical activities which include singing, playing, listening, and rhythmic activities. In time, additional activities are explored, e.g., theory, reading, composition, learning about music and its composers, and the media of musical performance.

Status. For the purpose of this study, status refers to the number employed and utilized.

Self-contained Classroom. A teaching arrangement in which all subjects are covered in a single classroom by a single teacher.

HYPOTHESES

Based on this investigator's experiences and knowledge of music education in California public schools the following set of hypotheses, related to changes in the status of the ESM teachers between 1966 and 1971, have been developed.

1. There was a change in the number of unified and non-unified elementary school districts employing Elementary Special Music Teachers.

2. There was a change in the grade levels serviced by the ESM teachers in the unified and non-unified school districts of California.

3. There was a change in the number of districts having a district-wide policy regarding the amount of music instruction per week.

4. There was a change in the number of unified and non-unified school districts of California that employed elementary music supervisors.

5. There was a change in the number of music supervisors employed by the unified and non-unified school districts of California.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The literature presents three rather distinct curricular patterns for music instruction. They are: (1) the self-contained classroom, (2) the departmentalized organization, and (3) the intermediate organization in which the self-contained classroom has some specialization in areas such as music.

This section reviews the differing opinions over the teaching arrangements for elementary school music instruction. Sowards and Scobey\(^1\) point out that, in all the curricular plans and staffing patterns used over the years, with varying degrees of effectiveness, the changes have centered on the question of whether one teacher or several specialists should be responsible for all of the learning experiences of a given group of children. The discussion by Sowards and Scobey indicates a division of opinion regarding two basic teaching arrangements: (1) departmentalization, and (2) the self-contained classroom.

Sowards and Scobey\(^2\) report that the self-contained classroom is presently the dominant teaching arrangement in the American elementary school. They place the beginning of its popularity around 1850, a time when the single teacher plan was developing. Sowards and Scobey credit


\(^2\)Ibid.
the present popularity of the self-contained classroom plan to the following developments occurring around 1930: (1) increased insights into the nature of child growth and development, (2) curriculum theories that placed great emphasis on the child, (3) a different conception of the role of organization of subject matter, and (4) the development of learning schemes.

According to these authors, the basic rationale behind the self-contained classroom is concern for the growth and the development of the child and for preferred teaching strategies which consider the most effective schemes for the utilization of time and the arrangement of learning experiences. They suggest that the emphasis be on the child and his needs, rather than on subject matter. Accordingly, the training emphasis is on teacher specialization in working with children. Hence, subject matter specialization is secondary. Sowards and Scobey further point out that the new ideas on curricular organization -- learning units -- be extended over fairly large daily blocks of time and crossed over subject matter lines whenever appropriate and necessary. They conclude by saying that the self-contained classroom is a structure that will facilitate rather than hinder integration and continuity of the educational process, or as Alice Miel puts it: "The self-contained classroom is a home base for organizing, evaluating and intellectualizing experiences." 3

In contrast, Sowards and Scobey 4 describe departmentalization as a teaching arrangement in which specialization is the feature and is some-

4Sowards and Scobey, ibid., p. 371.
times called the platoon system. They point out that departmentalization was the dominant organizational plan prior to 1850 when it was gradually replaced by the self-contained classroom. Sowards and Scobey explain the features of departmentalization as follows: (1) each teacher is a specialist and teaches only one or two subjects to several different classes of students, and (2) the training emphasis is on the teacher's competence in a subject matter area with a full range of teaching functions also expected.

An evaluation of the features of both the departmentalized structure and of the self-contained classroom is implied by Sowards and Scobey when they indicate that modern educational insight into child development has brought into serious question the advisability of the departmentalized structure because of the tendency, in past practice, to place emphasis upon subject matter content rather than upon the needs of the child. Nye does not completely support this argument. He suggests that the departmentalized structure has some validity because of the apparent continued need for some form of specialization in areas of instruction (such as music and art) due to the inability of classroom teachers to be competent in all areas. He sums up his point in this manner:

Theoretically, the classroom teacher may be the best to teach music. Practically, this theory has failed because of inadequate musical training, and employment practices in the schools which admitted musically incapable teachers to positions which involved music teaching.

---


6 Ibid.
Charles Burnsworth supports Nye. He declares that theoretically the self-contained classroom plan is good, however, practically its desirability may be questioned because the classroom teacher cannot be expected to develop competence in all of the specialty areas, nor can the classroom teacher be all things to all people. Burnsworth and Nye are supported by Olivero who has this to say:

The most obvious basis for specialization in the preparation of teachers for secondary schools is related to subject matter. Teacher training programs prepare English teachers, French teachers, mathematics teachers, Social Studies teachers, Science teachers, but all of them are expected to comprehend and develop skills in the full range of teaching functions. In the training of elementary teachers, we produce a slight variation on the same theme: and English teacher, Science teacher, Social Studies teacher, and mathematics teacher (not to mention music and art) -- all rolled into one.

Olivero considers the self-contained classroom to be inappropriate for meeting the needs of all children. Rather, he contends that there must be some specialized functions that should be performed by a variety of people with a variety of special competencies. He implores educators to consider individual differences in teachers, as well as in students.

Supporters of the self-contained classroom structure, such as Sowards and Scobey, Pierce, and Hoffer and English suggest additional points in support of the self-contained classroom structure. Sowards and Scobey point to the fact that within the self-contained classroom, the

---


9 Ibid., p. 16.

10 Sowards and Scobey, op. cit., p. 372.
teacher is likely to be more relaxed because there is less need to meet rigid schedules. Also, because of continued contact with students, the teacher is able to know each child as an individual which contributes to much greater understanding of individual children. They insist that such contact places the teacher in a better position to offer counseling and guidance. Continuity, integration, individualization of instruction, they conclude, are the benefits that accrue as a result of this structure. Pierce\(^{11}\) agrees that the classroom teacher has a better understanding of the children than the specialist teacher has. She also suggests that when music is taught by the classroom teacher, the students look upon music as a regular activity rather than an extra activity, and music taught by the classroom teacher can be readily linked with other subjects and used in many school activities. On the last two points, Nye\(^{12}\) concurs with Pierce. Hoffer and English\(^{13}\) echo many of the points made by Sowards and Scobey and by Pierce. They sum up their position by suggesting that integrating music into the other activities makes music a more meaningful and rewarding experience for the students. Hoffer and English express the opinion that without classroom teacher involvement, the music program becomes detached from the rest of the school curriculum.

The preceding examination of expert recommendations regarding


\(^{12}\)Nye, op. cit., p. 85.

staffing and utilizing the ESMT has resulted in specific recommendations regarding preferred staffing patterns. McKenna\textsuperscript{14} reported that Columbia University Institute of Administrative Research Studies supported the utilization of educational specialists. However, the examination of expert recommendations, made by prominent music educators on how the ESMT should be used, has not resulted in clear-cut recommendations. The arguments presented by proponents, of each of the two alternative approaches, do not fully reject or support either organizational plan. An example may be noted in the position taken by Nye who supports the need for specialized instruction in music, yet concurs with Pierce when she outlines the various advantages of having the classroom teacher teach music. Hoffer and English\textsuperscript{15} admit to the obvious limitations of the classroom teacher's skill in teaching music. Pierce\textsuperscript{16} expresses concern for the fact that classroom teachers are unable to devote as much time to the study of materials, problems, and methods of teaching as the ESMT because music is only one of the classroom teacher's many responsibilities. Therefore, the disagreement is not so much on the need for the ESMT as it is on how to use the ESMT. Phelps sums up the situation in the following statements:

Apparently the self-contained classroom is here to stay -- at least for the foreseeable future. This means that a solution must be found to the problem of who shall teach music if it is to be continued in our public schools.\textsuperscript{17}

Following an examination of a series of alternative solutions

\textsuperscript{14} McKenna, loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{15} Hoffer and English, op. cit., p. 552.

\textsuperscript{16} Pierce, loc. cit.

regarding the best way to cope with the classroom teacher teaching music, Phelps finally arrives at this conclusion:

It is apparent now to most readers that the music specialist must be the one to teach music. The ideal situation is a combination of the self-contained classroom and the platoon system classroom, philosophically speaking. Under this plan, the classroom teacher would be responsible for all subjects except art, music, and physical education.  

Burnsworth and Nye support Phelps' recommendation and agree that stronger preparation for the classroom teacher and more specialized training at the elementary level for ESMT's be provided.

The logical conclusion to this discussion of the controversy is that the third or intermediate position is the teaching arrangement that allows for the greatest advantages for the students. In this arrangement students will receive the benefits of the self-contained classroom and of having a specialist teacher for music. This plan clearly supports the need for the ESMT.

PRESSURES THAT AFFECT THE STATUS OF THE ESMT

The second part of the study is an evaluation of various types of pressures that have potential for affecting the status of the ESMT. In the dictionary, several definitions of the word pressure are used. However, two of these definitions relate to the manner in which pressures are used in this study. The first definition explains pressure as "the constraint of circumstances." The second definition explains pressure as

18 Ibid.
19 Burnsworth, op. cit., p. 558.
20 Nye, Music for Elementary School Children, op. cit., p. 73.
being "the stress of urgency of matters demanding attention." These two definitions support the manner in which the word "pressures" is used in this study. In this study, pressures are those circumstances which, in their urgent demand for attention, have a direct bearing on the status of the ESMT. The problem then is to identify these pressures.

Sowards and Scobey suggest that it is the nature of the educational experiences desired for children that should determine the way the school is organized and staffed. Yet, they point out, the opposite is more often true: the educational experiences that children receive are usually determined by the way the school is organized and staffed. McKenna lists the following as pressures: (1) priorities, (2) the availability of manpower, and (3) the availability of financial resources. Olivero expands the list of pressures adding: (1) changed personnel, (2) community pressure groups, (3) legislation, and (4) curriculum. He also concurs with McKenna by listing pressures due to a lack of qualified personnel.

Several prominent music educators, Hoffer and English, Nye, and Burnsworth express concern about the availability of qualified

---
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24 McKenna, *Staffing the Schools*, op. cit., p. 110.


26 Hoffer and English, op. cit., p. 551.

27 Nye, op. cit., p. 70.

28 Burnsworth, loc. cit.
personnel. Burnsworth concurs, as well, on the financial pressure as do Hoffer and English. Peterson\textsuperscript{29} expresses concern, also voiced by the other music educators cited, that the poor quality of music teaching that frequently occurs may have a negative effect on the music program. That is: poor teaching may dull the enthusiasm for a music program and consequently, operate to discourage the students, teachers, and administrators from maintaining or improving the music program. Peterson also refers to additional pressures: (1) financial pressures, (2) the general shortage of trained music teachers, (3) local board of education policies, and philosophical considerations.

Actions taken by professional music education associations, since 1966, such as convening of the Tanglewood Symposium,\textsuperscript{30} the publication of the California Music Education Association's Position Paper,\textsuperscript{31} and the convening of the Music Framework Committee can play an effective role in influencing the status of the ESMT in California. The effect of these recent developments in music education should be determined. An attempt will be made to assess the impact of these developments on the findings of this study.

The foregoing discussion indicates that several factors may operate as pressures to determine how the school is organized and staffed.


\textsuperscript{30} Tanglewood Symposium Report, Music in American Society, loc. cit.

Therefore, in this study it is assumed that these factors may also operate as pressures in determining the status of the ESMT. A compilation of these potential pressures is as follows:

1. The influence of recent legislation
2. The influence of community pressure groups
3. The influence of recent developments in music education
4. The availability of manpower
5. The availability of financial resources
6. The relative effectiveness of the ESMT in teaching elementary school music
7. Priorities
8. Local board action
9. Poor teaching

Legislation

A feeling that the attitude of the public and consequently, that of the legislature, has changed toward public education was expressed by Douglas Kidd, former Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the California Music Educators Association (CMEA). Mr. Kidd went on to explain that this change is reflected in the amount of money allotted to local districts. Mr. Kidd's remarks suggest that legislation has failed to provide adequate financial support for education. For instance, he pointed out that a state-wide property tax, if adopted, would have the advantage of equalizing the support for schools. However, Kidd praised the new Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS) for its good effect.

---

He suggested that as soon as teachers, as a group, learn to appreciate evaluation, they will discover that PPBS can actually work to the teachers' advantage. Kidd has pointed out the following two instances in which legislation can influence the status of the ESMT: (1) legislation has failed to provide for adequate financing, a negative pressure, and (2) legislation has provided for PPBS, a system designed to assist districts in improving goal setting, allocation of resources, and evaluation of efforts. 33

Other music educators express concern for the potential influence that legislation can have in determining the status of the ESMT. Burnsworth 34 calls for change in certification that would provide for K-6 music teaching specialists. Olivero 35 expresses concern over the new courses that are being legislated into the curriculum in many states. He suggests that the large number of mandated courses actually contribute to inflexibility which in turn inhibits curriculum and staffing pattern reforms. Olivero 36 cites the lack of legislation to deal with issues such as: (1) teacher evaluation, and (2) collective bargaining for teachers. However, he expresses enthusiasm for the passage of the Education Professions Development Act of 1967 because of the implications that such an act has for providing new

34 Burnsworth, op. cit., p. 559.
35 Olivero and Buffie, op. cit., p. 17.
36 Ibid., pp. 20-21.
directions for staff utilization. Olivero lists a variety of programs, created by federal legislation, that he thinks will have a positive influence in staffing and manpower development. Among these are the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, The Teachers Corps, Upward Bound and Headstart Programs and the Central Cities Projects.

In California, since 1966, legislation has been effective in reducing the list of mandated courses from the curriculum through the Miller Bill and in overhauling teacher credentialing procedures through the Ryan Act. Legislation has not been forthcoming to provide any support for the arts through the strengthening of requirements, financial assistance to local districts for music programs, nor for establishing any new guidelines for music teaching. Provisions for the statewide coordination of music instruction has not been made.

The preceding discussion of legislation as a potential pressure in determining the status of the ESMT reveals the following:

1. Federal legislation has provided for programs that can have influence on the ESMT as a result of increased efforts to devise new approaches to staff utilization and curriculum change.

2. Federal legislation has provided sources of funding that can assist a local school district in providing additional music education programming.

---

37 Ibid., p. 268.
(3) State legislation has provided PPBS, a new approach to greater efficiency in planning and budgeting.

(4) State legislation has reduced the number of mandated courses in the school curriculum.

(5) State legislation has begun efforts to overhaul teacher credentialing procedures, however, has not created an ESMT credential.

(6) State legislation has not provided for adequate financing for the music education program.

(7) Neither state nor federal legislation has developed legislation to deal with teacher evaluation and/or collective bargaining for teachers.

(8) State legislation has not provided for statewide coordination of music education.

(9) Local districts who have had to provide more than 50 percent of the operating costs for the education program, have, through local board recommendations, had to shoulder the responsibility for the maintenance of the elementary music programs.

This list of factors suggests that legislation operates as a potential pressure in determining how schools are organized and staffed. The legislative climate, as far as education is concerned, has not been conducive to strengthening the status of the ESMT.

**Community pressures**

The operation of community pressure groups to influence the status

---

of the ESMT was suggested by Olivero when he declared that: "All kinds of pressures are demanding this and that, new courses are being legislated into the curriculum in many states, and community action groups are applying pressures to have something added or deleted." The findings of the Committee on Educational Finance of the National Education Association (NEA) further suggest a relationship between pressure groups and the status of the ESMT when they indicate that the basic issue in the financial crisis faced by public education is one of willingness rather than the ability to finance public education. McKenna further ties in the point in his discussion of priorities of the people in providing the resources for adequate staffing. He suggests a need for pressure groups for education in this way:

Of course, it can be argued that it is the job of the schools themselves--their teachers, administrators, boards of education--to help the public see the needs of the schools--and it is. But it is the responsibility of many other groups in our society also--the churches, business and industry, service clubs, and a variety of others.

McKenna and Olivero indirectly suggest more than the fact that educators, and others who have special interests in education, must become involved in pressuring for increased support for education. The studies by the Committee on Educational Financing imply that pressure
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groups are already operating against education. Kidd's remarks concerning
the public's attitude toward education and the decrease in the allotment
for public education offer support to this implication. The operation of
community pressure groups as suggested above indicates that community
pressures can potentially influence the status of the ESMT. For this
reason school districts were surveyed regarding the impact of community
pressures on their decisions about ESMT's and music supervisors.

The influence of recent professional
developments in music education

Since 1966, the Tanglewood Symposium has been convened, the Cal-
ifornia Music Educators Association has published "A Position Paper in
Music Education," and the Framework Committee has been convened.

The California Music Educators Association (CMEA) published its
Position Paper in Music Education as a set of guidelines for the develop­
ment of expanded programs utilizing the provisions of the George E. Miller
Education Act of 1968. In the foreword to the documents, Dr. Judd Chew,
CMEA President, explained the role of the Position Paper as follows:

This Position Paper provides a base upon which a
local school district can effectively build its music
instruction program in grades kindergarten through
twelve---the association (CMEA) further encourages
school boards, school administrators, school music
personnel and others to utilize its contents as a
guide in reviewing current programs and promoting
changes consistent with the intent of this important
legislation.

In the Position Paper, a strong endorsement of the views of the
Tanglewood Symposium and the Educational Policies Commission (EPC) was

45"Position Paper," op. cit., p. 3.

46Ibid.
declared by the CMEA and the Music Education Committee of the California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (CASCD). Both the Tanglewood Symposium, convened by the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), and the EPC had gone on record recommending that "music be placed at the core of the curriculum," and that "wide exposure to the arts at all ages be provided and in as many areas as can be provided."

The Position Paper outlined the stance taken by the CMEA and the Music Committee of the CASCD in regards to philosophical issues in music education. Among these were some specific points for elementary school music. They called for (1) providing for the development of musical concepts through a variety of creative experiences, (2) music being handled by teachers competent in the area of classroom music as well as performances, (3) providing opportunities for children to hear live performances, (4) having a variety of materials readily available, and (5) being assured of adequate time in the classroom.

The Position Paper made specific recommendations for developing the expanded music program. Among these were: (1) a recommendation for the revision in college programs in music education which would establish priority for training elementary classroom specialists, (2)

---

51 Ibid., p. 13.
more effective use of staff, (3) varied approaches to teaching, and (4) the development of a state framework in music.

The recommendation on the development of a state framework in music has been realized. The committee met and drafted proposals which were far-reaching and carried even broader implications for curricular change than did the position paper, primarily because of the specificity of the guidelines.

Such developments in music education have possibly influenced curricular decisions which operate as pressures to determine the status of the ESMT.

The availability of manpower. McKenna, in 1965, made predictions regarding the availability of manpower. Interpreting studies to which he had access, he concluded the following:

When our priorities include time and action, in addition to lip service, we are not likely to find the notion wanting in manpower to staff the schools, particularly when college graduates will increase by seventy-nine % by 1970 (over 1960) and public school enrollment will increase only 24%.

Recent hiring practices in California school districts tend to support McKenna's implication that there is no serious shortage of music teachers in the sense in which they have been traditionally used. As Olivero cautions, indications are that unless special efforts to modify educational practice is taken, even less money will be forthcoming for the support of educational programs.

52"Music Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade 12," California State Department of Education.

53McKenna, op. cit., p.112.

54Olivero and Buffie, op. cit., p. 21.
An examination of the literature regarding the availability of manpower does not offer a clear indication of how this pressure has operated since 1966, to influence the status of the ESMT. Therefore, top administrative personnel who were surveyed were asked to share their perceptions of the impact of this kind of pressure on the decision making regarding the use of the ESMT and music supervisors in their districts.

The availability of financial resources. The Committee on Educational Finance of the NEA reports that the major problems of the schools today have their roots in one basic problem - financing. Their studies indicate that problems encountered in staffing, legislation, curriculum decisions, community pressures are, indeed, all closely related to financial constraints. The committee points to research which has shown that what a community spends to finance its schools and what the community expects of its schools are the two most powerful influences in producing quality education. Yet, they quote authorities who point to the fact that we are not investing enough in our schools and colleges to secure the return which our people should be receiving from education and furthermore, that substantial increases in expenditures for schools are both necessary and wise.

In this context, two important points need to be considered. The first is the source of financing for public education and the second is the utilization of the financing, how is the money to be spent? The


56 Ibid., p. 32. 57 Ibid., p. 35.
report continues by explaining that in American education, there is a unique system under which local communities are delegated far greater responsibility and authority for schools than is customary in other nations and that the local communities have a substantial say as to how their schools are to be run. Accordingly, the report continues, the state delegates much of the management to the local district which includes responsibility for providing more than 50 percent of the operating costs, as well as a say as to how the money will be spent. However, as McKenna points out, the local 50 percent of the operating costs are derived chiefly from the local property tax, a highly inconsistent source of income and subject to considerable variation within states and within regions. McKenna concludes that some obvious efforts at equalizing financing are needed and that both the states and the federal governments should share increased financial responsibility and that the American people are going to have to assume a greater role in establishing the priorities for the appropriation of the financial resources of this country. McKenna's point is related to the increasing awareness, on the part of local school districts, that the state and federal governments are mandating many programs and courses without providing the financial support for these programs.

The issue of how to spend the available resources becomes highly significant in view of the financial constraints under which districts
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must operate was a point suggested by Douglas Kidd in an interview.\textsuperscript{61} McKenna added to that point by indicating that the staff consumes the greater portion of the budget, which will cause the staffing patterns to assume considerable significance. Accordingly, McKenna\textsuperscript{62} declares that there are basically two choices that school districts can make if they are given a fixed budget. They can hire greater number of professionals and pay lower salaries or they can hire fewer professionals and pay higher salaries. On staff allocation, McKenna considers the following:

There are two major choices in staff allocation a school administration and board of education make, having decided on employing a given number of professional staff members. They hire many teachers to keep classes small and few specialists, or they hire fewer teachers (allowing classes to run larger) and provide a larger proportion of specialists. All decisions on allocation of number of staff, then, are variations on these two choices.\textsuperscript{63}

In California, since the state offers few, if any, guidelines regarding the staff needs and qualifications of music teachers, the local district must make the determination, with the added constraint of having no financial support from other levels. These problems coupled with unsuccessful efforts to float bond issues and pass tax overrides at the local level have created many handicaps for the districts in developing well rounded, quality educational programs. Programs, not considered absolutely necessary, are being discontinued or severely curtailed. Since the elementary special music teacher is not mandated by state law, nor is funding provided for hiring such a teacher, one of the first cuts in

\textsuperscript{61} Remarks from an interview with Douglas Kidd, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{62} McKenna, op. cit., p. 1.
\textsuperscript{63} Ibid., p. 14.
personnel can be made by cutting back or eliminating elementary music positions. An attempt was made to assess the impact of this particular pressure utilizing both a direct question and an indirect question related to other specialists in areas comparable to music.

The effectiveness of the elementary special music teacher in elementary school music. Herman declares that it is a widely accepted notion that music at the elementary level is the right of every child. That there is considerable agreement on the fact that an effective elementary music program has a tremendous potential in helping to meet the needs of elementary school children is a point strongly indicated in the Tanglewood Declaration. However, as Wilson found, there seems to be little agreement forthcoming over who will teach elementary school music. Also, Peterson's study showed that there are a variety of structures under which music is being taught.

Examination of the various arguments advanced to support the various positions reveals some highly persuasive but inconclusive points. For example, Sowards and Scobey list the limitations of the ESMT as: (1) limited time, (2) scheduling difficulties, (3) limited knowledge of individual children, and (4) the inability to integrate music with other


68 Sowards and Scobey, op. cit., p. 372.
subjects. They further call attention to the difficulty of adequately preparing a classroom teacher for teaching music. Wright, et al., declare that the classroom teacher cannot be all things to all people. Pierce suggests that classroom teachers also have a time problem; while Ernst explains that continuity in learning is difficult because of the wide variation in skills of the classroom teachers. Reimer concludes that these points all tend to deal with competence and other practical factors that question the efficiency of the classroom teacher's role in elementary music and point to some need to at least involve the special music teacher in the program, this involvement being considerably greater than currently practiced. Reimer's point is supported by the authorities who attempt a more conciliatory approach. Nye expresses it this way:

To introduce this subject and the spirited controversy which rages around it, let it be said that there should be no quarrel over who will teach music. There should, however, be concern over the competency of anyone assigned to this work.

Other conciliatory attempts concede the unique advantages held by both the classroom teacher and the music specialist and suggest that other factors being considered, perhaps the superior structure is the one which
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utilizes the services of both teachers in a partnership role. Nye and Nye express the rationale for this position in this manner.

It is widely accepted that the classroom teacher is a valuable partner in the music education effort... While the amount and kind of contribution will vary from teacher to teacher, he (the classroom teacher) is in a superior position to know the children, to relate music to the total school curriculum and to work with the specialist in helping children master concepts and form generalization.75

This conciliatory position is summed up in the words of Hoffer and English who have this to say:

The resolution of the problem, it appears to us, is essentially one of discerning how the music specialist and the classroom teacher can best work together to teach music, and what the roles of each should be.76

The foregoing examination of the arguments advanced to support the various positions reveals some highly persuasive but inconclusive points. There is an indication that the relative effectiveness of the ESMT in teaching music may operate to influence the status of the ESMT.

Priorities. In considering various issues that have a possible influence on the status of the special music teacher in California schools, the issue of priorities should be considered. This is necessary because, as the findings of the NEA Committee on Educational Finances77 show, local school districts have the final determination for the hiring and utilization of the special music teachers. This means that since neither state

76Hoffer and English, "The Music Specialist and the Classroom Teacher," loc. cit.
77National Education Association Committee on Educational Finance, loc. cit.
nor federal authorities mandate specific ways of utilizing the special music teacher and since they do not provide funding, decisions on the use of the special music teacher are made by the local school authorities. What remains then is the matter of making a choice. Choices are made on the basis of priorities. About priorities and choices, McKenna contends:

If we place the kind of priorities on educating our young that we do on some things that seem to this writer infinitely less important, then we shall be in a position to staff the schools with numbers and quality of personnel adequate to do the job.  

McKenna's thoughts on priorities have been supported, in past by the findings of Peterson who studied organizational plans favored by administrators for elementary general music. Peterson had this to say:

Although it is very probable that the educational philosophy which has emphasized the self-contained classroom will not change significantly in the immediate future, it is also highly possible that a greater use of the music specialist within the framework of the self-contained classroom organization is inevitable in order to effect stronger, more vitalized, and enriched music programs.

Peterson's awareness of the philosophical basis for the present dominance of the self-contained classroom structure relates directly to McKenna's concern about priorities.

McKenna does not deny the financial constraints facing public education. Rather, he calls upon a committed citizenry to devise new means of solving the problems and suggests that the resources are available. He maintains that it is a matter of reordering our priorities to include those things which are really as important, as we profess them to

---
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be. The National Education Association Committee on Educational Finance concurs when they say:

> Our economy is well past the primitive stage where it must concentrate upon a frantic effort to produce more food, clothing, and other material goods. There is an enormous margin of choice in the United States. The issue is not one of ability to finance an educational program consistent with the needs and demands of the period--The issue is one of educational vision and willingness to match this vision with fiscal action. Such are the conclusions of several national commissions of leading citizens.81

The California Music Educators Association Position Paper82 spoke to the issue of priorities when it stated that it believed that governing boards in school districts should study the research regarding the effect of music upon the personal development of students. They further called upon the boards to work within the confines of existing legislation to develop more innovative programs.

The preceding discussion indicates that priorities may operate to influence the status of the special music teacher.

SUMMARY

Some factors that influence the status of the ESMT have been examined in this section. Some appear to have greater influence than others; some have little, if any, influence and others are of considerable significance.

Legislation, or rather the lack of it, appears to operate as a

81 National Education Association of the United States Committee on Educational Finance, op. cit., p. 27.
highly significant factor in determining the status of the special music teacher primarily because of the lack of leadership at either the state or federal level. Community pressure may have operated against the school music program although it could be mobilized into a favorable influence by the music educators. Developments in the broad area of elementary curriculum have combined with professional efforts, in the area of music education, to bring about some influence indicating some changes since 1966.

Circumstances surrounding one factor, the availability of manpower, have changed considerably. The review of the literature indicates that reduced enrollments in the 1970's will have a serious effect in determining how educational manpower will be used. However, there is no clear indication of how the status of the ESMT will be affected.

The relative effectiveness of the ESMT in teaching music and the role of priorities or philosophy were additional factors cited as having a possible influence in determining the status of the ESMT. An attempt was made, in the survey of public school administrators, to at least explore the possible impacts of these various conditions on the status of the ESMT.
Chapter 3
METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

In chapter one, the problem was isolated, and found to consist of two sub-problems. (1) To determine whether there was a change in the status of the special music teacher in the unified and non-unified school districts of California between 1966 and 1971. (2) If any change is noted, to make a determination regarding the nature of the change, the extent of the change, and the reason for the change.

To develop the information relevant to the first sub-problem, the study by the Department of Music Education at the University of the Pacific, Stockton, California, was replicated in 1971 by mailing a questionnaire to the unified and non-unified school districts of California. This questionnaire contained all the items that appeared on the questionnaire used in the 1966 study, plus other items designed to elicit additional information from the respondents.⁴ To explore the second sub-problem, additional items on the mailed questionnaire and a telephone interview schedule were used.

Therefore, for the purpose of this study, two types of research have been utilized: to deal with the first sub-problem, a routine survey research procedure; and, for the second sub-problem, an ex post

---

¹See Appendix I, p. 96.
facto research procedure was used. This chapter provides a detailed explanation of the 1966 study and how it was replicated in 1971. After that the methods and procedures used in extending the 1966 questionnaire to obtain the additional data for answering questions raised in the second and third sub-problems will be outlined. Finally, an explanation of the procedures used to develop the telephone schedule will be explained.

THE 1966 STUDY

In October, 1966, the Department of Music Education, University of the Pacific, conducted a survey of the unified and non-unified school districts of California to determine the status of the special music teacher in the elementary schools of California. The mail questionnaire method was used. A total of 424 questionnaires were mailed to all of the unified and non-unified school districts of California. All questionnaires were addressed to the "Office of the Superintendent."

The questionnaire contained six questions and a remarks section. The first two questions contained the basic factual information of the questionnaire. They were:

Question 1. How many elementary schools are in your district?
Question 2. How many elementary special music teachers do you employ?

The third question was designed to give a general description of the way that the special music teachers were being used. It was as follows:

---

2 Lists of school districts were compiled from the California School Directory, 1965-66, California Association of Secondary School Administrators, Burlingame, California.

3 See Appendix II, p. 98.
Question 3. What grade levels are serviced by special music teachers?

Questions four and five were trend questions designed to predict the immediate future of the elementary special music teacher. The questions were as follows:

Question 4. Does your school district have definite plans to increase or decrease the use of special music teachers or to maintain the status quo?

Question 5. Do you believe the trend in your area is to increase or decrease the use of special music teachers, or maintain the status quo?

The sixth question was designed to clarify the difference between a music supervisor and a special music teacher rather than to gain pertinent data. This was especially important in that definitions, contained in the directions at the beginning of the questionnaire, made considerable effort to distinguish between the elementary special music teacher and the classroom teacher, as well as between the elementary special music teacher and the elementary instrumental or elementary vocal music teachers.

Question 6. How many elementary coordinators (supervisors) do you employ?

At the end of the questionnaire space was left for remarks to be made at the discretion of the person responding to the questionnaire.

THE 1971 STUDY

Introduction

The 1971 Study was designed as a three-part research project. The first part (the replication) utilized the first section of the mail questionnaire to survey the California elementary school districts to (1) determine whether there had been a change in the status of the Special
Music Teacher since 1966. The second part (the extension) utilized the second half of the mail questionnaire to determine why change, if any, did occur. The third part of the study utilized a telephone interview schedule to survey a sample of the responding districts in order to (1) validate some of the responses to the mail questionnaire, and (2) to obtain additional data to substantiate and explicate the status of the Special Music Teacher in that district.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire, in part one (the replication) was designed to (1) give information on the first sub-problem of determining whether or not there was a change in the status of the elementary special music teacher between 1966 and 1971. The solution of the first sub-problem, then, involved a replication of the 1966 study, utilizing the original questionnaire. The questionnaire part two (the extension) was designed to provide a partial solution of the second sub-problem. This was accomplished by including additional items in the 1971 questionnaire. The result was a two part questionnaire; the first part containing the format, directions and questions identical to those used in the 1966 questionnaire; and the second part containing additional items to elicit responses regarding pressures that influenced the status of the special music teacher.

The first six items on the 1971 questionnaire were identical to the first six items on the 1966 questionnaire and were designed to obtain comparable data. The remarks section was deleted after question six. Questions seven through nine were additional items not contained in the extension of the 1966 survey. Questions seven through nine were selected to explore the perceptions of administrative personnel answering the
questionnaire about the reasons for any changes. These data were used as the background information for the development of the interview schedule.

Question seven requested the respondee to compare the present status of elementary music specialists with five years ago by underlining one of three choices: unchanged, improved, or deteriorated.

Question eight contained an open-ended checklist of possible factors that influenced the status of the Special Music Teacher and two remarks sections. The respondee was asked to check off any of the pressures listed that could have affected change within the five categories listed. Respondees were encouraged to add any pressures not listed either within an already mentioned category or in the "other factors" category. In each case, the respondee was asked to be specific. In the remarks sections, they were asked to identify the primary pressures that contributed to the improved, deteriorated or unchanged status of the ESMT.

Question nine was a general remarks space available for the discretionary use of the person completing the questionnaire.

Directions were included at the bottom of the second page of the questionnaire indicating the name and address of the person to whom the questionnaire should be returned. This was an added precaution in case of loss or misplacement of the stamped, self-addressed envelope which was included with the questionnaire.

Four hundred and seventy-nine questionnaires were mailed to all of the unified and non-unified school districts of California having a minimum of 400 ADA. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter

---
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written by the State Chairman of the California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Music Committee explaining the rationale for the survey and requesting the cooperation of the districts. 5

A follow-up packet, including a cover letter from a member of the California Music Educators Association News Editorial Board, another copy of the questionnaire; and another stamped, self-addressed envelope; was sent out six weeks later. 6

The Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was developed after the questionnaire data had been tabulated. The interview schedule was designed to provide more complete data for the elucidation of the second sub-problem. The interview schedule consisted of two parts. The first part contained a listing of those pressures that were indicated as significant by the respondee to the questionnaire. The persons interviewed were asked to indicate the positive or negative effect of each pressure. The second part was a comparison section, designed to allow for a comparison of the utilization of music specialists with the utilization of comparable specialists in the area of art, drama and physical education. These were selected because similar problems encountered by music specialists are also encountered by

5 See Appendix III, p. 99.
6 See Appendix IV, p. 100.
specialists in these other areas, i.e., local options for using the specialists are similar; classroom teachers are frequently expected to conduct instruction in these areas; and these areas are frequently grouped together with music in a "frill" category.

Interview subjects were selected by stratified random sampling of the matched returns, (districts who returned questionnaires both in 1966 and 1971).

The size categories, established in the treatment of the data obtained from the 1966 study and status categories were used. Thus a sample was taken for each size category within each status category according to the pattern listed in Table I. Table I shows the breakdown of the size and status categories and shows the number of samples taken.

The numbers, in parentheses under the size categories, represent the total number of districts in that category who responded, i.e., in the size category of 1-5 schools, under the status category of "improved," the total number of responding districts was 25. A sample of that category (ten percent) is three schools. To determine which schools would be sampled, an alphabetical listing was made. This was done according to size of the total number of schools in that size and status category. From the list every fifth district was selected until the required number plus one additional district was obtained. The one additional district was selected for purposes of conducting a trial run of the procedure. This selection procedure resulted in ten percent of the districts for that

---

8In 1966, the responding districts were grouped according to the following size categories: 1 to 5 schools; 6 to 15 schools; 16 to 30 schools; and 31 and over schools.

9The status categories were: improved, deteriorated or unchanged.
size category however, since the interview schedule proved to be a relatively simple process, the two pilot districts were substituted for one of the other originally selected districts.

Table 1
Status and Size Categories Utilized in Selecting the Stratified Random Sample from Interview Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Deterioration</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Sample Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 schools</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 total</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 schools</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 total</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30 schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 total</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 total</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The telephone interview method was used. The items contained in the interview schedule were used as the basis for the telephone interview. Each person who originally completed the questionnaire, was contacted by telephone. The following procedure was followed: (1) the interviewer identified himself, (2) explained the purpose of the call, (3) established an interview appointment time, and (4) indicated that a copy of his answers to the 1971 questionnaire and a copy of his answers to the
interview would be mailed to him. Each interview was set up a minimum of four days in advance to allow time for the correspondence to reach the person to be interviewed.

At the appointed time the person to be interviewed was called. An inquiry was made regarding the receipt of the correspondence. With this information available it was possible to make direct reference to specific questions. The interviewee was given an opportunity to respond to each question at his discretion. The open-ended checklist was used by the interviewee. Particular effort was made to encourage the interviewee to extend the checklist by adding any similar or related items that, in his opinion, would provide additional clarification and/or information. At the conclusion of the questions raised by the interviewer, the person being interviewed was encouraged to make additional comments in much the same manner as at the conclusion of the questionnaire. It was explained that the interviewee should feel free to make any further comments that he deemed significant to the interview.

In each interview, the answers were reviewed with the person being interviewed to ascertain that the answers and comments were accurate. A space was provided on the first page of the worksheet listing the time and date of the interview, the name and position of the interviewee, the district, telephone number and the status category (improved, deteriorated, status quo) of the district, and the size category (1-5, 6-15, 16-30, 31+). This information along with the 1966 questionnaire and the 1971 questionnaire comprised the file for that district and was the source of data for the study.

The items selected for inclusion in the interview schedule were
selected from data provided by extending the 1966 questionnaire. The review of the literature in Chapter 2 indicated some potential pressures, i.e., finances, curriculum changes, priorities, community pressures, legislation and changed personnel. The items on the questionnaire were designed to check the applicability of these pressures. The resulting data yielded indications of pressures which were primary and those of less significance. The indications of the primary and secondary significance pressures were compared with the number of elementary special music teachers in the districts. Districts of similar size were compared with each other. The financial base for districts was compared according to size and status of the ESMT. The results of these comparisons suggested that factors other than finances were operating because of the inconsistency in the elementary special music teacher's status from district to district within the same size category and between districts having a similar financial base. Since the utilization of the elementary music teacher has been largely a local option depending on the philosophy of local districts, a comparison of the status of the elementary special music teacher with other elementary special teachers seemed appropriate. It was expected that a comparison of the status of a variety of specialists would yield some additional data that would offer more insight for solving the second sub-problem of analyzing the reason for the change in the status of the special music teacher in the elementary schools of California. Therefore, questions A and B listed under the "clarification" section were designed to make direct comparison of the policies, programs, special compensations, and special considerations that apply to the specialists, in the area of elementary school art, drama, and physical
education, with the same factors operating to affect the specialist in elementary school music. These four specialty areas were selected because of the similarity of the conditions under which they operate. For example, physical education was selected because of the local option under which the district is required to furnish instruction without a state mandate of the precise structure or designation of teaching responsibilities. The specialists in the elementary fine arts - art and drama - share most of the working conditions with elementary music specialists, hence their selection for comparison.

To obtain the information, the interviewer asked the following two questions:

Question A. Does your district have any specially stated policy regarding the use of the following specialists?

Question B. Does your community make any special compensations, financial or otherwise, for any of the following areas of instruction, due to any special community characteristics?

The list of specialists in the various areas and several possible titles and roles were listed under Question A. The interviewer suggested examples of policies and provided a complete explanation of the question in order to fully insure that the interviewee understood the question.

For Question B, examples were cited and additional explanation was made to insure that the interviewee fully understood the question.

Question C. Does your district participate in Planning Program Budgeting Systems (PPBS) located on page two of the interview schedule?

This question was designed with a dual purpose in mind: (1) to serve as a check on Questions A and B and (2) to elicit information regarding the general extent of budgeting and curricular planning in the district, a
consideration that is important because of McKenna's\textsuperscript{10} "alert district" notion.

According to McKenna, staffing studies indicate that the more alert districts tend to hire a larger number of specialists than less alert districts -- alertness being gauged by what happens in the classroom as well as by the number of other quality related factors that have been found to accompany good classroom practice. Consequently, Question 3 was included in an attempt to determine the extent of the district's commitment to quality education, of which music is a necessary component.

Further questions regarding PPBS were asked to determine the length of participation and the extent of the district's involvement. The question required very little explanation since most district administrators have been involved in some preliminary considerations of PPBS because of legislative mandate.

Question D. Have community groups been active in pressing for increased arts education? If yes, what are some of the activities?

Question D was designed to probe more deeply into the influence of community groups in pressing for or against increased arts education. The term "arts education" was used instead of "music education" in an attempt to facilitate answering. Since the questionnaire had provided data on the extent of community pressure on the music program, the emphasis on music education, in the interview, would have been an unnecessary duplication, yielding none of the additional data useful in making comparisons. Again, explanations were given and examples were suggested in addition to those contained on the worksheet that had been provided for the interviewee.

\textsuperscript{10}Bernard H. McKenna, \textit{Staffing the Schools}, loc. cit.
Question E. In the process of coping with the financial pressures, in your district, you have had to make certain decisions regarding specialty programs.
   a. Please indicate the position you have taken in regards to the following specialty areas in the school program.
   b. Please indicate, briefly, the rationale behind the decision.

Question E contained the key data for the comparisons. The interviewer was asked whether financial pressures had caused elementary art, drama and physical education programs to be increased or decreased between 1966 and 1971 or whether the 1966 level had been maintained. He was further asked to explain the rationale for the action. The data provided a direct comparison with action taken by the district regarding the music program.

The comparison data were provided in the questionnaire and were further confirmed in the first two questions asked in the interview. The specialty areas were listed on the worksheet. For purposes of clarification and accuracy, the interviewer requested that the interviewee respond to each specialty area individually, and indicate the current status while the interviewer checked the list on the worksheet.

Question F. What are the duties of your Special Music Teacher?

The final item for discussion was in Question F. It was designed to more clearly establish the status of the elementary special music teacher. An analysis of the 1971 questionnaire data indicated some confusion, on the part of the respondents, as to which teachers of music were considered elementary special music teachers in spite of an extensive definition at the beginning of the questionnaire. This confusion was further increased because of the various manners in which elementary
music personnel and district music personnel must function. Because the state does not regulate the manner in which music teachers are employed, each local district is free to devise whatever structure it deems to be to its advantage. Consequently, music personnel function in many different ways. They are subject to inter-level and intra-district assignments that may cover a variety of specialty areas in music, i.e., a high school choral specialist may be assigned two periods of choir at the high school and three periods of work at the elementary level. Such an assignment may include one or more periods of choral work in one or more elementary schools each week plus some elementary general music or a combination of consulting and resource teacher work. The net result is confusion and difficulty in accounting for the time and a special difficulty in categorizing such a teacher according to the definition used in the 1966 and 1971 questionnaires. This question, then, was designed to provide supplementary data regarding the number of elementary special music teachers employed in a given district, data available, otherwise, only from the answers supplied to Question B on the 1971 questionnaire.

To obtain the information, the interviewer asked for the total number of elementary music teachers employed in the district. Then, the exact nature of the working assignment was discussed for each teacher teaching elementary general music, not time spent in other related areas. The total time spent by all of the teachers in the district, divided by the normal full teaching load was later used to compute the number of teacher equivalents for the district. This figure was then checked with the figures given by the district and whatever differences were noted were subjected to statistical tests of significant difference. The resulting
data was used to supplement the original data, obtained from the questionnaire, and did contribute to a better solution of the first sub-problem which had to do with determining if any change had occurred in the status of the special music teacher in the elementary schools of California.

For purposes of establishing a clear understanding in an attempt to assure greater accuracy, the interviewer utilized the checklist, available to the interviewee, that contained several possible combinations. The interviewee was asked to indicate any of the combinations listed on the worksheet that described the way in which each music teacher operated. When there was doubt, the interviewer made an indication in the "other" category and then wrote the specific combination on paper and indicated the number of music teachers, in that district, who operated under that particular structure. The final compilation was concerned only with those persons who worked in elementary general music.

SUMMARY

The 1971 study utilized two different techniques: (1) the mail questionnaire and (2) the telephone interview. The mail questionnaire consisted of two sections - the same format, definitions, directions, and the first six questions which were on the 1966 questionnaire. This section replicated the 1966 study and provided data for comparing the status of the elementary special teacher of 1966 with 1971.

The second section of the questionnaire contained questions based on information gained from a review of related literature and expert opinion, that was designed to indicate what pressures operated to influence the status of the ESMT. The data, obtained from the questions in the
second part of the questionnaire, additionally led to the formulation of
the interview schedule.

The interview schedule used in a telephone interview to a random
sampling of those to whom the questionnaires were sent was an outgrowth
of the second part (the extension of the 1966 questionnaire) of the 1971
questionnaire. Data from the questionnaire gave concrete indications of
some of the pressures that were operating. The interview schedule ques-
tions were designed to confirm and/or clarify the responses obtained from
a stratified random sampling of the responding schools.
Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

The analysis and findings of the data for this study will be divided into two major sections. Section I will present and analyze data obtained from the mail questionnaire. Section II will present and analyze data obtained from the interview material. Section I will be further subdivided into two parts. The first part will present analysis and findings from the questions that indicate change and will relate to the hypotheses that correspond to those questions. The second part will present the analysis of the data obtained from the questions that indicate the reason for change. The data that deal with reasons for change will be examined in this section.

QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

The 1971 questionnaire consisted of: (1) a replication of the six questions used in the 1966 questionnaire, designed to determine whether or not a change had occurred in the status of the elementary special music teacher in the unified and non-unified school districts of California, and (2) the extension material, designed to determine the reason for any change that was noted. Data from questions two, three and six were selected because these questions directly indicate change. Data from question one is needed to categorize the districts according to size, thus making an indirect indication of change. However, questions four and five only
indicate whether the change was in agreement with anticipations of change. These data will be considered serendipitously at the conclusion of the chapter.

Data obtained from the Replication

Of the total of 424 questionnaires mailed in 1966, 296 were returned, a return of 70 percent. Four hundred and seventy-eight were mailed in 1971. Three hundred and seventy-six were marked and returned, a return of 78 percent. Of those returns in 1971, 249 were received from the same districts that returned the questionnaires in 1966. Eighty-four percent of the 1971 returns matched with returns from 1966. It was decided to utilize only those returns in 1971 that matched with those of 1966 in order to avoid confounding the findings by using data from non-matched districts (districts that previously had not reported).

Table 2 shows a comparison of the number of questionnaires sent, a comparison of the number and percent of returns for 1966 and 1971, and the number of 1971 returns that matched with returns from 1966. All comparisons are reported according to size categories.

Table 2 indicates a 100% matching of 1966 districts having 30 or more elementary schools within the same districts in 1971. Further this high percentage of matching occurred with the districts having the highest percentage of returns for both years, although 6 to 15 elementary schools in a district tied with "31 and over" school districts in 1971. A shift was noted in the districts having the lowest percentage of returns. In 1966, 1 to 5 school districts were lowest. In 1971, sixteen to thirty school districts had the lowest percentage of returns. These same districts yielded the lowest percentage of matches for the two studies.
Answers to the first two questions contained the basic factual information of the questionnaire for making comparisons of the number of elementary special music teachers employed in 1966 and 1971. Question one: How many elementary schools are in your district? Question two: How many elementary special music teachers do you employ? Table 3 provides the data for making the comparison. It compares the number of school districts, according to size categories, that employed zero, one, two, three, four or more than four elementary special music teachers for both years.

### Table 2

A Comparison of the number of Questionnaires sent, Number and Percent of Returns 1966 and 1971, Number and Percent of 1971 Returns Matched with 1966 Returns from Each Size Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools in District</th>
<th>Questionnaires Sent</th>
<th>Number of Returns 1966</th>
<th>Percent of Returns 1966</th>
<th>Number of Returns Matched 1966</th>
<th>% of Matched 1966</th>
<th>Number of Returns Matched 1971</th>
<th>% of Matched 1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 +</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 1971 data used in the tables were obtained from the 1971 returns that matched with the 1966 returns.

Table 3
Comparison of Tabulations of School Districts Reporting the Employment of Elementary Special Music Teachers 1966 and 1971 by Size of District and the number of ESMT's Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of ESMT's Employed*</th>
<th>Number of School Districts Reporting</th>
<th>Size Categories</th>
<th>Total Districts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 ESMTs</td>
<td>56 45 52 58 22 15 9 10</td>
<td>139 128</td>
<td>46.9% 51.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ESMT</td>
<td>54 38 27 25 3 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ESMTs</td>
<td>6 8 23 17 4 4 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ESMTs</td>
<td>2 2 16 7 3 1 0 0</td>
<td>155 120</td>
<td>52% 49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ESMTs</td>
<td>2 0 3 3 2 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 ESMTs</td>
<td>0 2 3 4 0 2 7 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>1% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is an unduplicated count of each school district sample and because of changes within size categories the N's are not equal.

The data in Table 3 indicate that, in 1971, 51% of the unified and non-unified school districts of California did not employ elementary special music teachers. This figure compares with 47% for 1966, a decrease of 4.7 percent in the number of districts employing elementary special music teachers. The data further indicate a decrease, in one to five
school districts that employed at least one elementary special music teacher from 54 to 38. Stated another way, the data indicate that in 1966, 52 percent of the districts reported that they employed elementary special music teachers, while in 1971 only 49 percent of the districts reported the same. The data indicate a decrease in the number of districts employing elementary special music teachers in all size categories except in 31 and over school districts. There was a three percent increase in the number of 31 and over school districts employing elementary special music teachers.

A further comparison of the number of districts employing elementary special music teachers indicated in Table 4, in which the number and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>ESMT Increased</th>
<th>ESMT Decreased</th>
<th>ESMT Status Quo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matched</td>
<td>Matched</td>
<td>Matched</td>
<td>Matched</td>
<td>Matched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 &amp; over</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percent of unified and non-unified school districts of California have been tabulated by both size and status categories.
Fifty-five percent of the districts indicated a change in the number of elementary special music teachers employed. By comparison there were five percent more districts that reported a decrease in the number of elementary music specialists than there were districts increasing the number that they employed. However, contrary to the overall findings, 16 to 30 districts reported a 7 percent increase while 1 to 5 school districts reported a 2 percent increase.

The greatest ratio of decrease over increase was reported by the large school districts of 31 schools and over.

The largest status category was for the status quo in which the number of elementary special music teachers employed remained the same. The overall category rating is 45 percent, with a high of 57 percent in the 16 to 30 school district size category. However, Table 5 indicates the breakdown of the 112 status quo districts according to size categories and the actual number of elementary special music teachers employed.

Table 5
The Number of Elementary Special Music Teachers Employed in 112 Matched Status Quo Districts by Size Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Number of Districts Employing Same Number of ESMT's 1966-1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data analysis indicates that 67 percent of the status quo districts did not employ elementary special music teachers in 1971. Furthermore, 23 percent of the same districts employed only one. A comparison of the district size, the number of schools to be serviced, and the number of elementary special music teachers employed indicates that more than one-third, eight out of 18 of the elementary special music teachers, must service six to 15 schools.

Comparing the 1966 and 1971 findings, the number of districts reporting a McQuerrey ratio\(^1\) more favorable than ten to one, dropped from forty-nine percent of those employing elementary special music teachers to 45 percent of those employing elementary special music teachers. The number of districts having a five to one ratio showed a smaller decrease, from 34 to 33 percent.

Hence, a comparison of the data from questions one and two from the same school districts in 1966 and 1971 indicates a definite change in the status of the elementary special music teacher in the unified and non-unified school districts of California due to the following: 30 percent of the districts report a decrease in the number of elementary special music teachers employed; 25 percent of the districts report an increase in the number of elementary special music teachers employed; in 1966, 47 percent of the districts did not employ elementary special music teachers while in 1971, 51 percent of the districts did not employ elementary special music teachers. This would indicate a decrease in the availability

\(^1\)Lawrence H. McQuerrey, "The Status of the Special Music Teacher in the Elementary Schools of California" (unpublished study conducted by the Department of Music Education, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California, 1966), p. 5.
of music education in the elementary schools.

These comparisons support the first hypothesis which maintained that there was a change in the number of elementary special music teachers employed in the unified and non-unified school districts of California and the change was toward a decrease.

The data in Table 6 were obtained from Question 3a. Question 3a was: what grade levels are serviced in music by special music teachers?

Table 6

Comparison of Grades Serviced by Elementary Special Music Teachers as Reported for 1966 and 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades Serviced by Elem. Special Music Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total replies</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total returns</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison is made between the grade levels serviced by elementary special music teachers as reported by 138 districts in 1966 and by 124 districts in 1971. Unusual grade level combinations such as one
through three, two through six, one through five, two through 4, K through one, one through four, four only, and five only were reported by only one district. These levels are combined into an "others" category.

Analysis of the data from Table 6 indicates that the majority of the elementary special music teachers serviced grades K through six. The number of K-6 level music specialists serviced districts increased from 38 percent in 1966 to 49 percent in 1971. Grades four through six were the second most frequently serviced levels in both 1966 and 1971. However, the percentage of districts in which elementary special music teachers serviced this level decreased from 25 percent in '66 to 19 percent in '71. The number of one to six level districts remained in third place although there was a decrease from 17 percent to 10 percent. The one to six level districts were tied, in third place, with the five through six level districts.

Overall, there was an increase in the number of districts reporting the grade levels serviced by the elementary special music teacher. This overall increase, coupled with the 10 percent increase at the K through six level, and the dramatic decrease at the four through six and the one through six levels, serve as sufficient indications to the hypothesis that there was a change in the grade levels serviced by the elementary special music teacher in the unified and non-unified school districts of California. However, there were more ESMTs in the lower grades.

Question 3b was: If you have a district-wide policy of the number of music class meetings or number of minutes instruction per week, please indicate here. An analysis and comparison of the number of districts having district-wide policies regarding the number of minutes of music instruction per week broken down by size category and the number
of minutes per week is presented in Table 7. Because of the large number of districts reporting estimated minutes per week, i.e., 40 to 60 minutes, the midpoints of these estimated time periods are reported. For example, where districts reported 20 to 40 minutes in response to the question, 30 minutes is shown to assist in making comparisons with the time periods used in 1966.

Table 7
Comparison of the Number of Districts having District-wide Policies regarding the Number of Minutes of Music Instruction by size Category and the Number of Minutes of Music Instruction for 1966 and 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table 7 reflect the number of matched districts that responded to Question 3b. From Table 7 it can be seen that there were only forty-six districts (18 percent) reporting that they had policies on the number of minutes per week of music instruction in 1971. This compares with 79 districts (27 percent) having similar policies in 1966. The number of one to five school districts having policies, decreased from fifty-two to twenty percent. However, the number of six to 15 school districts increased from 35 to 54 percent. No substantive difference was noted for sixteen to thirty, or thirty-one and over school districts.

Of the districts having district-wide policies in 1971, regardless of size, the majority reported a policy requiring 100 minutes per week. In 1971, more districts reported an estimation of the number of minutes per week, i.e., 20 to 40 minutes, 75 to 100 minutes, etc., than was reported in 1966. Also, in 1971, district-wide policies requiring minutes per week in excess of California's recommended minimum of 100 minutes per week were noted. In general, the policies contrasted with 1966. In 1971 a greater percentage of the districts having policies were meeting the state requirements of one hundred minutes of instruction per week.

The data obtained from Question 3b supports the hypothesis that there was a change in the number of districts having a district-wide policy on the number of minutes per week of music instruction. There were fewer districts having a policy in 1971.

Question 6 was: How many elementary coordinators (supervisors) do you employ? Table 8 compares the number of districts employing elementary music supervisors in 1966 and 1971, size category and the number
of supervisors employed.

The data in Table 8 indicate that in 1966, 42 percent of the unified and non-unified school districts of California employed a music supervisor, while in 1971, 44 percent of the same districts employed a music supervisor. The number of districts employing one music supervisor decreased from 32 to 27 percent and the number of districts employing two or more music supervisors decreased from 5.6 percent in 1966 to .8 percent in 1971. The number of districts employing half-time supervisors increased from .6 percent to 2 percent. A decrease in the number of districts employing music supervisors was noted in all size categories except the 31 and over school districts where an increase was noted, from 3 percent in 1966 to 5 percent in 1971.

The data obtained from the responses to Question 6 support the

Table 8

A Comparison of the Number of Districts Employing Elementary Supervisors in 1966 and 1971 by Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Number of Districts Reporting</th>
<th>Number of Music Supervisors Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>'66</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>'66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>'66</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 &amp; over</td>
<td>'66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dist.</td>
<td>'66</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>'66</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hypothesis that there was a change in the number of unified and non-unified school districts that employed elementary music supervisors with fewer districts employing elementary music supervisors.

In Table 9, the number of elementary music supervisors employed in 1966 and 1971 has been tabulated by size category.

Table 9
Tabulation of the Number of Elementary Music Supervisors Employed in 1966 and 1971 by Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Number of Elementary Supervisors Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and over</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supervisors</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data indicate decreases in the number of elementary supervisors employed in all size categories. These data support the hypothesis that there was a change in the number of elementary music supervisors employed in the unified and non-unified school districts of California and there were fewer supervisors employed.

Data obtained from the survey extension

Questions seven, eight and nine comprise the extension. Question seven was: Please indicate the status and/or use of elementary music
specialists now as compared with five years ago by underlining one of the following: unchanged, improved or deteriorated. Question 8 was based on the response to Question 7. It was: "If you believe that the status and/or use of elementary special music teachers has changed since 1966, please identify those pressures which have affected this change."

Responses to Question 7 were elicited to indicate whether or not the respondees would answer Question 8. The respondees who felt that change had occurred were asked to indicate the pressures that operated to cause the change.

Table 10 is a tabulation of the number of districts that reported the various pressures that influenced the 1971 status of the ESMT.

Analysis of the data collected from Questions 7 and 8 indicates that 65 percent of all of the matched districts reported financial pressures. Of the districts reporting financial pressures, 56 percent were change districts. Fifty-three percent of the districts that did not report financial pressures were change districts. Sixty-six percent of the change districts reported financial pressures and 63 percent of the status quo districts reported financial pressures. This period of time appears to have been a period of financial stress for most districts.

A tabulation of the number of districts that reported legislation pressures as a factor influencing the 1971 status of the ESMT show that twenty-three percent of the 249 matched districts reported legislation pressures. Of those districts reporting legislation pressures, 57 percent were change districts. Of those districts that did not report legislation pressures 54 percent were also change districts. Twenty-four percent of the change districts reported legislation pressures. Twenty-one percent
## Table 10
Tabulation of the Number of Districts Reporting Various Pressures by 1971 ESMT Status Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Pressures</th>
<th>ESMT Increased</th>
<th>ESMT Decreased</th>
<th>ESMT Status Quo</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>37 (15%)</td>
<td>54 (22%)</td>
<td>71 (29%)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>25 (10%)</td>
<td>21 (08%)</td>
<td>41 (16%)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62 (25%)</td>
<td>75 (30%)</td>
<td>112 (45%)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation Pressures</th>
<th>ESMT Increased</th>
<th>ESMT Decreased</th>
<th>ESMT Status Quo</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>15 (06%)</td>
<td>18 (07%)</td>
<td>24 (10%)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>47 (19%)</td>
<td>57 (23%)</td>
<td>88 (35%)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62 (25%)</td>
<td>75 (30%)</td>
<td>112 (45%)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Pressures</th>
<th>ESMT Increased</th>
<th>ESMT Decreased</th>
<th>ESMT Status Quo</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>12 (05%)</td>
<td>09 (04%)</td>
<td>10 (04%)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>50 (20%)</td>
<td>66 (26%)</td>
<td>102 (41%)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62 (25%)</td>
<td>75 (30%)</td>
<td>112 (45%)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Pressures</th>
<th>ESMT Increased</th>
<th>ESMT Decreased</th>
<th>ESMT Status Quo</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>23 (09%)</td>
<td>21 (08%)</td>
<td>31 (12%)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>39 (16%)</td>
<td>54 (22%)</td>
<td>81 (33%)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62 (25%)</td>
<td>75 (30%)</td>
<td>112 (45%)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changed Personnel Pressures</th>
<th>ESMT Increased</th>
<th>ESMT Decreased</th>
<th>ESMT Status Quo</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>23 (09%)</td>
<td>19 (08%)</td>
<td>26 (10%)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>39 (16%)</td>
<td>56 (22%)</td>
<td>86 (35%)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62 (25%)</td>
<td>75 (30%)</td>
<td>112 (45%)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Factors Pressures</th>
<th>ESMT Increased</th>
<th>ESMT Decreased</th>
<th>ESMT Status Quo</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>18 (07%)</td>
<td>20 (08%)</td>
<td>25 (10%)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>44 (18%)</td>
<td>55 (22%)</td>
<td>87 (35%)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62 (25%)</td>
<td>75 (30%)</td>
<td>112 (45%)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the status quo districts reported legislation pressures. Of the districts not reporting legislation pressures, there were more change districts than status quo districts. Similarly, a larger number, 57 percent, of the districts reporting legislation pressures were also change districts. The data suggest a relationship between legislation pressures and the 1971 status of the ESMT.

The tabulation of the number of districts that reported curriculum pressures reveals that only 12 percent of the 249 districts reported curriculum pressures. Of the districts reporting curriculum pressures, sixty-six percent were change districts. Of those districts that did not list curriculum pressures, 53 percent were change districts. A majority in both categories were change districts. Fifteen percent of all change districts listed curriculum pressures while 9 percent of all status quo districts listed curriculum pressures.

Despite the greater number of change districts in both cases where curriculum pressures were listed and where curriculum pressures were not listed, the low percentage (12 percent) of the total 249 matched districts, indicates that curriculum pressures were not a major force in the change in status of the ESMT.

The tabulation of the number of districts reporting community pressures by the 1971 ESMT status category reveals that 30 percent of the 249 matched districts reported community pressures. Of the districts reporting community pressures, 58 percent were change districts. Of the districts that did not report community pressures, 53 percent were also change districts. Only 27 percent of the status quo districts reported community pressures while 32 percent of the change districts reported
community pressures.

Of the districts not listing community pressures, there were more change districts. The same was true for districts that listed community pressures. The data indicate that a greater percentage of the districts that listed community pressures were change districts. However, the number of districts, that did not list community pressures, was twice as large. There were 93 change districts that did not list community pressures.

Significantly, there were almost three times as many status quo districts that did not list community pressures (81) compared to 31 status quo districts that listed community pressures. The small numbers involved renders these findings inconclusive.

A tabulation of the number of districts that reported changed personnel pressures indicates that 27 percent of all of the matched districts listed changed personnel pressures. Sixty-one percent of the districts, that listed changed personnel pressures, were change districts. Fifty-two percent of the districts, that did not list changed personnel pressures, were change districts. Of the change districts, 30 percent listed changed personnel pressures while 23 percent of the status quo districts listed changed personnel pressures. The majority of districts that listed changed personnel pressures were change districts. However, the number of change districts that did not list changed personnel pressures (95) was more than twice as large as the number of change districts (42) that listed changed personnel pressures. For the status quo districts, there were more than three times as many districts (86) that did not list changed personnel pressures as there were districts that listed changed personnel pressures.
A relationship between changed status and the listing of changed personnel pressures is suggested by the fact that the larger percentage of districts that listed changed personnel pressures were change districts. It appears that a change in personnel frequently meant that they were not replaced, thereby creating more musical deprivation. However, the small number of total districts that listed changed personnel pressures and the large number of change districts that did not list changed personnel pressures do not indicate a strong relationship between the 1971 status of the elementary special music teacher and changed personnel pressures. The findings, though significant, are inconclusive.

Question 8f was concerned with factors other than those dealt with in sections "a" through "e" of Question 8. Respondees listed pressures that operated instead of or in addition to the pressures listed in sections "a" through "e". The tabulation of the number of districts that reported other factors pressures indicates that 25 percent of all of the matched districts reported "other factors" pressures. Of the districts reporting "other factors" pressures, 60 percent were change districts. Of the districts not reporting "other factors" pressures, 52 percent were change districts. The number of districts that did not report "other factors" was more than twice greater than the number that reported "other factors" pressures. Of the status quo districts, there were more than three times as many that did not list "other factors" pressures than there were districts that listed these pressures. Clearly, the majority of all the 249 matched districts, 75 percent, did not list "other factors" pressures regardless of the status category. The findings are inconclusive. Our findings indicate that except for financial pressures and legislative
pressures, the remaining pressures taken singly do not predict status changes.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE DATA

Administrative or music personnel from a stratified random sample of the 249 matched districts were interviewed. The telephone survey method was used. Questions for the interview were developed into an interview schedule designed to confirm questionnaire responses and to probe more deeply into the reasons for change that were indicated by the districts.

In Section I of the two part interview schedule, the two questions, that were included, asked the interviewee to confirm whether or not the pressures listed by him on the questionnaire were the actual pressures that operated. He was further asked to confirm the manner in which the pressures operated. Data obtained from the answers to questions in Section I of the interview schedule will be presented and analyzed in this section. This data will consist of confirmed responses to the questions that were asked about which pressures operated to influence the change in the status of the ESMT in the unified and non-unified school districts of California between 1966 and 1971.

Twenty-seven school districts comprised the sample. Of the 27, eleven were status quo districts, nine were districts in which the status of the ESMT had increased and seven were districts in which the status of the ESMT had decreased. Those districts with increased and decreased ESMT status comprise the change district category. Therefore, there were sixteen change districts and 11 status quo districts.

Table 11 is a tabulation of the pressures confirmed in the
interview of the personnel of the stratified random sample of the 249 matched districts according to status and size categories.

Table 11
Tabulation of Confirmed Pressures by Status and Size Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Status Categories and Pressures</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>2 3 3 2 0 1</td>
<td>2 0 1 1 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4 3 3 3 1 1</td>
<td>4 1 1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND: 1 = financial pressures 4 = community pressures
2 = legislation pressures 5 = changed personnel pressures
3 = curriculum pressures 6 = other factors pressures

NB: This is a duplicated count since most school districts listed more than one pressure.

The data in Table 11 indicate a confirmation of the questionnaire data which showed that financial pressures were the pressures most frequently felt by the districts. In the sample, 13 districts, 48 percent of the sample, confirmed financial pressures while the next most frequently mentioned pressure was community pressures with a total of eight districts, thirty percent confirming this pressure. Of the 16 change districts, 8 or fifty percent listed financial pressures. Five change districts, 31 percent listed community pressures.

The interview sample data support the questionnaire data which showed that financial pressures were listed by enough sample districts to
indicate that financial pressures did influence the status of the elementary special music teacher. With 48 percent of all of the sample districts and 50 percent of all of the sample change districts, the listing of financial pressures was well above the listing of community pressures, the second highest.

The interview data confirm the findings of the questionnaire data which indicated that the change of the status of the elementary special music teacher appears to have been greatly influenced by financial pressures.

The data obtained from the interviews also confirm the questionnaire data regarding the remaining pressures. Curriculum pressures were confirmed by 25 percent of the sample change districts, legislation pressures and other factors pressures were each confirmed by 19 percent of the sample change districts, and changed personnel pressures were confirmed by 13 percent of the sample change districts. Of the total sample districts, the percentages of listings were the same or somewhat lower than questionnaire data. Legislation and changed personnel pressures were each confirmed by 19 percent of the total sample districts, with curriculum and other factors pressures each being confirmed by 15 percent of the districts. Financial pressures were pervasive, yet the other factors, though not as pervasive, were significant.

Section II of the interview schedule contained six questions, A through F. These questions sought two kinds of additional information: how the district planned for and utilized the services of the ESMT; and how the district planned for and utilized the services of the other specialists in comparison. The basic purpose of this section was to obtain background information that would be valuable in interpreting the questionnaire findings.
Question A asked: Does your district have any specially stated policy regarding the use of elementary art, drama, music or physical education specialists? Table 12 is a tabulation of the responses to Question A by school district size and the 1971 status categories of the ESMT.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Districts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the sample districts in which the status of the ESMT had increased, none had policies regarding the use of elementary art, drama, music or physical education specialists. However, of the sample districts in which the status of the ESMT had decreased, more than half reported that they had policies regarding the utilization of these specialists. Seventy-five percent of the sample change districts did not have a policy as compared with 73 percent of the status quo districts. Seventy-four percent of all of the sample districts did not have a policy.
The districts in the decreased status category reported the largest number having a policy. The districts in the 6 to 15 school size category also reported the largest number having a policy. Although the N's were very small, it does appear that the development of policy did not necessarily favorably influence the status of the ESMT or other specialists.

Question B asked: "Does your district make any special compensations for areas of instruction in the fine arts and physical education due to special community characteristics or conditions?" The responses to Question B are contained in Table 13, a tabulation of the number of sample districts that reported making special compensations for areas of instruction in the fine arts and physical education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>5 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>10 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-five percent of the change districts indicated that they made special compensations for areas of instruction in the fine arts and
physical education. Of the status quo districts, 55 percent did not make special compensations. Again, as in the case of Question A, the districts where the status of the ESMT was decreased, the largest percentage of affirmative replies were received. Five of the seven sample large districts, those with 16 or more schools, reported that they made special compensations in the fine arts and physical education. Most of the compensations were in the area of enrichment programs. Seven districts reported special summer programs in the fine arts and physical education. Six districts offered out-of-school or after-school special activities in the fine arts and recreation. Three districts reported having volunteer groups assist in fund raising for the arts and physical educational programs. Three districts listed special performances and three listed special incentive pay for specialists in the arts and physical education. Festivals were listed by two districts. Three districts reported the use of special volunteer instructors for teaching classes in the arts. Arts Fairs, Junior Olympics, extended day programs and special elementary string programs were among those special compensations listed by at least one of the districts. Transportation compensation was reported by two districts. The lack of relationship between special compensation and the increased use of ESMT's appears to have been related to the fact that much of the special compensation was for specialized programs during out-of-school hours.

Question C: "Does your district participate in PPBS?" If the district answered affirmatively, it was requested to indicate the extent of participation in terms of how long and whether the participation was district-wide and whether or not this included music and other fine arts.
Table 14 indicates whether or not the district participated in PPBS.

Table 14
Tabulation of the Number of Districts That Participate in PPBS by Size and Status Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No  Yes</td>
<td>No  Yes</td>
<td>No  Yes</td>
<td>No  Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2  1</td>
<td>0  1</td>
<td>3  1</td>
<td>5  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>2  2</td>
<td>4  0</td>
<td>2  2</td>
<td>8  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>1  0</td>
<td>0  1</td>
<td>2  0</td>
<td>3  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>1  0</td>
<td>1  0</td>
<td>1  0</td>
<td>3  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Districts</td>
<td>6  3</td>
<td>5  2</td>
<td>8  3</td>
<td>19  8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the data in Table 14 reveals that more than half of the sample districts did not participate in PPBS. Sixty-six percent of the sample districts, where the ESMT status was increased, did not participate in PPBS. Of the sample districts where the ESMT status was decreased, seventy-one percent of the districts did not participate in PPBS. Six out of eight sample change districts in the 6 to 15 school districts size category did not participate in PPBS. None of the sampled districts in the 31 and over school district size category participated. Of the eight participating districts, three had participated in PPBS for one year, one for two years and one for three years. Seven of the eight participating districts indicated district-wide involvement. The non-district-wide participating district indicated that it chose only the areas that were best suited to PPBS. Those areas that were excluded included music and
the other fine arts. The fine arts were included in the participation by the other districts. The overwhelming majority of the sample districts were not making use of PPBS. Therefore, it appears that most of the districts were not "alert" as far as PPBS and the use of the ESMT was concerned. While there may not be a direct relationship between the use of a sophisticated administrative tool like PPBS and the availability of music in the curriculum, studies such as McKenna's strongly suggest at least a philosophical deficit in educational planning.

Question D requested information regarding the involvement of community groups in pressuring for an increase in arts education. Table 15 is a tabulation of the number of sample districts that reported the operation of community pressure groups by size and status category.

Table 15
Tabulation of the Number of Sample Districts Reporting the Operation of Community Pressure Groups by Size and Status Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Increased No</th>
<th>Increased Yes</th>
<th>Decreased No</th>
<th>Decreased Yes</th>
<th>Status Quo No</th>
<th>Status Quo Yes</th>
<th>Total No</th>
<th>Total Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Districts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all status and size categories more districts reported not having community pressure groups than reported having such groups. Fifty-
six percent of all sample districts did not report the operation of community pressure groups. The smaller districts had the least number of reports of the operation of community pressure groups. All seven of the districts in the 16 to 30 school district and the 31 and over categories reported having community pressure groups.

Of the districts reporting the operation of community pressure groups, three reported that the groups gave special support in special elections, six reported special money raising efforts, three reported scholarship programs, and ten districts indicated a variety of other activities that ranged from attendance and involvement at board meetings to sponsoring special programs for the children and the training of volunteers to conduct special programs for the students. It appears that the efforts of community pressure groups were not great, they did have an affect on the status of the ESMT.

Question E asked for an indication of the position that the district had taken in regards to specialty areas such as the fine arts and physical education. Table 16 is a tabulation of the responses to Question E. The table consists of a comparison of the change in the status of the ESMT between 1966 and 1971 with the change in the status of elementary art, drama and physical education programs between 1966 and 1971. The comparison is broken down according to the size categories of the districts.

The data in Table 16 indicate that the majority of the sample districts maintained a status quo level for elementary art, drama and physical education programs between 1966 and 1971, regardless of the size of the district and the status category of the ESMT. Within the sample change districts, elementary physical education programs showed
the greatest gain in status while elementary drama programs showed the least gain. In all the sample districts, elementary art programs showed the greatest loss.

Table 16
Comparison in the Change in the Status of the ESMT Between 1966 and 1971 with the Change in the Status of the Elementary Art, Drama and Physical Education Programs by Size Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>ESMT Increased</th>
<th>ESMT Decreased</th>
<th>ESMT Status Quo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art   Drama  PE</td>
<td>Art   Drama  PE</td>
<td>Art   Drama  PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+   -   +   -   +   -   +   -   +   -   +   -   +   -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 4 0 0 4 0 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>0 1 3 0 0 4 1 2 1 1 0 3 0 0 4 0 0 4 1 0 3 1 0 3 2 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 0 2 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 1 5 3 0 6 4 2 3 1 1 5 0 0 7 1 1 5 2 1 8 1 0 1 0 2 1 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that the status level of elementary art, drama and physical education programs tended to develop at a level comparable to that of the status level of the ESMT. For example, when the status level of the ESMT was decreased in a district, the status of the elementary art, drama and physical education programs were at a lower level, while in districts where the status level of the ESMT was increased, the level of the elementary art, drama, and physical education programs was also increased. Status quo music districts indicated that their art, drama and physical education programs also remained at the status quo level.
SUMMARY

To summarize the findings of the questionnaire, the extension and the interview schedule there was a decrease in the number of ESMT's employed in the unified and non-unified school districts of California between 1966 and 1971.

There was a change in the grade levels serviced by ESMT's with more ESMT's servicing the lower grades.

There was a change in the number of districts having a district-wide policy regarding number of minutes per week of music instruction with more districts meeting the state required minimum of 100 minutes per week.

There was a change in the number of unified and non-unified school districts of California that employed elementary music supervisors. Fewer districts employed elementary music supervisors and these districts employed fewer supervisors.

There was pervasive financial stress throughout the years 1966 to 1971.

There was a relationship between community group, changed personnel and legislation pressures and the 1971 status of the ESMT.

The interview data confirmed the findings of the questionnaire extension that financial community, changed personnel and legislative pressures were predictors of status change.

The development of a district-wide policy did not influence the status of the ESMT and other specialists.

The majority of the districts did not participate in PPBS.
There appeared to be a strong relationship between community pressure groups and the status of the ESMT.

The majority of the sample districts maintained a status quo level in art, drama and P.E. and the status of art, drama and PE developed at a level comparable to that of music.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there was a change in the status of the Elementary Special Music Teacher (ESMT) in California during the five-year period from 1966 to 1971 and to ascertain the reason for the change.

The Replication Data

The unified and non-unified school districts were resurveyed in 1971 to determine the amount of change. This was done as a replication of the 1966 McQuerrey survey. Additional items were included on the replication questionnaire in order to elicit responses that would indicate the reason for change.

In answer to Hypothesis 1: there was a change in the number of unified and non-unified school districts that employed ESMT's; the findings indicate that during that five-year period from 1966 to 1971, there was a decrease of 4.7 percent in the number of school districts which employed ESMT's. While not catastrophic, this finding indicates some serious loss of ESMT's and indicates that there needs to be careful monitoring in the future of the number of districts employing ESMT's.

However, a consideration of these data by size category showed that in school districts having 6 to 15 schools the decrease in those districts employing ESMT's was 9 percent, almost double the rate for the total population. This is an alarming rate of decrease and suggests that
the school districts of this size have special problems which should be evaluated immediately.

In answer to Hypothesis 2: there was a change in the grade levels serviced by ESMT's; the findings indicate that 11.5 percent more districts reported that ESMT's were servicing all elementary grades (K-6) in 1971 than in 1966. This coupled with the fact that few districts have ESMT's would indicate that ESMT's are more spread out, trying to work with more students.

In answer to Hypothesis 3: there was a change in the number of districts having a district-wide policy regarding the amount of music instruction per week; the findings indicate that there was an 8 percent decrease from 1966 to 1971 in the number of districts reporting a district-wide policy regarding the amount of music instruction per week. This decrease, combined with the decrease in numbers of districts having ESMT's and the increase in the number of grades covered appears to suggest an erosion both quantitatively and qualitatively in music instruction in California elementary schools.

However, a consideration of these data by size category shows that more of the districts in the 6-15 size category had a district-wide policy than all other size categories combined. The findings indicate that in regards to policy, the change in the 6-15 size category is contrary to the change in other size districts.

In answer to Hypothesis 4: there was a change in the number of unified and non-unified school districts that employed music supervisors; the findings indicate that 8 percent fewer districts employed music supervisors in 1971 than in 1966. Combining the data in hypothesis 1 and
four, we discover that not only fewer ESMT's were available, but there is a continuing decline in the number of specialists to supervise the efforts of regular classroom teachers.

However, a consideration of the data by size category shows that over half (56 percent) of all school districts reporting the employment of music supervisors were in the 6-15 size category. Again this suggests that the change in the 6-15 size category is unique and different from the change in other size categories. Combining the findings in regards to hypotheses 1 and 4, school districts in the 6-15 size category are apparently supplanting the teaching of music by ESMT's with classroom teachers who have involvement with music supervisors. This size category seems to be moving toward the intermediate position described in Chapter two.

In answer to Hypothesis 5: there was a change in the number of music supervisors employed by the unified and non-unified school districts; the findings reveal that there was a 20 percent loss in the number of music supervisors reported - from 84 percent in 1966 to 64 percent in 1971. This appears to be a major loss and is indicative of a major trend. The loss appeared to be comparable in all size categories. This loss in music supervision personnel appears to represent a major loss in music education in California.

The Extension Data

The survey extension data were designed to show why the changes occurred. The districts responded by listing the pressures that influenced their position in regards to ESMT's. The findings show that 65 percent of
the school districts reported that financial pressures were the major factor affecting the employment of the ESMT. However, financial problems appeared to be pervasive in public schools throughout the state and were reported not only by districts who had lost ESMT's but by districts that increased ESMT's and by districts that maintained the status quo.

Three other factors were reported by approximately one fourth of the districts. These include pressures by community groups (30 percent), change or loss of musical personnel (27 percent) and legislation (23 percent).

The data show a strong impact by community pressure groups on decision making regarding the use of ESMT's. Changed personnel implies (1) loss of personnel who are not replaced and (2) the impact of individual personalities on the success or failure of the music program. The change or loss of personnel must be carefully monitored to avoid loss by attrition or other automatic factors. Legislation is a factor which indicates how important it is that music educators maintain communication with their legislators.

The Interview Schedule Data

These data were designed to validate the responses to the questionnaire and to probe further into the reasons for change. The interview data supported and agreed with the data obtained from the responses to the questionnaires, and it indicated a high validity to those responses. Serendipitious findings from the interview indicated that the specialist teachers in art, drama and P.E. were subjected to the same pressures and were in approximately the same employment status as were specialist teachers in music. They were in a special category as far as finances,
legislation, changed personnel and community pressures were concerned.

Summary

The data from the total study indicate that the status of the ESMT's is slightly weaker in 1971 than it was in 1966.

Recommendations

1. Due to the changes in status indicated by this study, replication studies should be made at least every five years in order to monitor the rate of change in the status of the ESMT. This should be a natural task of the state education bodies, and because of the response validity discovered in this study, the Survey appears to be an adequate instrument.

2. Because this study found that 30 percent of the school districts reported that community pressures influenced administrative decisions in music, Community pressure groups should be utilized in lobbying for increased status of the arts and other specialty areas of instruction. The MENC should be commended for their insights in recognizing the value of community support and the need for practical and consistent effort. Good public relations for music should be promoted at the national, state and local levels.

3. Because 25 percent of the school districts reported that personnel changes affected administrative decisions in music, the replacement and reassignment of music personnel need to be carefully monitored so that music positions are not phased out and key personnel are replaced when they resign or more from one position to another. The impact of individual personalities needs to be considered when making assignments in key music positions.
4. Because 23 percent of the school districts reported that legislation influences administrative decisions in music, the impact of legislation needs to be appreciated and state and local music education organizations and individuals need to redouble their efforts in maintaining communication with the legislature and increasing their impact on legislation.

5. Because serendipitous interview findings indicated an equivalent status in a number of specialty teaching areas, music educators need to join forces with other education specialists in seeking ways to improve their situation in California schools.
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APPENDIX I

A COPY OF THE 1971 QUESTIONNAIRE
(two pages)
APPENDIX I
THE STATUS OF THE SPECIAL MUSIC TEACHER IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF CALIFORNIA

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of School District: ____________________________________________

Address: ________________________________________________ Telephone: ______________________

Name of Person Completing this Form: ____________________________

Title or Position: ____________________________________________ Date: ________________

* * * * * * * * * *

For this questionnaire, an elementary special music teacher is one who teaches only general music to elementary school children.

It does not refer to music supervisors or coordinators who do not teach.

It does not refer to instrumental (band or orchestra) teachers.

It does not refer to classroom teachers who teach their own music.

* * * * * * * * * *

1. How many elementary schools are in your district? __________________________

2. How many elementary special music teachers do you employ? ________________

3. What grade levels are serviced in music by special music teachers? Please circle: K 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th

(If you have a district-wide policy of number of music class meetings, or number of minutes instruction per week, please indicate here.)

Remarks: ____________________________________________________________

4. Do you have definite plans in your district to increase or decrease the use of elementary special music teachers? Please underline:

increase decrease maintain status quo

5. Do you believe the trend in your area is to increase or decrease the use of elementary special music teachers? Please underline:

increase decrease maintain status quo

6. How many elementary music coordinators (supervisors) do you employ? ________

7. Please indicate the status and/or use of elementary music specialists now as compared with five years ago by underlining one of the following:

unchanged improved deteriorated
3. If you believe that the status and/or use of elementary special music teachers has changed since 1966, please identify those pressures which have affected this change. (You may check more than one item in each category.) In the space provided in the remarks section below, please identify what you feel was the primary pressure. (You may indicate pressures under either improvement or deterioration, or both.)

a. Finances
   tax overrides ___
   bond issues ___
   state funds ___
   federal funds ___
   local apportionment ___
   other (please specify) ___

b. Legislation
   federal laws ___
   state laws (Miller Bill, etc.) ___
   local board recommendations ___
   other (please specify) ___

c. Curriculum
   Tanglewood Symposium ___
   flexible scheduling ___
   CMEA Position Paper ___
   PPBS (Planning Program Budgeting System) ___
   other (please specify) ___

d. Community Pressures
   parent groups ___
   voter groups ___
   music groups ___
   other (please specify) ___

e. Changed Personnel
   administration ___
   supervisory ___
   music personnel ___
   other (please specify) ___

f. Other Factors (please specify) ___

Remarks related to factors which caused improvement:

Remarks related to factors which caused deterioration:

General remarks:

Please return questionnaire to Mr. Algin C. Hurst
1212 Wellington Drive
Modesto, California 95350
APPENDIX II

A COPY OF THE 1966 QUESTIONNAIRE
Appendix II
Copy of The Questionnaire of The Study

Name of School District ________________________________

For this questionnaire, an elementary special music teacher is one who teaches only general music to elementary school children. It does not refer to instrumental (band or orchestra) teachers. It does not refer to music supervisors or coordinators who do not teach. It does not refer to classroom teachers who teach their own music.

* * * * * *

1. How many elementary schools are in your district? __________________________

2. How many elementary special music teachers do you employ? ____________

3. What grade levels are serviced in music by special music teachers?
   (Please circle) K 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th
   (If you have a district-wide policy of number of music class meetings, or number of minutes instruction per week, please indicate here.)

Remarks: ____________________________________________________________________

4. Do you have definite plans in your district to increase or decrease the use of elementary special music teachers?
   (Please underline) increase decrease maintain status quo

5. Do you believe the trend in your area is to increase or decrease the use of elementary special music teachers?
   (Please underline) increase decrease maintain status quo

6. How many elementary coordinators (supervisors) do you employ? __________

Remarks:

Dr. Lawrence H. McQuerrey, Department of Music Education
University of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif. 95204
APPENDIX III

A COPY OF THE COVERLETTER FOR
THE FIRST MAILING OF THE 1971
QUESTIONNAIRE. THIS LETTER RE-
PRESENTS THE SUPPORT OF THIS
CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION FOR SUPER-
VISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
FOR THIS STUDY
Elementary School Administrators
State of California

Dear Sir:

Because of several factors, such as the adoption of a framework for music education in California, the implementation of Senate Bill 1 and financial problems plaguing school districts, I highly recommend that the status of the elementary special music teacher in California be examined.

Mr. Algin Hurst, a doctoral candidate at the University of the Pacific, under the guidance of Dr. Lawrence McQuerrey, is intending to survey this problem which was done by Dr. McQuerrey in 1966 and is now out of date. He will be extending the study further by trying to delve into the "whys" of the status he finds.

Would you be so kind as to take a few minutes to answer his questionnaire so that music educators can know what the present situation is? Your cooperation will be truly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Edna Jo Reed
State Chairman
CASCID Music Committee
Curriculum Coordinator - Music
San Diego County Department of Education

EJR:GS
APPENDIX IV

May 25, 1971

Music Supervisors
State of California

Dear Sir:

A few weeks ago we sent to you a questionnaire on "The Status of the Special Music Teacher in the Elementary Schools of California." Because of several factors such as an adoption of a framework of music education in California, the implementation of Senate Bill 1, and financial problems plaguing school districts, it seems that the status of the elementary special music teacher should be reexamined.

Mr. Algin Hurst, a doctoral candidate at the University of the Pacific, under the guidance of Dr. Lawrence McQuerrey, Chairman of the Department of Music Education, is surveying this problem which was originally done by Dr. McQuerrey in 1966 and is now out of date. The present study has been extended further to delve into the "whys" of the present status.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the questionnaire that was originally mailed to your district. Would you please be so kind as to answer this questionnaire.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Fay S. Gartin

Mrs. Fay S. Gartin
Member, Editorial Board
CMEA NEWS
Consultant, Stanislaus County Schools
Lecturer in Music, Stanislaus State College
APPENDIX V

A COPY OF THE INTERVIEW CONTROL FORM USED IN THE TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

(two pages)
APPENDIX V

DISTRICT: ________________________________ DATE: ________________________________

PERSON INTERVIEWED: ________________________________

INCREASE / DECREASE / STATUS QUO

I. Pressures

A. ________________________________
B. ________________________________
C. ________________________________
D. ________________________________

Manner in which pressures operated

A. ________________________________
B. ________________________________
C. ________________________________
D. ________________________________

II. Clarification

A. Does your district have any specially stated policy regarding the use of the following specialists?

1. Yes ______
2. No ______
3. Which specialists:
   a. **Fine Arts**: Teacher _____ Coordinator _____ Supervisor _____ Consultant _____
   b. **Art**: Teacher _____ Supervisor _____ Coordinator _____
   c. **Music**: Vocal _____ Instrumental _____ General Music _____ Teacher _____
      Consultant _____ Supervisor _____ Coordinator _____
   d. **Drama**: Teacher _____ Supervisor _____ Consultant _____ Coordinator _____
   e. **P. E.**: Teachers _____ Coaches _____ Director of Athletics _____

B. Does your community make any special compensations, financial or otherwise, for any of the following areas of instruction, due to special community characteristics:

1. Yes ______
   No ______

2. If yes, in which subjects?
   a. **Art**
   b. **Music** Vocal _____ Instructor _____ General Music _____
   c. **Drama**
   d. **P. E.** Classes _____ Inter-scholastic _____
C. Does your district participate in PPBS?

1. Yes ____ No ____
2. For how long ____
3. Is your participation: districtwide ____ individual schools ____
   elementary level ____ secondary level ____ other ____
4. Does the participation include music and other fine arts
   Yes ____ No ____

D. Have community groups been actively involved in pressing for increased arts education?

1. Yes ____ No ____
2. If yes, what were some of the activities:
   (a) petitions ____
   (b) special support in special elections ____
   (c) sponsored referendums ____
   (d) special money raising efforts ____
   (e) scholarships ____
   (f) other ____

E. In the process of coping with the financial pressures in your district, you have had to make certain decisions regarding specialty programs.

1. Please indicate the position you have taken in regards to the following specialty areas in the school program.
   (a) Art: Increased ____ Decreased ____ Maintained level ____
   (b) Drama: Increased ____ Decreased ____ Maintained level ____
   (c) P.E.: Increased ____ Decreased ____ Maintained level ____
2. Please indicate, briefly, the rationale behind the decision:

F. What are the duties of your Special Music Teacher?

1. Teach elementary vocal, only ____
2. Teach elementary instrumental, only ____
3. Teach elementary and secondary vocal ____
4. Teach elementary and secondary instrumental ____
5. Teach elementary vocal and instrumental ____
6. Teach elementary vocal and instrumental and general music ____
7. Teach elementary general music, only ____
8. Teach elementary and secondary general music ____
9. Teach secondary vocal, elementary general music ____
10. Teach secondary instrumental and elementary general music ____
11. Consultant ____
12. Supervisor ____
13. Consultant and teacher ____
14. Consultant and supervisor ____
15. Supervisor and teacher ____
16. Secondary vocal or instrumental and elementary supervisor ____
17. Secondary vocal or instrumental and elementary consultant ____
18. Secondary vocal or instrumental and elementary vocal or instrumental ____
19. Only elementary music person ____
20. Only district music person ____
21. Other ____