

Running head: COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

A COMPARISON OF TEACHER PREPARATION, RESOURCES, AND STUDENTS'
CONTINUED COLLEGE MUSIC STUDY BETWEEN URBAN AND NON-URBAN HIGH
SCHOOL BAND PROGRAMS IN TENNESSEE

by

Charlie S. Edmonds

Submitted to the faculty of the
Jacobs School of Music in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree,
Master of Music Education
Indiana University
July 2019

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Accepted by the faculty of the Jacobs School of Music,
Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Music Education.

Thesis Committee

Patrice Madura Ward-Steinman, Chair

Brenda Brenner

Peter Miksza

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Acknowledgements

There are several people who have made this project possible. I am grateful for every encouraging word and positive interaction I've received on my journey, and am indebted to those who continued to breathe life into a project that I thought I would never get to finish.

Thank you to my chairperson, Dr. Patrice Madura Ward-Steinman, who has taken time check in with me over many years to make sure I not only understood the steps for conducting my research, but also that I could reach the finish line. I am grateful for her dedication to my project, and I would not have been able to proceed without her expertise and willingness to help.

I am also thankful to the members of my research committee, Dr. Brenda Brenner and Dr. Peter Miksza, for their interest in my research and their detailed perspectives on my work. I appreciate their immediate attention to any questions I had, even after a long hiatus.

I am eternally indebted to the students and staff at Vine Middle Magnet School, a place that initially felt like an obstacle to research completion, but one that ultimately fueled my passion for this topic and pushed me toward my goals. Teaching in an urban band program and experiencing the heart of my students and their desire for success despite their environment encouraged me to continue in this process. This work is for them.

Lastly, I extend my gratitude to my family and friends, who never stopped asking me about this work, and never allowed me to lose sight of my goals. It was their constant encouragement and interest that motivated me to finish what I started.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

A Comparison of Teacher Preparation, Resources, and Students' Continued College Music Study between Urban and Non-Urban High School Band Programs in Tennessee

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent of high school band directors' preservice preparation for teaching in urban schools, as well as determine what disparities exist between band program resources in urban schools and non-urban schools. Participants ($N = 27$) were high school band directors in West, Middle, and East Tennessee who completed a researcher-designed questionnaire. The researcher collected information on the inclusion of topics on teaching minority students and low SES students, directors' perspectives on teaching minority students and creating culturally relevant instruction, and band program resources that promote student success. To measure student success, data were correlated with the number of music majors that had come from the high school band programs in the past three years. Results showed that the majority of band directors (93%) never or very rarely had topics included on teaching minority students in their undergraduate coursework, and 59% very rarely had topics included on teaching students from low socio-economic backgrounds. Most participants (70%) did not feel prepared to teach in urban schools, but were generally comfortable creating instruction relevant to the interests of minority students. Band resources by program demographics were unequal. Significant findings showed that band programs with fewer minority students had more students taking private lessons, more participation in ensembles outside of school, higher parental involvement in fundraising, more supplemental instructors, and received more student teachers than band programs with higher percentages of minority students. Band programs with more minority students had more students using school-owned instruments. Significant findings also showed that band programs with lower percentages of minority students had more students become music majors after high school.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....iii

Abstractiv

List Of Tables.....vii

Chapter 1: Statement of the Problem..... 1

 Problem Statement 4

 Purpose of the Study.....4

 Operational Definitions.....5

Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature.....7

 Underrepresentation of Minorities in Classical Music Programs.....7

 Status of Urban Music Education.....16

 Teacher Preparation for Urban Music Teaching19

 Comparisons and Equity32

 Summary43

Chapter 3: Methodology.....45

 Pilot Study.....46

 Participants47

 Measure47

 Procedure48

 Data Analysis.....48

Chapter 4: Results and Discussion.....50

 Results

 Band Director and Program Demographics 50

 Undergraduate Teacher Preparation for Urban Settings52

 Band Program Resources.....55

 Student Intent to Major in Music.....60

 Correlations.....60

 Discussion

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Band Director and Program Demographics	63
Undergraduate Teacher Preparation for Urban Settings	64
Band Program Resources.....	65
Student Intent to Major in Music.....	66
Correlations between Demographics and Band Program Resources.....	66
Correlations between Demographics and Teacher Preparation for Urban Settings.....	68
Correlations between Intent to Major in Music, Demographics, and Program Resources.....	69
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, Implications, And Recommendations.....	71
Summary	71
Conclusions.....	78
Implications	79
Recommendations	81
References.....	83
Appendices.....	86
A. Correlation Tables	86
B. Pilot Study.....	88
C. Invitation to High School Band Directors	90
D. Band Director Questionnaire Paper and Online Formats.....	91

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

List of Tables

Table 1: Frequencies and Percentages for Region of Tennessee Represented.....	50
Table 2: Frequencies and Percentages for Type of School Represented	50
Table 3: Band Director Ethnicity Represented in Sample	51
Table 4: Number of Years Teaching Band	51
Table 5: Number of Years Teaching Band in Current School	51
Table 6: Band Director Level of Education	52
Table 7: Percentage of Minority Students Enrolled in Band Program.....	52
Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for Inclusion of Urban Topics in Undergraduate Music Education Courses.....	53
Table 9: Band Director Undergraduate Field Experience Assignment.....	53
Table 10: Descriptive Statistics for Undergraduate Encouragement for Jobs in Urban Schools...53	
Table 11: Frequencies of Teacher Confidence with Teaching Minority Students.....	54
Table 12: Descriptive Statistics for Level of Comfort in Instruction by Ensemble Ethnic Makeup	54
Table 13: Descriptive Statistics for Types of Music Taught in Band Program.....	55
Table 14: Frequencies of Student Teachers or Interns in Band Programs in Past Three Years....	56
Table 15: Percentages of Students Using School-Owned Instruments in Band Program.....	56
Table 16: Percentages of Students in Band Program Taking Private Lessons.....	57
Table 17: Frequencies of Funding for Private Lessons in Band Program	57
Table 18: Descriptive Statistics for Frequency of Band Program Resources Offered	59
Table 19: Frequencies of Students Enrolling in University Music Programs after High School Graduation in Past Three Years.....	60
Table 20: Spearman Correlations between Percentage of Minorities in Band Program, Resources, and Number of Music Majors	61
Table 21: Spearman Correlations between Percentage of Minorities, Teacher Preparation, Type of	

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Music Taught, and Number of Student Teachers62

Table 22: Spearman Correlations between Percentage of Minorities in Band Program, Resources,
and Number of Music Majors (complete matrix)86

Table 23: Spearman Correlations between Percentage of Minorities, Teacher Preparation, Type of
Music Taught, and Number of Student Teachers (complete matrix).....87

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Chapter 1: Statement of The Problem

In university instrumental music programs, minority faculty members are few (Sheldon & Hartley, 2012), and the minority makeup of students in secondary and university bands do not mirror the minority makeup of the general population (DeLorenzo, 2012; Elpus & Abril, 2011; Sheldon & Hartley, 2012; Walker & Hamann, 1995). High school music students who identify themselves as African American or Hispanic/Latino and align with the lowest socioeconomic status (SES) percentile consistently comprise most of the population in urban schools (Elpus & Abril, 2011; Doyle, 2014; Johnson, 2008), and are frequently characterized by the challenges of the corresponding environment. Socioeconomic challenges, low parental support, single-parent structure, and faltering community support are frequent aspects of concern for urban schools (Johnson, 2008). Retaining teachers in this environment is also a challenge; aside from a few exceptional cases, most teachers who enter urban schools leave within one to three years of employment (Eros, 2009).

Teacher preparation for the urban school, particularly urban music programs, is inadequate (Doyle, 2012; Fitzpatrick, 2012). Few teachers in their preservice stage of education desire to be assigned to or hired in urban music programs (Robinson, 2012). Collegiate students on the cusp of their teaching careers prefer placement in a well-established, well-reputed school with a mixed-ethnicity, middle to high-income student population holding musical experiences similar to their own (Robinson, 2012). Consequently, music programs in urban schools experience little to no student teachers and struggle to find and retain quality instruction (Doyle, 2012; Robinson, 2012).

Furthermore, most teachers that are hired in urban schools are mismatched in ethnicity, SES, and musical background with their students, and are uncomfortable venturing outside of Western classical music traditions learned at their universities (Doyle, 2012). This discomfort with relating to the culture of students in urban schools not only alienates teachers from students, but also affects the teacher's expectations of the students due to failure to understand them and

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

their needs (Doyle, 2012). As a result, students in urban music programs are often not pushed to their highest potential, as teachers are not as well-versed in culturally relevant teaching as they are in traditional music training, and may tend to push students into the accepted norm for American suburban schools (Doyle, 2012, 2014). Students of color who seek identity and cultural significance may not feel that they belong in instrumental music study, and may disengage from music instruction altogether (Fitzpatrick, 2012).

Contrastingly, many teachers in urban schools have rewarding experiences, though undergraduate music programs may not be informed about them. Music instructors who have been in urban schools for at least three years have reported many aspects that encouraged them to remain in the schools. Positive factors included meaningful and valuable teaching experiences, non-intimidating neighborhoods, and a commitment to the students (Eros, 2009; Fitzpatrick, 2011). Unfortunately, a dim view of urban schools is often relayed in preservice music education programs, reinforcing undergraduates' desire to be placed in highly-funded, high-achieving music programs as student teachers. As a result, urban schools often miss out on remarkable music teachers, and new teachers miss the benefits and professional growth that accompany teaching in the urban sector (Eros, 2009).

As White music teachers continue to outnumber their minority colleagues and enter urban schools with African American and Hispanic/Latino-concentrated populations, very few models reflect the students' cultures—an element that can heavily influence a student's recruitment to music study (Fitzpatrick, 2012; Walker & Hamann, 1995). The cycle of underrepresentation continues, as urban students are not choosing to study music at the same rate as their non-urban peers, and the number of African-American and Hispanic/Latino students in instrumental music study, such as wind band degree programs and conducting symposia/workshops, remains extremely low (Sheldon & Hartley, 2012).

Another probable factor stifling urban student representation in music study is the unequal financial footing with other schools. A study by Rickels et al. (2013) shows that student

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

choice to pursue a future in music education is heavily influenced by positive experiences and access to honor ensembles in high school band, orchestra, and choir programs, but a lack of resources in urban programs may not make these experiences as readily available as they may be in programs with affluent provisions (Doyle, 2014; Johnson, 2008). Teachers have reported less than acceptable facilities in urban music programs (Doyle, 2014), as well as a lack of instructional resources needed to offer the varied curriculum that is seen in some suburban schools (Doyle, 2014). Schools that receive adequate funding have more opportunities to hire private lesson instructors and offer exploratory music experiences like field trips and master classes, and tend to see a higher influx of student teachers (Costa-Giomi, 2008). Conversely, without adequate funding, instrument quality may suffer greatly, producing a poorer ensemble and individual sound, regardless of how hard the student practices. As loaner instrument programs have become more integral, this situation is less problematic; however, parents and students in urban areas are still often overwhelmed with frequent additional costs that accompany the instrument and musical involvement, such as purchasing quality reeds or other woodwind and brass accessories, and paying fees for band, choir, orchestra, private lessons, and music-related trips (Kinney, 2010). These challenges affect enrollment and recruitment of urban music students greatly, as the student and parent consider the costs and amount of support that would help a student be successful in music.

Also highlighted in previous research (Kinney, 2010; Johnson, 2008), many students in urban schools are from single-parent family structures and are classified as low SES. As a result, the options for parental resources dwindle because the single parent likely works more than one job, and may have trouble transporting the student or being present at music program events. Furthermore, the parents who are involved tend to be more concerned about the academic achievement of their child rather than musical achievement, as test scores for urban schools have been lower than their surrounding counterparts (Doyle, 2014; Johnson, 2008; Kinney, 2010). Consequently, music directors in urban schools have experienced difficulty soliciting parental

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

involvement for activities that are typically well-supported in suburban schools, such as fundraisers and transportation committees for band trips, solo opportunities, and competitions (Kinney, 2010).

Problem Statement

Prior research has highlighted that participation and achievement in music programs, particularly in urban schools, is affected by home environment and parental framework (Kinney, 2010), teacher preparation and expectations, (Doyle, 2012; Eros, 2009, Fitzpatrick, 2011), socioeconomic status (Abril & Elpus, 2011), and other nonmusic factors such as funding, resources, administrative support, and recruitment strategies (Costa-Giomi, 2008; Johnson, 2008; Kinney, 2010). The majority of these studies have focused on elementary or middle school music programs, and the findings are valuable. However, few studies have been conducted to examine the impact of these factors in the context of high school band programs, with even fewer studies focusing on how these factors vary between urban and non-urban schools. A need exists for a study to examine the extent of teacher preparation and resources among urban and non-urban band programs to explore relationships between these two variables and student music achievement in the context of future music study plans.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate high school band directors' preservice preparation for teaching in urban schools---particularly, the frequency of inclusion of topics on minority students and low SES students in undergraduate coursework, preservice band directors' familiarity with and encouragement to apply for jobs in urban schools, and how comfortable they are or would be with teaching in urban schools. The study will also compare program resources between high school band programs to examine disparities between the programs in urban and non-urban schools. The research study will determine if inequalities exist between the two independent variables: a) extent of teacher preparation for the music program, and b) extent of program resources (e.g., instruments resources, additional instructors, private lessons, camp

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

privileges, travel opportunities, and parental resources), with the dependent variable: student intent to study music at the university level.

Five research questions will be answered:

1. How much university training have high school band directors received on teaching minority/low SES students and/or in urban schools, and what does this training include?
2. How comfortable are music teachers with culturally relevant instruction? Are they comfortable developing methods or repertoire deviating from those learned in traditional music teacher training programs?
3. Are resources for instrumental music learning (supplemental staffing, parental resources, access to honor bands, festivals, and events, facilities, owned instruments, quality equipment) different between schools with higher percentages of minority students and those with lower percentages of minority students?
4. What are the relationships between the extent of urban and non-urban band programs' resources (i.e., quality instruments, additional instructors, camps, and travel opportunities) and the intent of their students to study music in college?
5. What is the relationship between the number of students who become university music majors from a high school band program and the program's percentage of minority students enrolled?

Operational Definitions

Minority. *Minority* is defined as “a small group within a community or country that is different because of race, religion, language, etc.” (Oxford University Press, 2011, Retrieved from URL).

For the present study, the term *minority* will refer to individuals in the United States who identify themselves as African American or Hispanic/Latino.

Urban. The cryptic term, *urban*, has been used to reflect city design, culture, population size, ethnicity, and more, depending on the situation in which it is used. This study will use Fitzpatrick's (2011) definition of the urban environment as a reference: “The majority of its

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

population is non-White, it is located in a city, it has a variety of income levels, and/or has low levels of socioeconomic status...” (Fitzpatrick, 2011, p.27)

Musical Achievement. In this study, musical achievement will be defined as the number of students over the past three years who have become college music majors upon graduating from their high school band programs.

Culturally Relevant Teaching. This term will refer to teachers’ sensitivity and response to cultures represented within the band classroom. Culturally relevant teaching requires that teachers intentionally connect with their students’ cultures and form effective and relevant curricula that, in turn, foster confidence in the students’ social and cultural identities (Fitzpatrick, 2012).

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature

Research relevant to this study will be organized into the following categories for review:

(a) underrepresentation of minorities in classical music programs, (b) status of urban music education, (c) teacher preparation for urban music teaching, and (d) comparisons and equity.

Underrepresentation of Minorities in Classical Music Programs

DeLorenzo (2012) challenged readers to view the classical orchestra outside of a white lens. With this new view, the author stated, one will notice underrepresentation in orchestral ensembles. According to DeLorenzo's account of correspondence with personnel managers of the New York Philharmonic, Philadelphia Orchestra, and Atlanta Symphony Orchestra, less than 2% of the participating musicians in these groups were African American or Latino. The author highlighted that Black and Latino musicians had historically been featured (Marian Anderson String Quartet, the Sphinx Organization, Black and Latino Composers and Musicians) and that this action was commendable. However, DeLorenzo expressed that organizations would not need to highlight musicians of color if schools were truly equal in the "nation of opportunity" (p. 40). The author cited a study addressing the imbalance of music participation in suburban schools when compared to urban schools (Abril & Elpus, 2011), and concluded that such inequalities should promote further examination of urban schools.

DeLorenzo (2012) attributed the racial imbalance between suburban and urban music participation to the social justice discrepancy in the quality of music education offered between the two realms. Comparison of urban with suburban schools reveals a stark realization of the contrasts in SES, where the likelihood of poverty in a school populated with a concentration of Black and Latino students is six times higher than that of a school comprised of mostly White students. This financial situation is seen not only on a student level, DeLorenzo stated, but also on a district level, where urban teachers live with the uncertainty of whether legislation will continue supporting their school's budget. Though this uncertainty is also common in suburban schools, DeLorenzo stressed that fear is intensified in urban schools because they heavily rely on federal

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

and state support. Likewise, DeLorenzo cited research (Costa-Giomi, 2008) that found SES to be an influential factor on urban students' choice to participate in instrumental ensembles. SES can also influence whether or not urban students can remain in ensembles, as they may be part of a mobile family or a family that needs the student to babysit, and consequently miss many days of instruction.

DeLorenzo (2012) also called attention to the other privileges that frequently surround suburban students that may not exist in urban settings. According to the researcher, many professional musicians expressed having grown up in youth orchestras and been surrounded by summer music camps, private lessons, and opportunities to play recitals. This is not often the case in urban climates, where paying for musical experiences outside of the classroom is less likely to be an option. Outside of arts magnet schools or schools that have received special funding, there are often gaps in resources for instruction. Consequently, the Black and Latino students who comprise most of the urban schools are at a disadvantage when instruction is compared across schools, and thus are not equally prepared for college or professional music settings. According to DeLorenzo, there is little opportunity for continued music study for students in urban schools if they cannot access the same private lessons, resources, and competitive experiences as those in suburban schools.

To help alleviate inequities, DeLorenzo (2012) gave several recommendations. DeLorenzo encouraged teachers to teach or mentor in schools where there is racial diversity. The author also conveyed that SES may not be the sole cause of underrepresentation of minorities in orchestras, and thus suggested that students of color need to have relationships with model musicians of color. DeLorenzo stated that this action could both influence a student's decision to participate in instrumental music ensembles and help them feel stable in their identity as an adolescent of color in their society. DeLorenzo referenced a conversation held with an African American university music student where the student expressed that she had no idea that she

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

could study classical music until she saw another Black individual doing so. Reflections like these are common among minority students, and teachers must be aware of them.

Walker and Hamann (1995) also noticed a scarcity in the number of minority students in higher education, specifically in music, and created a study to examine the perceptions that high school musicians have about becoming music majors and/or participating in major ensembles. The researchers attributed much of the lack of minority representation to recruitment strategies and the failure of recruiters to understand that their strategies may need to be altered in order to attract minority students to university music programs. Walker and Hamann discussed non-music factors such as sociocultural needs, lack of minority faculty members, and financial resources as having a substantial influence on whether or not minority students would consider a future in music.

Walker and Hamann (1995) selected a sample of 1,252 high school students from eight inner-city schools in an urban district. Seven hundred and seventy-four of the selected students planned to attend college, and thus became the participants in the study. All of the participants were enrolled in band, choir, orchestra, music theory, music appreciation, or a combination of the music classes listed. A survey was administered to the participants and contained demographic questions as well as questions to be answered on a Likert-type scale, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest. The Likert-type questions asked whether or not the student would major in music, take music classes, or sing or play in a college or university ensemble. Additionally, the survey contained items addressing how much the students valued the racial makeup of the music class or ensemble, quality of the music class or ensemble, as well as the music teacher's effectiveness, race, and gender. Lastly, the survey asked participants how important race and gender were when speaking with a college or university recruiter.

Differences in data according to the race, number of years participating in music classes or ensembles, and grade level of participants were analyzed using Chi-square. Regarding race, 34% of African Americans stated that they would choose music as a college major, while 66%

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

would not. Contrastingly, 86% of White students, 49% of Hispanic, and 63% of Asian students stated that they would choose music as a college major. On the question of willingness to enroll in college music classes, 88% of African Americans, 95% of Whites, 82% of Hispanics, and 100% of Asian participants said they would. Each racial group's interest in singing and playing in an ensemble yielded similar percentages (86% of African Americans, 79% of Whites, 74% of Hispanics, and 87% of Asians). In regards to each ethnic group's rating of the importance of the race of college recruiters, director's race was less important to participants than director effectiveness, quality of the ensemble, social rewards, or race of participants in the ensemble. Still, of all participants, White students, who were the most represented in music ensembles, were the least concerned about the director's race (1.47) on a 5-point Likert-type scale, while Asian (2.00), Hispanic (1.92), and African American students (1.88) were slightly more concerned about director race. One may infer that White students, as the most represented race in this setting, may be comfortable in settings where they already outnumber any other ethnicity, thus the race of the recruiter or leader may not have a strong influence.

Also examining high school students' reasons for pursuing music in college, Rickels, Brewer, Council, Fredrickson, Hairston, Perry, Porter, and Schmidt (2013) desired to perform an in-depth study of influential causes for prospective students to choose a music education major. This study surveyed candidates auditioning for acceptance into music programs at eight colleges and universities in the spring 2010 semester. Surveys were distributed to any student who expressed an interest in the music education major at their audition site. A total of 250 surveys were returned, and the study had a response rate of 44.72%

The slight majority of participants (52.4%) in the study (Rickels et al., 2013) were female, while 47.2% were male. The ethnicity of the sample was largely White (80.8%), with 9.2% Hispanic, 5.2% African American, 2.8% Asian, and 2% other or unidentified. The median age of participants was 17 years.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Participants in the study (Rickels et al., 2013) were asked to identify the grade in which they decided to become a music major and what grade they decided to specifically major in music education. The median grade for student choice to major in music was 9th grade, while the median for choice in music education was 11th grade. On their primary backgrounds with music, nearly all respondents (92.4%) had a background in band, with experiences in choir, orchestra, and general music being much lower. Participant interest in teaching areas aligned with their primary background (e.g., students with band backgrounds were interested in teaching band in the future).

Students were asked to use a scale of 0 to 5 (where 0 was not at all influential and 5 was extremely influential) to rate influential individuals, experiences, and teacher communication concerning careers in music education. Responses showed that high school orchestra ($M = 4.53$), band ($M = 4.44$), choir ($M = 4.44$), and general music teachers ($M = 2.57$) had the highest influence on participants in their own respective backgrounds. Private lesson instructors also heavily influenced students with backgrounds in orchestra ($M = 4.40$), choir ($M = 4.24$), and band ($M = 4.01$). When reporting on influential experiences, the two highest ranking factors were important performance(s) with a school music group ($M = 4.42$), and membership in an honor performance ensemble (all-region band, all-state choir, etc.) ($M = 4.37$).

The researchers (Rickels et al., 2013) found strong connections between prospective music majors and not only high school teachers, but also private lessons instructors and additional ensembles. These findings indicate the need for positive experiences in high school music programs, access to private instructors, and access to additional music-making experiences (such as honor bands, regional choirs, and festivals) that were shown to heavily influence young students' choices to major in music education.

Another study (Kinney, 2010) grounded in the underrepresentation of minority students in music examined the incongruity between the number of students participating in music programs in urban and non-urban areas, as well as the possible factors contributing to this imbalance. The researcher focused on the following non-music influences to determine whether

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

or not they were predictors of urban music student enrollment and retention rates: academic achievement, student transience, socioeconomic status (SES), gender, ethnicity, and family structure, seeking to determine whether or not they were predictors of urban music student enrollment and retention rates.

Kinney (2010) utilized a school district in a Midwestern metropolitan area for the study, due to its population of over 400,000 and median household income of \$28,730, placing 19% of the area below the poverty line. Within the district, two middle schools, both identified by the state department of education as in need of improvement, were selected for analysis. The demographics and test score data were similar, and both schools possessed the same band director for their programs, thus minimizing the possibility of instructor and demographic effects on achievement. The middle schools both offered band as the only instrumental music option (no string courses were found) in grades six through eight.

After obtaining a database of student demographics and tests scores from the two middle schools, Kinney (2010) was limited to only sixth-grade ($n = 402$) and eighth-grade ($n = 340$) students because the school district measured middle school academic achievement of students in sixth grade and eighth grade only. Of the sixth-graders, 69 (17%) were enrolled in band, and the ethnicities presented were white (68%), African American (24%), multiracial (7%), and Hispanic (1%). Fifty eighth-graders were enrolled in band, and their ethnicities were White (67%), African American (25%), multiracial (6%), and Hispanic (1%).

To measure academic achievement, the state proficiency test was used for those in sixth grade, and the McGraw-Hill Terra Nova CTBS Multiple Assessment provided data for those in eighth grade. To align with previous studies on SES, this study used the free and reduced lunch status as a measure for income status. Nearly half of students in both grades studied (49% of sixth-graders and 44% of eighth-graders) qualified for free or reduced lunch. To measure family structure, the author categorized students based on the number of parents or guardians the school district had on record as living in the student's primary residence. Kinney found that 75% of sixth

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

graders and 74% of eighth graders lived in single-parent or single-guardian family structures, while 25% of sixth graders and 26% of eighth graders lived in two-parent or two-guardian family structures.

Lastly, to measure student transience, or mobility, Kinney (2010) applied two definitions to the participants. Sixth graders who moved into the district between the end of fourth grade and the beginning of sixth grade (32%) were defined as transient students. Eighth graders who moved into the district during middle school—between sixth and eighth grades—were labeled as transient students (35%). The inclusion of the transience factor helped to observe the effect of changes and recruitment on enrollment and retention in the two programs. Data analysis was performed through logistic regression model building, with the dependent variable being whether or not the student was in band, and the independent variables being the list of predictors previously discussed, with ethnicities other than White being combined as one group of minorities. Additionally, due to the potential for low variance, reading test scores were retained for academic achievement correlations in the model, while math scores, though correlating highly and more significantly with other predictor variables, were excluded.

Kinney's (2010) results showed that reading test scores and family structure played a significant role ($p < .01$) as predictors of enrollment in band, and may become increasingly important as the student decides to continue participation over time. Kinney used the findings to suggest that students who excel academically may be more likely to progress in music, while those struggling academically may tend to drop out of band. Results showed a strong relationship between students who lived in two-parent households and enrollment and persistence in band programs. The odds ratio for family showed that students with two parents were 2.43 times more likely to be in band than those from single-parent households. It is safe to infer that single-parent households may experience difficulty providing for and being available to support extracurricular activities like band, which involves after-school and weekend requirements.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Regarding SES, Kinney (2010) found that eighth graders with higher SES were significantly more likely to be participants in band than those with lower SES ($p < .001$), while the SES of sixth graders showed no significant correlation to initial enrollment in band. This intriguing finding may suggest that money does not necessarily influence students' choice to enroll in instrumental music programs, but it may challenge their continued participation past the sixth grade. Kinney adds that, although both middle schools were able to provide school-owned instruments to students with financial need, additional expenses for instrument equipment, concert attire, and trips may have been a negative influence on students' and families' desires for participation. No significant effects were found from the variables of ethnicity or mobility in the final models. It is important to note that, although these schools were classified as urban schools, the ethnicity of the majority of the students was White; therefore, studying the effects of ethnicity would have led to inaccurate generalizations about urban schools possessing more typical minority representation. Though this study (Kinney, 2010) provided useful information for band directors in recruiting and retaining urban students by examining academic achievement, financial obligations, and parental structures, further investigation is needed in urban schools that have higher percentages of minorities.

Recognizing that role models matching the gender or ethnicity of a student is favorable to a young musician's growth, and that most women and students of color are left without these corresponding models, Sheldon and Hartley (2012) focused on trends in instrumental music leadership. The purpose of the study (Sheldon & Hartley, 2012) was to reveal trends in band and orchestra leadership among women and minorities from 1996 to 2008.

The researchers collected data from the archives of the Midwest Band and Orchestra Clinic, the largest conference showcasing national and international instrumental music groups. Sheldon and Hartley gathered information that detailed gender and ensemble level at each conference from 1947 to 2008. Additionally, they accessed records from the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) that rendered gender and ethnicity data for graduate

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

students studying wind band conducting from 1999 to 2008, as well as the College Music Society directory for an overall listing of United States institutions that offer a wind-conducting emphasis for graduate students.

From these data, the researchers selected the most consistently attended symposiums offered by universities, and sent a survey to these institutions in 2000 and 2008 to gain an inventory of the gender and ethnicity of participants in the symposia. Of the 139 institutions which consistently offered and attended wind band conducting symposia, 22 responded with gender and ethnicity information in 2000, yielding a 16% response rate for that year. For 2008, 49 schools responded and provided a higher response rate (35%).

Results of the survey showed that 570 graduate students were enrolled as wind band conducting majors between 1999 and 2008. Of the 410 males, 371 (90%) were White, 15 (4%) were Hispanic, 11 (3%) were Asian/Pacific Islander, 7 (2%) were Black, 5 (1%) identified as Other, and 1 was American Indian/Alaskan Native. Of the 160 females enrolled during these years, the distribution was: 137 (86%) White; 9 (6%) Hispanic; 7 (4%) Black; 4 (2%) Asian; 3 (2%) American Indian/Alaskan Native and; 0 Other. The ethnicity distribution for symposia/workshop also showed a heavy concentration of Whites. Though the data did not provide ethnicity records for every year from 1999-2008, the data for 802 (61%) attendees was utilized. Of the 802 attendees, 692 (86%) were White, 38 (5%) Asian, 37 (5%) Hispanic, 30 (4%) Black, 4 American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 1 Other.

Sheldon and Hartley's (2012) study displays the persistent scarcity of people of color in instrumental music leadership. Though the census reports also reflect an overwhelming majority of Whites in the U.S., the ratios of Whites to Non-whites seen in this study do not reflect the same ratios of Whites to nonwhites in the general population, thus yielding a reason for concern. Race and gender models for aspiring musicians are a vital part of their decision to pursue music as a career; hence, there must be models available to square with various ethnicities and cultures. The research discussed above reveals that most of the students preparing to be band and orchestra

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

directors (and/or those already in teaching positions and sharpening their skills at symposia and workshops) are not people of color.

Status of Urban Music Education

Research examining the lack of minority population in music education has been discussed (Hamann & Walker, 1995; Hartley & Sheldon, 2012; Kinney, 2010), and the following will present the status of urban music education. Doyle (2014) provided a synthesis of literature that addressed the state of general and urban music education in regards to issues of equity between suburban and urban areas, demographic characteristics of urban areas, enrollment trends, and culturally relevant pedagogy. For the synthesis, Doyle chose literature from years 2001 to 2012.

On the topic of suburban and urban areas and the issues of equity between them, Doyle (2014) stated that suburban schools are seen as the mainstream, accepted norm for American schools, and a model for American schools to attempt to emulate. The author suggests that these suburban schools are mostly Caucasian, hold less demographic diversity, and do not have as much of a concentrated group of students in poverty when compared to the urban areas they surround. Doyle also highlights that suburban schools tend to be in good physical condition, supported by their local community and administration, and are academically adequate. Contrastingly, the urban schools, holding a much higher concentration of demographic diversity and low SES, experience an income disparity due to wealthier urban families sending their children to private schools, and a shortage of resources and highly qualified teachers, as cited by Doyle. Due to this lack of resources, the researcher states, urban schools cannot provide the varied curriculum needed to achieve the level of mastery assessed in suburban schools using standardized test scores. In addition, high school dropout rates, low college enrollment rates, and, therefore, a limited opportunity for high or middle income in the future can keep students in urban areas in a constant cycle of low SES. Despite this bleak outlook, Doyle provided a more positive view with the discussion of low SES students in arts participation, where studies have

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

shown that low SES students in music achieve at higher rates than non-music low SES students. Still, the decline of arts programs in urban areas that likely contain a concentration of low SES students threatens the opportunity for this population to even experience music instruction.

Also in Doyle's (2014) synthesis of literature was the discussion of American music student demographics. The studies discussed that instrumental music demographics at the high school level were mostly Caucasian and had few students categorized as low SES. Additionally, Doyle relayed insights from Kinney's (2010) study that listed parental/home structure, previous academic achievement, and high SES as predictors of student enrollment in instrumental music ensembles.

On teachers and materials used in urban music education, Doyle (2014) cited studies that found that preservice in-service music teachers tended to come from middle to high SES and White backgrounds. The researcher concluded that these music teachers were trained in the Western classical music traditions and usually taught with the same focus. Studies on cultural relevance showed the discrepancy between the number of minority students enrolled in urban schools versus the number of minority students participating in classical music study in their urban school music programs. Using Abril's (2009) definition, Doyle marked culturally relevant teaching as curricula that has been created through the teacher's sensitivity and response to the cultures of his or her students and maintains a goal to better connect with and effectively teach the students. Doyle holds that teachers who provide this culturally relevant material (diverse music and/or nontraditional ensembles) may grant a more welcoming environment for students of color. The researcher noted, however, that teachers were generally uncomfortable with incorporating this type of material, and therefore suggested that more experiences with multicultural music during preservice teacher education will alleviate the general discomfort with non-Western classical music teaching.

Doyle's (2014) synthesis of literature addressed every topic that I find to be a current issue in urban music education—an insufficient number of minority students studying classical

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

music, unequal resources and financial support, non-music hindrances (e.g., parental support and family structure, administrative support, SES), and inadequate teacher preparation for multicultural environments. My study will examine secondary schools much like the ones discussed in the article.

In the difficult attempt to characterize urban schools, Johnson (2008) defined the urban environment as a culture that is highly populated, diverse, and comprised of citizens of low to middle SES. Johnson also noted that, in addition to poverty, students in this urban cluster are exposed to high crime rates. The author additionally cited problems affecting all areas of education in urban schools (i.e., teacher retention, funding, and assessments associated with the No Child Left Behind Act), holding that these issues inevitably influence urban music education. It was noted by the author that these problems may not all be observed in every urban setting, but that music teachers will likely face at least one of these challenges in the duration of a career in urban music teaching. The purpose of Johnson's writing was to investigate the factors that can help music educators in urban schools overcome the aforementioned obstacles.

Johnson (2008) reported many issues affecting achievement in urban music programs. The author emphasized funding inequities, highlighting that, in many urban schools, allocations are often given to support athletic teams, especially if enrollment in music programs is low. Also on funding, Johnson stated that a successful approach to gaining federal funding is through test scores, but that this method is useless for music programs, as there is no uniform evaluation system in place to justify achievement.

Lastly, the author identified teacher preparation and retention as the weakest aspect of urban music education, and inferred that providing higher quality music teachers would solve many issues. The dire need for quality music instruction in some urban areas has called for grade-level teachers to include music sections in their own disciplines. Likewise, under-qualified and underprepared teachers for urban climates are likely to leave after one year in the taxing environment. Johnson believes that training on the skillset necessary to function in a diverse,

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

multicultural environment, along with student teaching in urban classrooms and hiring based on contextual knowledge (in addition to conceptual knowledge) will help provide more teachers who can be effective in urban music programs.

Johnson (2008) provided a descriptive account of the current state of urban music education programs; however, the article presents only the author's view of the situation, and lacks an empirical study. My study will address the areas of teacher preparation and resources, as discussed by Johnson, through data collection from band directors in varying settings, in hopes to further assess discrepancies between urban and non-urban music programs.

Teacher Preparation for Urban Music Teaching

Focusing on improving pre-service teachers' preparation for urban classrooms, Languell (2018) investigated first-year music teachers' perceptions of their readiness for teaching in urban settings. The researcher asserted that there was much research on teacher preparation for urban teaching in general education, but very little on how this applies to music education.

The researcher (Languell, 2018) chose four beginning music teachers who met the necessary criteria to target the research problem. The participants chosen all met the following criteria: (a) completed an undergraduate degree in music education or a graduate certification in music education, (b) were from varying geographic locations in the United States, (c) represented male and female, (d) represented a variety of instrumental and vocal backgrounds, (e) were currently in the first stage of teaching (e.g. less than five years of experience), and (f) represented a variety of school settings (e.g. elementary, middle, and high school). Languell invited six qualified participants for the study, and four agreed to participate.

Languell (2018) performed a case study and used a background survey, multiple interviews, participant observations, and participant journals as forms of data collection. The background survey gathered information on participant's hometown, university experience, current school district, fieldwork, student teaching experience, and specific details of their current teaching setting. Interviews focused on each participant's pre-service experiences. The

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

participants were asked about their undergraduate coursework, opportunities to teach in urban, suburban, and rural education environments, and their relationships between the school and the surrounding community. Languell also asked the participants about their perceptions of their preparation for teaching in an urban school and what was missing from their pre-service education in regards to this topic. Field notes involved Languell observing each participant for two full days of teaching. The researcher was a nonparticipant in the teaching, and collected evidence of participants' management of the challenges of teaching in the urban environment. The researcher observed the participants' relationships with students, interactions, use and management of classroom resources, in addition to holding conversations with participants and other staff members throughout the day. The fourth data collection method, the use of participant journals, was completed over a 10-week period. Languell prompted the participants to respond to journal prompts bi-weekly on perceptions of challenges and rewards of teaching in an urban setting, personal motivation, and instructional practices.

For data analysis, the researcher (Languell, 2018) completed single-case analysis by searching for ideas and themes within each participant's data, and cross-case analysis by transferring the ideas and themes to other contexts. Languell used the data collected and coded to create participant profiles. From the data collected in the profiles and the cross-analysis performed, the researcher identified three emerging themes and coded them as (1) willingness to adapt, (2) varied relationships, and (3) challenges and rewards of the urban setting.

On willingness to adapt, two participants, Cori and Brandon, displayed enjoyment of their jobs, an ability to shift their focus to the needs of their students, and an acceptance of their environment. Cori disclosed a need to make a mental shift to accept the school environment and teach her students through the emotional traumas some of them may be experiencing. Brandon focused on what was meaningful and accessible to his students and wanted to concentrate on what they could do, rather than what they could not. Contrastingly, Marie and Shannon were looking for new teaching positions and struggling to make meaningful relationships with their

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

students. Shannon expressed feeling like an outsider in her classroom, as she was unfamiliar with both the general music curriculum and the culture of her students. Marie struggled to adapt to the disconnect between her students' musical interests and the music she wanted to teach them. Marie expressed confusion about how to spark interest in Bach and Brahms in a "stereotypical urban kid" (Languell, 2018, 99). Marie planned to leave her current school at the end of the school year, regardless of whether or not she had another teaching position. Languell reported that both Shannon and Marie expressed a feeling of teacher burnout and a struggle to teach uninterested students, while Cori and Brandon conveyed a theme of belonging and making necessary adjustments for student success.

The next emic theme from Languell's (2018) cross-case analysis was varied relationships. Much like the willingness to adapt emic theme, Brandon and Cori's relationships in the school and community were positive. Brandon expressed being intentional about making sure students know that he cares for them. He discussed bringing in food and clothing for them, constantly offering lessons and help, and giving anything for the needs of the students, without thought or question. Brandon believed that if students' basic needs were met, they will be more ready to thrive at school because their attention is now on learning instead of surviving. Brandon did not have good relationships with his staff, and cited that he often avoided them to avoid toxic discussions about students. The next participant, Cori, asserted that having a maternal-like relationship with students was helpful to her teaching, and natural to her as a mother of five. Cori allowed students to call her "mom" and helped students with schoolwork outside of her music curriculum. On the other hand, Shannon had difficulty building relationships with students who were not in her world drumming classes. The other classes Shannon taught were rotation classes that lasted only 45 days before the group rotated to another arts subject, and Shannon expressed a battle to build relationships with students in such a short time and in a situation where the students did not choose her class. Marie expressed being a loner among her students and in her field and stated that she had not yet met any other music teachers in the Catholic school district,

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

though she planned to soon change that situation by creating meetings with other music teachers. Marie did, however, express a connection to her surrounding teachers, and stated that she felt comfortable decompressing about a demanding administrator.

The final theme in Languell's (2018) study was challenges and rewards of teaching in the urban setting. Brandon expressed challenges teaching in an unpredictable environment where fights, drug issues, and violence were common and could happen at any moment in the close-knit school. Both Brandon and Cori expressed challenges with their music budget. Brandon frequently paid for over half of his students' supplies out of pocket, and both Brandon and Cori supplied much of their programs' music out of pocket. Shannon and Marie both spoke of language and cultural barriers that challenged their adjustment and daily teaching.

To conclude, Languell (2018) answered her first research question (Why did participants decide to teach in an urban setting?) with the observation that three of the four teachers--Shannon, Marie, and Cori—were in desperate need of a job, with two of them being placed in their schools through an employment agency. Only one participant, Brandon, chose to teach in an urban school. The second research question was: What are participants' perceptions of their preparedness to teach in an urban setting? Languell concluded that the same three participants—Shannon, Marie, and Cori—saw themselves as unprepared and quickly realized that they needed additional training and specializations. Both Shannon and Marie admitted a conscious choice to narrow their study and observations to focus on suburban bands during their preservice training. Brandon was the only participant who expressed feeling prepared for his urban environment.

Consequently, the researcher and participants expressed a need for more coursework discussing content specific to the urban classroom. The final research question (What other experiences or individuals may have prepared participants for urban teaching?) was answered with Brandon's two university professor mentors who encouraged him to be well-rounded, and his jazz experience, which provided him with arranging skills necessary to write and rework pieces of music for the limited instrumentation in his ensemble. Cori attributed her preparation to

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

motherhood, and believed that her nurturing approach with students made her successful. Both Shannon and Marie discussed feeling completely unprepared for urban teaching, though Marie initially believed that her experiences in her private Catholic school would resemble that of her current situation.

This study (Languell, 2018) highlights the lack of teacher preparation for urban music programs. Though two participants were able to adapt to their situations, all four participants expressed feeling unprepared by their undergraduate programs for jobs in urban schools. It is interesting that the two teachers who focused on adapting and creating culturally relevant material for their students felt the most successful in their jobs. In accordance with Languell's study, my study will further examine undergraduate teacher preparation for urban schools and teachers' level of comfort with creating culturally relevant material.

In addition to this researcher's aforementioned literature review on urban music education, Doyle (2012) observed the effects of teachers' backgrounds, undergraduate preparation, and program support on their own attitudes toward urban teaching. Doyle's research arose from recognition that teachers in urban environments have likely been inadequately trained for their schools (i.e., unprepared to work with great cultural diversity or provide appropriate culturally relevant material, trained to teach in ideal situations, or trained to teach the material learned in a Western classical conservatory or program) and therefore may harbor negative attitudes and lowered expectations toward their urban students. Doyle held that these negative attitudes and lowered expectations can discourage student achievement. The researcher presented literature on teacher background and demographics that suggested that most music teachers entering the schools are female, White, and middle-class, and do not reflect the general make-up of the urban school population. Doyle also highlighted that, although school district reports publicly claimed that all schools had the same resources, it was evident that inner city schools suffered from inadequacies in resources, quality teachers, teacher-to-student ratios, and facilities.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Due to these observed problems, Doyle's 2012 study sought to answer research questions concerning teacher demographics, background, preparation, attitudes, and expectations. The researcher collected data from music educators in all grade levels, all years of experience, and various geographic areas of the United States. The researcher targeted certain urban areas (28 large cities) to ensure that all sample criteria were met. Doyle invited all music teachers from the sample ($N = 3,138$) and received a 15% response rate ($n = 476$). After missing data disqualified 29 more participants, the researcher used a total of 447 participants. These participants were sent a *Culturally Relevant Teaching Questionnaire* (CRT) created specifically for the study. The survey contained questions pertaining to the following independent variables: (a) background, (b) preparation, and (c) support, and the dependent variables: (a) implicitly prejudiced attitudes, (b) culturally relevant attitudes about teaching, (c) culturally relevant attitudes about music, and (d) expectations of students.

Doyle's (2012) results first outlined the status of the urban schools studied. The results indicated that most of the teachers surveyed (70%) worked in Title-I schools, and the schools represented by the teachers had 50-90% of their students qualifying for free or reduced lunch. The schools surveyed were populated largely by Hispanic/Latino and African-American students; however, these ethnic groups represented a smaller portion of the population in music classrooms in the schools. On teacher demographics, 82% of participants ($n = 365$) had five or more years of teaching experience, and 69% ($n = 310$) had five or more years of experience teaching in urban schools.

Particularly beneficial to my study is Doyle's (2012) 4-point Likert-type scale (1 indicating strong disagreement and 4 indicating strong agreement) to assess teacher preparedness for urban teaching. She found that most of the respondents did not feel prepared upon graduation from their preservice programs to handle issues of the urban environment ($M = 2.19$, $SD = 0.89$). Likewise, they did not feel adequately prepared for urban student resistance to participate in music ($M = 2.48$, $SD = 0.84$), nor comfortable identifying potential cultural biases in classical

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

music ($M=2.43$, $SD=0.86$) or American folk music ($M=2.42$, $SD=0.81$) upon leaving their teacher education programs. Teachers surveyed felt slightly more prepared to teach culturally relevant music to their students ($M=2.62$, $SD=0.83$).

Doyle's (2012) survey also examined teacher attitudes and expectations of teachers. The dependent variables (*Implicitly Prejudiced Attitudes*, *Culturally Relevant Attitudes/Music*, *Expectations*, and *Culturally Relevant Attitudes/Teaching*) were analyzed using a MANOVA. With the level of significance set at $p < .05$, results showed that *Implicitly Prejudiced Attitudes* were affected by Teacher Quality Instruction (TQI) ($p = .009$), SES Match ($p < .001$), Race/Ethnicity Match for School ($p = .041$), and Support ($p < .001$). *Culturally Relevant Attitudes about Teaching* were significantly affected by TQI ($p = .019$), Urbanicity Match ($p = .006$), SES Match ($p = .01$), and Preparation ($p < .001$). For *Culturally Relevant Attitudes about Music*, TQI ($p = .013$) and Preparation ($p < .001$) were statistically significant. The last factor, *Expectations*, was significantly affected by the Race/Ethnicity Match for School ($p = .008$), indicating that teachers who matched the race or ethnicity with their students held higher expectations of students than those who did not match the race or ethnicity of their students. Also on *Expectations*, teachers who had higher SES than their students had statistically different expectations for their students with lower SES ($p < .001$).

The study (Doyle, 2012) reported that schools comprised mostly of White students had higher SES levels than those with mostly Hispanic or Black students. Furthermore, results were consistent with previous studies that asserted that most teachers' (75%) childhood economic experiences did not match that of their current students. Contrastingly, more than half of the teachers surveyed grew up in neighborhoods with different ethnicities and levels of SES, but, perhaps due to school zoning, did not always attend a school having varying ethnicities or SES. Pertaining to teacher preparation, Doyle's study revealed a disconnect between teacher education programs and the urban schools, as most participants, though highly educated with a master's

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

degree or higher (64%), were not prepared to incorporate other music genres outside of Western classical genres ($M = 2.36$).

Also interesting for my study, most participants indicated a need for more adequate funding ($M = 2.05$), though they expressed administrator support ($M = 3.02$). Aligning with previous research (Johnson, 2008), teachers indicated that they did not feel that their music programs were as supported or valued as athletic programs ($M = 2.36$). With the stated statistics in mind, and using a survey model similar to Doyle's (2012), I will assess teacher preparation for teaching urban students.

Robinson's (2012) study provided a view of preservice music teacher's preferences and concerns in regards to placement after graduation. The researcher noticed a strong push from legislation and school administration in the past decade to provide all students with highly qualified teachers, but also noticed that many schools were still experiencing a deficit of effective teachers. Robinson highlighted that the teacher vacancies in school were not because of teacher retirement or teachers leaving the profession, but instead because of teachers transitioning from school to school and consequently affecting the cohesiveness and effectiveness of learning in the classroom. Robinson stated that there exists substantial research on general education teachers' leaving or remaining in schools for certain reasons (class sizes, school facilities, administrative support), but not as much research on this same issue in music education. For this reason, Robinson chose to examine the factors that attract music educators—specifically, preservice music teachers—to certain future employment opportunities.

The participants in the study (Robinson, 2012) were undergraduate music education majors ($N = 187$) from a 4-year public university. Robinson identified the participants through the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) collegiate chapter database and determined if they were eligible for the study. Based on study criteria, 100 colleges and universities were selected using random sampling. A web-based survey was sent to all NAfME collegiate chapter advisors with a request to forward to all chapter members. Based on the number of colleges and

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

universities that responded to the participation request, the researcher calculated a response rate of 28%.

Robinson (2012) utilized an adaptive conjoint analysis to collect data, as Horng used to examine teachers and their preferences for working conditions and demographics in a previous study (2009). This survey method allowed the researcher to observe the values of the preservice teachers through answers to paired-comparison scenarios, where freedom of choice lessened the possible difficulty of pinpointing certain preferences. The survey involved ranking, level of preference, and hypothetical scenario questions to assess the undergraduate's preferences for job placement. The items assessed for preference were salary, commute, administrative support (e.g., funding, scheduling, teacher input), type of environment, student race/ethnicity, student SES, resources, facilities, program retention, and parental/community support.

Of the surveys distributed in each geographic region of NAFME collegiate chapters, 187 students responded. One hundred and eleven (59%) were female and 76 (41%) were male; the majority (93%) indicated their race or ethnicity was White.

Data were analyzed by finding the average values for each teacher's preference, with a negative (-) value meaning that an item was less preferred than a positive (+) value for each of the items. The respondents indicated that they would prefer higher salaries (+46.94) over lower salaries (-49.61), excellent administrative support (+64.75) over little administrative support (-65.60), strong parental and community support (+51.57) over little parental and community support (-55.67), students from middle-income families (+21.27) over students from low-income (-22.51) or high-income (+1.83) families, and student populations where 50% are minority (+19.29) over populations where 95% are minority (-17.83) or 5% minority (-1.36). Lastly, the respondents indicated that they would rather teach in suburban school environments (+29.72) than urban (-0.92), rural (-3.98), or private (religious [-23.34] and nonreligious [-1.48]) schools.

If one considers the commonly expressed factors that classify the status of the urban school (limited resources, little parental support, low program retention, low income, and mostly

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

minority students [Doyle, 2012; Johnson, 2008; Kinney, 2010]), one can infer from the preservice teacher respondents in this study (Robinson, 2009) that future teachers do not desire to be placed in urban music programs, where the conditions may hold those characteristics. Robinson's research supported the problem observed in urban music education: effective teachers are not going (or do not desire to go) to urban music programs. The section of the study indicating that the participants preferred schools with 50% minority and an average level of income proves interesting, as it may imply that music teachers desire some sort of diverse environment. Further study is needed in order to observe the preferences of current music teachers in regards to ethnic groups and income levels.

Research on music educators in urban climates has focused primarily on teachers in the pre-service stage or in their first five years of teaching (Doyle, 2012; Robinson, 2012). Investigating lengthier experiences of teachers, Eros (2009) performed a case study of three music teachers in inner city schools who had taught for five years or more and were considered to have progressed to their second stage of teaching. Eros sought to uncover reasons why teachers came and left frequently from urban schools, in addition to reasons why teachers decided to remain in urban schools for the duration of their career. The research questions revealed the author's curiosity about what occurs within the first five years of teaching in an urban school, what teachers hold as meaningful in their experiences, what major issues emerge as common issues in urban music teaching, and what factors have helped to develop the urban music teachers.

Eros (2009) utilized a case study qualitative method for his research, highlighting that a case study "necessitates a clearly recognizable phenomenon or entity as the focus of the study" (p. 59). As he considered the long-term urban music teacher a phenomenon alone, Eros chose the case study method as it allowed for the most intensive descriptions and information analysis. Another quality of the method that he believed worked in his favor was the necessity for a case study to be "*a single unit or bounded system*" (Merriam, 1998), as he considered the teachers in this setting to be a bounded group in one school system, specifically, the urban school system.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Eros chose three teachers for the study—two in their seventh year of teaching, and one in the ninth year. Teachers in this stage were chosen because they had extensive experience, but would also be able to easily reflect on their first stage of teaching.

To collect data, Eros (2009) sent a background survey and an email journal, and conducted “semi-structured” interviews and a focus group discussion (p. 63). The background survey collected basic information from the teachers before the interview as a time-saving tool. The email journal allowed teachers to record their experiences leading up to the interview to ensure that teachers would have the best recall possible when in an interview situation. The interview rounds with each teacher built on each other, and the (guided) focus group helped the teachers to culminate any thoughts that may not have surfaced during the individual interviews.

In Eros’s (2009) analysis of the three cases, common themes were found. First, music teachers made meaning of their teaching experiences through their own values, such as work ethic, gaining a rewarding teaching experience, and teaching in a large city, regardless of challenges (funding, students’ home life, administration). A combination of internal values and external factors or challenges made meaning for urban teachers, and helped the teachers to define what urban teaching was.

The researcher found that the views of the teachers studied were heavily impacted by their immediate physical teaching environments. Contrary to research providing a bleak outlook of urban school facilities (Abril, 2006), the teachers described pleasant facilities and livable, unintimidating neighborhoods, though the buildings were old. Additionally, Eros found that the participants were committed more to the students and location in which they were teaching than to the content (music), as each of the teachers expressed strong discontent with the thought of leaving their schools, or told stories of their devastation upon having to leave one of their previous urban schools. The participants’ affections toward student motivation, preparation for performances (in contrast to the performances themselves), and futures also contributed to their commitment. Lastly, results indicated that all three participants defined an “urban” school

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

differently, as teachers' reasoning rested in ethnicity, achievement, resources, and even staff philosophy. As the term "urban" has been used generally in reference to minority populations without connection to an actual location, Eros suggested further study on the labeling of "urban schools" alone.

Eros' (2009) results implied the need for second-stage teachers as mentors for pre-service teachers, as it may help shape the expectations and preparation of teachers earlier in their careers. Likewise, Eros indicated a need to utilize the experiences of second-stage urban music teachers for professional development purposes because of their ability to foresee potential problems and become proactive—a skill that Eros determined could help build awareness for teachers and administrators in not only music, but in all disciplines.

Fitzpatrick (2011) explored the attitudes of teachers toward urban music teaching, and centered on the instrumental music sector. The researcher ventured to answer the questions concerning how Chicago music teachers navigated the urban setting, what urban contextual knowledge the teachers held, what attitudes existed toward their teaching setting, and what challenges the teachers perceived.

A mixed methods approach including both quantitative and qualitative methods was used. To ensure reliability and validity, the researcher (Fitzpatrick, 2011) used: 1) a focus group, recorded visually and audibly, 2) a survey of urban teachers across the Midwest, and 3) interviews and observations. The researcher classified the recorded interview and survey responses into themes and then applied codes on a 1 ("not at all") to 5 ("to the maximum extent") Likert-type scale.

Results of teacher responses showed a mean of 3.79 for challenges from not having a background in urban schools. When asked how much of a challenge racial differences provided them, a smaller mean of 2.81 was found, indicating a lesser challenge. Teachers also reported that they knew their communities, schools and students well, and understood that a special skillset was required in order to effectively instruct in the environment ($M = 3.54$). Results included

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

varying reasons for choosing to teach in urban schools, and moderately high levels of satisfaction with the current choice. The teachers defined success as student personal and musical progress rather than program recognition. Similarly, the qualitative results showed themes of commitment to improving student life, expecting frustration, and focus on traditional educational aspects. Regarding contextual knowledge about the urban community, the interviews revealed that many teachers were former Chicago Public School students themselves, and had experiences similar to the students. Contrastingly, teachers who attended suburban or rural schools saw a higher level of challenges when transitioning to the urban schools.

Findings of this study (Fitzpatrick, 2011) show not only that teachers familiar with urban environments have fewer challenges teaching in those music programs, but also that teachers who possess contextual knowledge about urban students and schools can readily adapt their instructional approach for their students. Aside from the passion and care for the students that all the participants exhibited, further studies are needed to investigate the skillset that is most effective with students in an urban music environment, and the methods for training pre-service teachers in this specific skillset.

A later article by Fitzpatrick (2012) looked into the practice of teaching urban students. She discussed the issues that White teachers have encountered when teaching in urban music programs. The author provided personal accounts of urban music teachers' realizations that students of color seek identity through the things they learn, and that music education is no exception. Fitzpatrick asserted that convincing students that their own cultural backgrounds are respected, valid, and valued is necessary not only for learning, but also for providing social justice in the classroom. This acknowledgement of the student's own culture helps them build self-worth and realize their capability in areas that they may have once considered to be foreign by their culture. Fitzpatrick stated that aligning music content with the music that the students value is an important step towards lessening identity issues and teacher-student conflict. Likewise, Fitzpatrick called for teachers to recognize the social benefits of the music classroom

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

for minority students. Capitalizing on same-culture peer relationships, providing models from the students' cultures, and using compositions or arrangements from contributing members of the students' cultures are all ways to begin a culturally relevant music experience.

Fitzpatrick (2012) warned against assuming that the needs of today's student are the same as the needs of teachers when they were the same age. By the same token, teachers cannot allow their socially-constructed attitudes or preconceived notions to shape their expectations of their students, especially in an urban environment. The tendency of White teachers to hold their own experiences and culture as "normal" and consequently measure all other experiences against their own experiences is detrimental, Fitzpatrick explained. To combat this tendency as well as provide a more effective learning experience for the cultural classroom, Fitzpatrick suggested a few strategies: (a) Inquire about the background and experiences of all students (as it may not be readily apparent), (b) Explore the musical cultures and traditions in local communities surrounding the school, (c) Ensure that traditional classical music styles still have a place in the classroom, and (d) Authentically teach cultural awareness, rather than merely including a cultural piece.

Fitzpatrick's article (2012) not only addressed the needs of minority students in the music classroom, but also challenged teachers to begin recognizing those needs as well as employing strategies to meet them. The author's opinions about the norms of Whiteness and the tendency to impose the Western structure on a cultural classroom were highly relevant to my study. These shared insights about teachers' preservice education and their expectations of urban students have helped to focus and affirm the direction of my research.

Comparisons and Equity

Before examining studies that highlight the more evident disparities in equity between urban and non-urban schools, I will discuss work by Farmer (2015) that focused on academic discourse in music education and the inherent inequity and negative connotations that accompanied topics on urban schools.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

After noticing that urban education topics were often omitted in preservice teacher development and practicing teacher professional development, and that teachers often failed to consider who their students were culturally and sociologically prior to teaching them, Farmer (2015) sought to analyze scholarly discourse from the past 20 years on urban music education topics. Farmer analyzed how authors of publications in the *Music Educators Journal* (MEJ) and *The Journal of Research in Music Education* (JRME) handled terms related to urban music education in order to determine whether or not attitudes or biases existed to negatively shape the perception of urban music education within the music education discipline. The author's primary goal was to identify and expose trends of bias toward urban music education existing in powerful, influential publications that purport objectivity and knowledge.

Through critical discourse analysis (CDA), Farmer (2015) evaluated statements from scholarly publications (MEJ and JRME) from 1991 to 2010 to determine the outlook on urban music education within the music education field. Using published text as her data source, the author examined how practices and language reinforced power, hierarchies, regulations, and social order, and whether the practices influenced behaviors in the field. Farmer used the year 2001 as a time marker in her study, as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation occurred in this year, and initiated required labeling of pass/fail or successful/failing schools. Farmer investigated the trends of discourse of urban music education in the ten years before NCLB and after its enactment. The study included 1,206 articles from *MEJ* and *JRME* with a total of 4,524,530 words. Farmer used keywords to point to statements, and then analyzed those statements to find threads in the discourse. Upon learning which keywords yielded the most output among the articles, the author decided to focus on the terms "urban," "at-risk," "race," "inner-city," and "diversity."

After analyzing data and discarding terms such as "Urbana" or "disturbance" that included the word "urban" but did not directly relate to the use of the desired word, Farmer (2015) found 264 data statements in 135 articles that allowed for further discourse analysis.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Farmer categorized the statements into the following: Urban as different or abnormal, Urban as challenging, Urban as unequal (not ideal, substandard), Urban as unwanted (less desirable, broken, pitiable), Urban as culturally disconnected, and Urban as a demarcation (category, city, undefined label). In the category of Urban as different or abnormal, the researcher found a thread of statements likening urban schools, teachers, and students to “otherness”, making them separate from “normal” or “usual” schools, teachers, or students (p. 89). Farmer highlighted phrases that implied differences between urban settings and non-urban teachers, such as one that stated, “Susan, a bright, energetic, young music education student, has been placed in an elementary school in an urban area,” (Fallin & Royse, 2000, p. 20) implying a difference between the teacher (bright, energetic, young) and the type of school to which she has been assigned (urban). The author also discussed threads of phrases that implied abnormalities in preparation for urban settings. She featured a survey question from an *MEJ* article that read, “researchers asked successful urban music teachers, ‘Do you feel that your undergraduate/graduate education courses prepared you to teach in the urban setting?’” (Allsup, 1997, p. 33). Farmer discussed how this wording seems insipid at first glance, but shapes the idea that non-urban teaching situations are the norm, and that urban music teachers must then receive additional preparation to handle the abnormalities of an urban school and urban students. Similarly, Farmer discussed a thread of statements that perpetuated urban students as different by calling non-Western musics nontraditional, as well as suggesting that urban students enjoy primarily this type of music. The author discussed similar connections to SES when highlighting a thread in articles that suggest that urban low-SES students do not participate in band as much as their non-urban peers due to financial responsibilities. Farmer also found that success in urban music programs was considered different or abnormal. The author found threads of statements suggesting that there was a suburban norm of success, that this norm was difficult to achieve in an urban school, and that trends of considering students’ growth of confidence and belief in themselves were accepted as

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

success more than the group's actual musical achievement. There was a lesser focus on musical achievement than in articles discussing suburban music programs.

In regards to my own research, the threads of bias and harmful ideas perpetuated to masses of music educators relate directly to my problem statement. I hope to show that preparing teachers to provide a quality music education to students across varying types of schools is important.

In regards to equity between minorities and their majority counterparts in public schools, current reports supplied a grim outlook. The 2011-2012 Civil Rights Data Collection was released by the U.S. Department of Education through their Office for Civil Rights (OCR) on March 21, 2014, and provided survey data from every U.S. public school---a first in twelve years. Reports of the data stated that one in three high schools with the highest percentages of African-American and Latino students do not offer a chemistry course, nor do they offer a math course beyond the Algebra I level. Moreover, schools where minority students made up almost half of the school's population were starkly underrepresented in that school's "gifted and talented" programs. On teacher quality between the public schools, data showed that higher concentrations of first year teachers were seen at schools with higher concentrations of minority students, while more experienced teachers were more likely to be employed at schools with more white students.

The 2014 OCR data release confirms the need for a study of equity among schools that serve high concentrations of minority students and schools that serve a large number or mixture of white students. The data highlight that students of color are not being placed on equal footing with their White counterparts in the areas of course offerings, discipline, and teacher quality. Because the disparities shown through the data are seen in schools comprised of mostly minority and low-income students---urban schools, as I have referenced them---there is a concern about whether or not these inequities are also specific to urban music programs as well.

Narrowing the scope to music education, a concern for educational inequality was the focus of Elpus and Abril's (2011) research. The researchers noted previous studies that had

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

advocated for the benefits that music study provides all students, but missed a population of students affected by variables of SES, race, ethnicity, and native languages. The authors stated that unequal education is linked to social class and race in the U.S., citing research on relationships between low SES environments and a lack of orchestra programs, and high SES environments that offered a variety of music programs and groups. Elpus and Abril also cited research placing SES as a predictor of students' perceptions of teachers and parents, as well as their intent to continue music study.

Likewise, Elpus and Abril (2011) stated that research has examined the academic achievement of music students (Miksza, 2007, 2010) and demographics of students who have elected to study music (Stewart, 1991), but that more research was needed to examine what factors are associated with students who make this choice. The purpose of the study was to present a profile of high school students participating in music ensembles in the United States. The researchers desired to answer questions regarding the demographics of high school students in the country, the proportion of seniors in music ensembles, and the relationship between demographics and participation in these ensembles.

Elpus and Abril (2011) utilized the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS) to obtain a demographic profile of high school seniors from the class of 2004. This sample allowed the researchers to compare their findings to Stewart's (1991) research, and helped them to extract the desired subset of high school students who chose to enroll in a music ensemble. In this sample, gender, SES, race, and academic achievement were examined. Twenty-one percent (N = 621,895) of surveyed high school seniors indicated that they participated in band, choir, and/or orchestra in 2004. This set of students was used for further demographic examination.

The results of the study (Elpus & Abril, 2011) indicated that most of the U.S. music students attended suburban schools (51%), with urban following (28%), and rural schools coming in last (21%). The race of the music students was predominantly White (66%), followed by Black (15%), Hispanic (10%), multiracial (4%), Asian (4%), American Indian/Alaskan Native (0.7%),

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.2%). In regards to SES, the participation of music students displayed a ladder of economic advantage, with 32% of music students in the highest quartile, followed by only 17% of students in the lowest SES quartile. Also, 79% of music students came from a two-parent/guardian family structure (79.4%), leaving only 21% in a single-parent home.

The researchers (Elpus & Abril, 2011) then used the senior class of 2004 data to determine which variables were associated with music ensemble participation. The Rao-Scott adjusted statistic was used for the analyses, and the level of significance was set to .005. Results showed a significant association between race and ensemble participation ($p < .001$), as Whites made up 66% of the music student sample. Similarly, the underrepresentation of Hispanic students was significantly associated with lack of music ensemble participation ($p < .001$). Odds-ratio analysis indicated that students in the lowest SES quartile were significantly underrepresented in music ensembles. It was 1.71 times more likely that a music student would be in the highest SES quartile than the lowest. Also, parent's level of education yielded a significant association with music ensemble participation, as students whose parents had earned a master's degree or higher were the most represented ($p < .001$). No significant results were found between family structure and music ensemble participation.

Elpus and Abril's (2011) salient factors of race and SES on music participation in suburban schools align with my observation that music instruction is not occurring in the same manner in urban, minority-populated schools as it is in higher SES, suburban schools. This study provides a useful framework for comparison of high school instrumental music programs and variables (teacher preparation and resources) that might have led to lessened participation in or enthusiasm for music study.

Calloway (2009) was concerned with middle school music programs in urban areas that were underperforming in many ways. The author noted that a lack of resources, socioeconomic segregation (due to white and middle class members moving to suburban areas), and an absence

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

of qualified and inspiring teachers contributed greatly to the current status of many urban music programs. Realizing a need for research on equity and opportunity for these failing programs, Calloway conducted a qualitative research study in a middle school in a large city on the West Coast.

The qualitative research method at the urban middle school included interviews with all school administrators, both of the music teachers, and two student focus groups. Calloway (2009) also observed six classes at the school in order to assess the importance of music at the school, student interest in the program, and the need for equity. The author sought to find themes in program rationale, cultural relevance, addressing of state music standards, and alternative music methods. Specifically, to measure music equity issues and cultural relevance, Calloway asked faculty, “Does the music program provide socially relevant content curriculum to the students?” and “Does the music program put students on equal footing with other schools and does it prepare them for music in high school” (Calloway, 2009, p. 51).

Data from the audio-recorded interviews were transcribed into written form and then coded for recurring themes that addressed the research questions. The faculty responses yielded a theme suggesting that there was not as much culturally or socially relevant music teaching as possible, but that the rock band was a start, though they understood that it did not cater to the 90% population of minority students in the school. The faculty asserted that rock band, though not culturally relevant to the Hispanic students in the school, could be helpful in teaching a new genre, and that the Hispanic students had created their own form of rock in the school, called “Latin rock.” One teacher responded that he taught “Feliz Navidad” at Christmas time, which was loved by the kids, but has not done any other music relevant to Hispanic culture. Most of the responses from faculty were in accordance with this teacher’s response—they studied one or two multicultural pieces per year with the music groups, and did not give much thought to including more culturally relevant material until prompted by the interviewer.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Also, Calloway (2009) found that instruction did not adequately prepare students for higher-level music classes, and did not equip them for entrance auditions to the school district's high school for music and the arts. The student progress was found to be minimal, as observed performance levels of middle school bands were below average and students did not show an adequate level of knowledge pertaining to the music content standards. Calloway stated that most of the students observed did not continue into the intermediate music ensembles or high school arts programs. The researcher did observe, however, that students involved in the rock band at their middle school seemed to be more engaged, though most members of the group were not representative of the African American or Hispanic students that accounted for most of the school's population. The faculty's candid responses were helpful in observing teachers' philosophies on motivating and engaging minority and/or low-income students. The researcher suggests further study of institutional neglect of the musical needs of urban students.

Ester and Turner (2009) investigated the impact of a public school musical instrument loaner program on the attitudes and achievement of low-income music students in an urban environment after seeing the difficulty of some music programs to provide an adequate inventory of musical instruments to fit the need of students who cannot afford to purchase their own, and how this factor possibly contributes to lower numbers of band enrollment. All 6th-8th grade students enrolled in music ensembles ($N = 245$) at a middle school with a diverse, urban environment were participants in the study.

The minority population of the school represented 13% of the total population, and 42% of the total population received free or reduced lunch. Ester and Turner (2009) used a Pretest-Posttest Comparison Group Design involving two dependent variables: a) attitude, which was measured by surveys, and b) achievement, which was measured in two categories: 1) music teacher assessments of musical, academic, and personal growth, and 2) classroom teacher assessments of musical, academic, and personal growth. The two independent variables in the study were instrument status (IS) and socioeconomic status (SES). There were three groups of

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

participants in the study: 1) a focus group consisting of instrumental music students playing loaner instruments (SI), 2) a comparison group of students playing personal instruments (PI), and 3) a comparison and control group of vocal ensemble students (V).

Data collection involved a pretest student survey that was comprised of Likert-type scale questions that assessed the students' general attitudes about their lives, music study, potential for growth in music, and academic growth. This pretest was distributed in October, along with a corresponding version for music teachers and classroom teachers to complete. Students and teachers continued with routine music classes throughout the rest of the academic year, and were given the posttest in late April, where a Musical Growth assessment was added to the survey. Music teachers also completed the musical growth instrument for a sample of 68 students, while the sixth grade classroom teachers completed the academic and personal growth questionnaire for 79 students.

Ester and Turner (2009) analyzed the pretest data using ANOVA, with SES and IS serving as independent variables and each survey item serving as the dependent variable. With the level of significance set at $p < .05$, significant differences based on SES were found: More students with medium to high SES disagreed with the statement "I am sad a lot" and strongly agreed with "I am usually happy" than students with low SES, who agreed more with the statement "I am sad a lot" ($p = .023$). Another statistically significant result was that participants with medium to high SES disagreed with the statement "There are many things I wish I could do but I don't think I am smart enough to do them," while low SES participants agreed with the statement ($p = .022$). Also, significantly more medium to high SES participants than low SES participants agreed strongly with "I believe I am smart enough to do whatever I want," $F(1,239) = 6.96, p = .009$, and the statement "I know I will be happy when I grow up", $F(1,239) = 6.09, p = .014$. No statistically significant effects were found for instrumental status on any of the general attitude items---only the SES variable provided these significant results discussed above.

Once posttest data were analyzed, they were compared to those of the pretest using t -test

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

and ANOVA. The ANOVA revealed significant differences attributable to SES and Instrument Status (IS) on General Attitudes and Music Attitudes. All but two items were dismissed due to failure to meet homogeneity of variance. The remaining two items pertaining to General Attitudes showed significant differences between the medium to high SES participants and the low SES participants on “There are many things I wish I could do but I don’t think I am smart enough to do them” ($p = .013$), and “I know I will be happy when I grow up” ($p = .030$).

Regarding relationships between student and teacher responses on the Music Growth survey, there was a significant difference between how the students rated their “appropriate care of the instrument” and how the teachers rated the same item ($p = .038$). In addition, teachers’ ratings on the Music Growth survey showed significantly more improvement made by medium to high SES students than low SES students on focus, concentration, motivation, and self-confidence ($p = .001$). No significant difference on improvement was found between students who owned their instrument (PI) and students who used the school loaners (SI), but a significant difference was found between these two groups on their response to the statement, “I will keep playing my instrument when I am an adult” ($p < .001$), as students who owned their instruments agreed significantly more with this statement than did those who were using loaner instruments.

Ester and Turner (2009) discussed results asserting that playing a loaner instrument could be a factor in negative effects on personal happiness and intellectual self-esteem. Their data also suggested the potential for equal achievement of all instrumental students with the provision of school loaner instruments. The authors stated that quality instruction was provided in all situations; thus, research should be continued on access to quality instruments and the need for quality instruction in order to keep evaluating its impact on music education in multiple situations. As the research sought to find a link between SES, instrument quality (two factors of concern in the urban setting) and student happiness, intellect, self-confidence, and future involvement in music, this study applies to my intent to compare aspects of music education between urban and non-urban music programs at the secondary level.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Differences in the provision of music education resources based on race and socio-economic characteristics were examined by Costa-Giomi (2008) in a large urban area in Texas. With the massive state population and a little over half of that population being minority, the researcher found it intriguing that there were no descriptive studies regarding the make-up of the state's elementary public school music programs, or any data available regarding which elementary schools have music specialists.

To gather data, Costa-Giomi (2008) sent a questionnaire to all elementary music teachers ($N = 75$) from the selected urban school district, which serves about 80,000 students with an average of 71% minority students, 53% of which are classified as economically disadvantaged. Teachers responded ($n = 54$) with a 70% response rate. The teachers were then divided into three groups based on their school's minority representation (MR) and socio-economic status (ES). The questionnaire assessed the teacher's perspective, including their views on employment, education, certification, experience as a music teacher, parental support, administrative support and opinions on equality. Likewise, the questionnaire prompted program information on number of assistants, schedule, planning opportunities, student-teacher ratio, special education numbers, private lesson opportunities, performances, competitions, facilities, fees, and budget.

The results of the study (Costa-Giomi, 2008) were analyzed in two divisions--the economic classification of the schools (ES) and the minority representation (MR). Regarding teachers, results showed no significant differences in teacher preparation, experience, certification, or involvement in professional musical activities outside of school among low and high ES or MR schools. A significant difference was found, however, between the numbers of student teachers among low and high ES and low and high MR schools ($p = .02$). The majority of student teachers were sent to schools with high economic status and low minority representation, while less than 30% of the other schools received student teachers. Additionally, most of the teachers who reported that they presented at professional conferences were from schools with

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

lower minority numbers, as only 6% of teachers from high minority schools reported presentations.

Regarding program characteristics, no significant relationships were found between allocation of instructional time, class size, or performance opportunities and the school's categories. However, schools with a smaller minority population reported having three times more music-related field trips than schools with more minority students. Also, significant differences ($p = .02$) were found between music student-to-teacher ratios at low-minority schools and high-minority schools. Three quarters of the teachers at schools with high SES reported having student teachers in the past, while less than 30% of teachers at schools with low SES and higher minority representation did so. The schools with lower numbers of minority students also reported fewer inadequacies in facilities, instructional resources, instrument quality, and technology, while those with higher minority and low SES numbers reported having inadequacies in these categories three times as often. Lastly, in program support, the study revealed that parental support was higher in schools with high economic status and low minority representation. As was reported by the teachers in schools with lower economic status, the lack of parental support occurred in areas of volunteering and fundraising.

With Costa-Giomi's (2008) study in mind, it is important to note that this questionnaire highlighted the inequalities of only the urban schools within a district, and did not assess overall equity between urban schools and the non-urban, possibly more economically-advantaged schools in the district.

Summary

This review of research literature reveals the essential need to address the shortage of minority representation in music and music education, the status of urban music education, comparisons and equity between urban and non-urban schools, and teacher preparation for urban teaching. In summary, it is important to note that: (a) Minority students, particularly Blacks and Hispanic/Latinos, are not pursuing music study at the same rates as their majority counterparts

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

(DeLorenzo, 2012; Sheldon & Hartley, 2012; Walker & Hamann, 1995) , nor are they choosing to participate in school music ensembles at the same rate as their majority counterparts (Kinney, 2010; Elpus & Abril, 2011); (b) Urban schools are frequently characterized by high proportions of minority students, low socioeconomic status, inconsistency of allocations of resources, poor equipment quality, understaffing due to low teacher retention, and single-parent family structures (Calloway, 2009; DeLorenzo, 2012; Doyle, 2012; Doyle, 2014; Elpus & Abril, 2011; Johnson, 2008; Kinney, 2010;); (c) Most teachers who have not been exposed to an urban environment nor acquired experiences abroad encounter challenges when entering the urban public school, and are often uncomfortable creating culturally and socially responsive curricula for urban students (Doyle, 2012; Doyle, 2014; Eros, 2009; Fitzpatrick, 2011; Fitzpatrick, 2012; Robinson, 2012) and; (d) Schools with higher SES and smaller proportions of minorities have more music students and report more adequate facilities, resources, and musical achievement than those with low SES and greater proportions of minority students (Elpus & Abril, 2011; Calloway, 2009; Costa-Giomi, 2008; Ester & Turner, 2009).

The literature presented provides an extensive view of urban music education. More investigation is needed to specifically compare the resources and instruction in instrumental music programs at the secondary level across both urban and suburban schools to determine what differences exist and discuss how they may promote or discourage future music study for minority, low SES high school students.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this study was to investigate high school band directors' preservice preparation for teaching in urban schools---particularly, the frequency of inclusion of topics on minority students and low SES students in undergraduate coursework, preservice band directors' familiarity with and encouragement to apply for jobs in urban schools, and how comfortable they are or would be with teaching in urban schools. The study also compared program resources between high school band programs to examine disparities between the programs in urban and non-urban schools. The research study will determine if inequalities exist between the two independent variables: a) extent of teacher preparation for the music program, and b) extent of program resources (e.g., instruments resources, additional instructors, private lessons, camp privileges, travel opportunities, and parental resources), with the dependent variable: student intent to study music at the university level.

Five research questions will be answered:

1. How much university training have high school band directors received on teaching minority/low SES students and/or in urban schools, and what does this training include?
2. How comfortable are music teachers with culturally relevant instruction? Are they comfortable developing methods or repertoire deviating from those learned in traditional music teacher training programs?
3. Are resources for instrumental music learning (supplemental staffing, parental resources, access to honor bands, festivals, and events, facilities, owned instruments, quality equipment) different between schools with higher percentages of minority students and those with lower percentages of minority students?
4. What are the relationships between the extent of urban and non-urban band programs' resources (i.e., quality instruments, additional instructors, camps, and travel opportunities) and the intent of their students to study music in college?

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

5. What is the relationship between the number of students who become university music majors from a high school band program and the program's percentage of minority students enrolled?

Pilot Study

To measure the state of undergraduate music teacher preparation for the urban environment, a survey was administered to undergraduate music education students at Indiana University who were participating in the Fairview Violin Project. Because undergraduate teachers involved with the Fairview Project teach violin to economically-disadvantaged and/or minority children, the pilot study measured undergraduate preparation for teaching in an urban setting as well as the students' reactions to the children they taught. The survey contained items to collect student ethnic and educational background, prior experiences with teaching minority and/or low SES students, and comfort level with teaching this demographic. The questions also addressed whether or not students' undergraduate classes discussed teaching in urban schools, and whether or not students were interested in teaching in urban schools in the future. The questionnaire was pilot-tested on March 9, 2014 to 24 teachers at a mandatory Fairview training session. IRB approval was obtained on February 27, 2014. (See Appendix B for pilot survey).

From pilot testing, I learned that I needed to specify my operational definition of "minority" on the survey, so when revising the band director questionnaire, I included "African American or Latino" parenthetically when asking about minority students. I also gained a sense of how long the survey took the participant to complete, and removed questions that did not directly answer any of my research questions (i.e., "Did you have assumptions of the students and environment at Fairview upon starting the program?"). I saw the importance of the questions on whether or not the students' undergraduate courses included material on teaching minority or low SES students, and questions about culturally relevant teaching; thus, I made sure to keep those questions on the band director questionnaire.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Participants

Participants in the main study ($N = 27$) consisted of high school band directors from five school districts located in west, middle, and east Tennessee that met the researcher's district criteria: contains a mixture of suburban, rural, and urban schools, where the latter contains a 50% or higher number of students qualifying for free lunch (low SES). The researcher obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to distributing the survey to participants.

The researcher used <http://www.k12rate.com> to access free and reduced lunch and school demographic data of all Tennessee schools in order to determine which districts had a mixture of suburban, urban, and rural schools, and specifically, which schools had 50% or more minority students and/or 50% of its students qualifying for free lunch.

Measure

The researcher-designed questionnaire (see Appendix C) was created with Survey Monkey and contained 20 questions that were formatted as open-answer, multiple-choice, or Likert-type scale items. The first section (questions 1-8) of the survey collected band director and band program demographic data to provide a source for correlation analysis between demographics and the other items on the survey. Questions 8-11 and question 14 addressed research question 1: How much university training have high school band directors received on teaching minority/low SES students and/or in urban schools, and what does this training include? Questions 12, 13, and the first three parts of question 18 addressed research question 2: How comfortable are music teachers with culturally relevant music teaching? Are they comfortable developing methods or repertoire deviating from those learned in traditional music teacher training programs? Questions 15-17 and the last portion of question 18 addressed research question 3: Are resources for instrumental music learning (supplemental staffing, parental resources, access to honor bands, festivals, and events, facilities, owned instruments, quality equipment) different between band programs with higher percentages of minority students and

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

those with lower percentages of minority students? Question 19 addressed both research questions 4 and 5: What is the relationship between the extent of an urban band program's resources (i.e., quality instruments, additional instructors, camps, and travel opportunities) and the intent of its students to study music in college? What is the relationship between the number of students who become university music majors from a high school band program and the program's percentage of minority students enrolled? The survey ended with question 20, an open-answer opportunity for band directors to leave any additional comments they felt important for the researcher to know.

Procedure

Each high school band director in the five school districts that met the research criteria ($N = 94$) was sent through email a cover letter explaining the purpose of the research and an invitation to complete the online questionnaire on April 7, 2014. After the initial invitation, participants who did not respond received a mailed copy of the cover letter and questionnaire, as well as another link to the online method on April 16, 2014.

After April 16, unresponsive participants received three more email reminders containing a given deadline: April 25, 2014. In an effort to obtain more responses, surveys were hand-delivered to school mailboxes of band directors in districts with low responses. The researcher sent reminder emails throughout the collection window (April 7, 2014 – April 25, 2014). More survey completions began to appear after the K-12 semesters ended, with the last survey completion occurring online in June, 2014. Of 94 targeted participants, a total of 27 band directors responded ($N = 27$).

Data Analysis

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 25 software and surveymonkey.com were used to enter and/or calculate quantitative results. The researcher used surveymonkey.com to compute percentages and frequencies, and used SPSS 25 to compute correlations, means, standard deviations, t -tests, and Mann-Whitney U test results.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

School demographics were reported as frequencies and percentages from the teacher and student questionnaires. Other items yielding nominal data were reported as frequencies, percentages, and central tendencies. Ranking or ordinal questions were analyzed and reported according to their frequency. Correlational analyses were performed to describe program and teacher demographics, teacher preparation, resources, and number of students who have chosen to pursue a college major in music, as well as to determine relationships between program and teacher demographics, teacher preparation, and resources with the number of students who chose to become college music majors in the three years before the survey was conducted (2011-2014). Urban or non-urban schools were identified and coded using k12rate.com's listing of schools by percentage of minority students and students eligible for free lunch, as well as the participant-reported percentage of minority students enrolled in band programs. For correlation purposes, if a participant reported 50% or more minority enrollment in their band, the school was labeled an urban school, and coded 1.00 in SPSS. If a participant had less than 50% minority enrollment in their band, it was labeled a non-urban school and coded 2.00 in SPSS.

Chapter 4: Results and Discussion

Results

Band director and program demographics.

Participants represented high school band programs in west, middle, and east Tennessee. A small majority (44%) of participants were from west Tennessee (see Table 1). Band directors in non-urban schools represented 59% of the population ($n = 16$) and directors in urban schools represented 41% ($n = 11$) (see Table 2).

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages for Region of Tennessee Represented (N=27)

Region	<i>f</i>	%
West Tennessee	12	44.4
East Tennessee	11	40.7
Middle Tennessee	4	14.8

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages for Type of School Represented (N=27)

School Type	<i>f</i>	%
Non-urban	16	59.3
Urban	11	40.7

All but seven of the participants were White (74%), while 26% of participants were African-American. No participants reported being any other ethnicities (see Table 3). Subjects represented a wide range of teaching experience, with approximately 52% in their first ten years of teaching, while 19% had taught for 25 years or more (see Table 4).

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table 3

Band Director Ethnicity Represented in Sample (N=27)

Ethnicity	<i>n</i>	%
Caucasian	20	74.1
African American	7	25.9
Asian	0	0
Biracial/Multiethnic	0	0
East Indian	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0
Native American	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0

Table 4

Number of Years Teaching Band (N=27)

Years	<i>f</i>	%
Less than 4	5	18.5
4-10	9	33.3
11-17	5	18.5
18-24	3	11.1
25 or more	5	18.5

Participants showed less variance in the number of years at their current school, with the majority (81%) having been at their current school for less than ten years. Just 8% had been in their current program for 18 or more years (see Table 5). Nearly half (48%) of band directors had their bachelor’s degree only, and most of the other half (48%) held a master’s degree. One participant (4%) held a degree at the doctoral level (see Table 6).

Table 5

Number of Years Teaching Band in Current School (N=27)

Years	<i>f</i>	%
Less than 4	12	44.4
4-10	10	37.0
11-17	3	11.1
18-24	1	3.7
25 or more	1	3.7

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table 6

Band Director Level of Education (N=27)

Degree	<i>f</i>	%
Bachelor's	13	48.1
Master's	13	48.2
Doctorate	1	3.7

Participants were asked to estimate the percentage of minority student enrollment in their band programs. Half of the schools had fewer than 25% minority students, while just under half had more than 56% minority students in band. (see Table 7)

Table 7

Percentage of Minority Students Enrolled in Band Program (N=27)

Minority Students	<i>n</i>	%
0-10%	7	25.9
10-25%	7	25.9
26-40%	1	3.7
41-55%	0	0.0
56-75%	3	11.1
75-100%	9	33.3

Undergraduate teacher preparation for urban settings.

A four-point Likert-type scale ranging from “Frequently” (4) to “Never” (1) was used to address how often participants’ undergraduate music education programs included topics about teaching in urban schools. The great majority (93%) “very rarely” or “never” had minority student topics included in their undergraduate courses. Topics about students from low SES backgrounds occurred more frequently than minority topics, as the majority (59%) reported that it “very rarely” happened, and 26% reported that it was “sometimes” discussed.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Inclusion of Urban School Topics in Undergraduate Music Education Courses (N=27)

Topic	Frequently	Sometimes	Very Rarely	Never	Mean	SD
Teaching Minority Students	3.7% (n = 1)	3.7% (n = 1)	55.6% (n = 15)	37.0% (n = 10)	1.74	.71
Teaching Students of Low SES	3.7% (n = 1)	25.9% (n = 7)	59.3% (n = 16)	11.1% (n = 3)	2.22	.70

Preservice field experience was nearly split in half, with 56% of directors reporting that they had field experience in an urban school, while 44% of band directors reported experience in a non-urban school (see Table 9). Nearly all participants (74%) specified that they were either “very rarely” or “never” encouraged by undergraduate professors to apply for teaching positions in urban schools (see Table 10).

Table 9

Band Director Undergraduate Field Experience Assignment (N=27)

Field School Type	n	%
Urban	15	55.6
Non-urban	12	44.4

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Undergraduate Encouragement for Jobs in Urban Schools (N=27)

Frequently	Sometimes	Very Rarely	Never	Mean	SD
3.7% (n = 1)	22.2% (n = 6)	44.4% (n = 12)	29.6% (n = 8)	2.00	.83

The majority of directors (81%) felt comfortable teaching minority students (see Table 11). Although over half (70%) of the participants felt unprepared by their undergraduate coursework to teach minority students, most directors (48%) indicated that they were currently able to prepare relevant lessons regardless of ensemble ethnic makeup (see Table 12).

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table 11

Frequencies of Teacher Confidence with Teaching Minority Students (N=27)

Level of Confidence	<i>n</i>	%
A fish out of water	2	7.4
Somewhat apprehensive	3	11.1
At ease	11	40.7
Fully confident	11	40.7

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for Level of Comfort in Instruction by Ensemble Ethnic Makeup (N=27)

Level of Comfort	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	<i>SD</i>
I am most comfortable teaching music in a classroom of mostly White/Caucasian students	7.4% (<i>n</i> = 2)	33.3% (<i>n</i> = 9)	37.0% (<i>n</i> = 10)	22.2% (<i>n</i> = 6)	2.26	.90
I am most comfortable teaching music in a classroom with a large population of minority students	3.7% (<i>n</i> = 1)	33.3% (<i>n</i> = 9)	55.6% (<i>n</i> = 15)	7.4% (<i>n</i> = 2)	2.33	.68
I am comfortable creating music instruction relevant to the backgrounds and interests of an ensemble of mostly minority students	22.2% (<i>n</i> = 6)	48.1% (<i>n</i> = 13)	29.6% (<i>n</i> = 8)	0.0% (<i>n</i> = 0)	2.93	.73
My undergraduate music courses well-prepared me to teach in urban schools with low SES and/or high concentrations of minority students	3.7% (<i>n</i> = 1)	25.9% (<i>n</i> = 7)	48.1% (<i>n</i> = 13)	22.2% (<i>n</i> = 6)	2.11	.80

Participants were asked about the frequency with which they taught classical, popular, and world music in their band programs. A Likert-type scale was used and coded with categories “Frequently” (4), “Sometimes” (3), “Rarely” (2), and “Never” (1). Classical music was taught most often ($M = 3.74$), as 74% of band directors stated that they “frequently” taught classical

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

music, and none (0%) stated that they “rarely” or “never” taught it. Teaching popular music in ensembles ($M = 3.33$), varied a bit more, with 52% of participants who “sometimes” taught it, and 7% who “rarely” taught it to their students. World music received the least exposure to students ($M = 3.15$), with only 22% of participants who “frequently” taught it.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for Types of Music Taught in Band Program (N=27)

Music Taught	Frequently	Sometimes	Very Rarely	Never	Mean	SD
I teach classical music to my students	74.1% ($n = 20$)	25.9% ($n = 7$)	0.0% ($n = 0$)	0.0% ($n = 0$)	3.74	.45
I teach popular music to my students	40.7% ($n = 11$)	51.9% ($n = 14$)	7.4% ($n = 2$)	0.0% ($n = 0$)	3.33	.62
I teach world music to my students	22.2% ($n = 6$)	70.4% ($n = 19$)	7.4% ($n = 2$)	0.0% ($n = 0$)	3.15	.53

Band program resources.

Band directors were asked to indicate the number of student teachers their program had received, the percentage of their students who used school-owned instruments, the percentage who took private lessons, and how the private lessons were financially made available to students. Forty percent of directors had never received a student teacher, while 59% had, with 30% of that majority having had three or more student teachers in the past three years (see Table 14). 17 directors had fewer than half of their students using school-owned instruments, while 10 said most (50-100%) of their students play school-owned instruments (see Table 15).

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table 14

Frequencies of Student Teachers or Interns in Band Programs in Past Three Years (N=27)

Student Teachers or Interns	<i>f</i>	%
None	11	40.7
1	6	22.2
2	2	7.4
3	5	18.5
4	0	0.0
More than 4	3	11.1

Table 15

Percentages of Students Using School-Owned Instruments in Band Program (N=27)

Percentage of Students	<i>n</i>	%
0% (all students own an instrument)	0	0.0
10-20%	3	11.1
30-40%	8	29.6
40-50%	6	22.2
50-60%	2	7.4
70-80%	2	7.4
80% or more	6	22.2
School does not provide school-owned instruments	0	0.0

Of 27 responses, 8 indicated that none of their students were taking private lessons, while 15 said that fewer than half took private lessons, and one reported that 100% of students were in private lessons. Of the 19 band directors who reported having students in private lessons, 17 directors stated that the lessons were funded solely by the student or family, while four directors partially funded the lessons through their band program or band boosters (see Tables 16-17).

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table 16

Percentages of Students in Band Program Taking Private Lessons (N=27)

Percentage of Students	<i>n</i>	%
0%	8	29.6
10%	11	40.7
20%	3	11.1
30%	3	11.1
40%	0	0.0
50%	1	3.7
60%	0	0.0
70%	0	0.0
80%	0	0.0
90%	0	0.0
100%	1	3.7

Table 17

Frequencies of Funding for Private Lessons in Band Program (n=21)

Source of Funding	<i>n</i>	%
Provided and funded by student/family	17	81.0
Partially funded by band program (district or booster funds)	2	9.5
Fully funded by band program (district or booster funds)	0	0.0
Other	2	9.5

A four-point Likert-type scale ranging from “Frequently” (4) to “Never” (1) was used to further assess band program resources and the frequency with which they occurred in participants’ programs (see Table 18). The majority (48%) of directors “frequently” sent school-owned instruments to shops for repairs, while only 11% of participants “rarely” sent instruments for repairs. 44% of band directors stated that their students “frequently” attended Solo & Ensemble Festival, and 30% rarely or never had students attend.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

When asked if their band programs provided the resource of supplemental instructors for additional instruction for each instrument group and/or sectional rehearsals, 63% of band directors reported that they “frequently” or “sometimes” provided this resource, while 36% “rarely” or “never” had this resource. The results for supplemental instruction resources for marching band were similar, with 37% of participants stating that they “never” supplied supplemental staff for drill writing, music arranging, or visual effect purposes (see Table 18).

On access to outside experiences and resources for their students, nearly half (48%) “frequently” provided transportation for students to attend festivals, honor bands, and/or auditions, while 26% “rarely” or “never” supplied this resource. Also, the great majority of respondents (89%) reported that their bands “never” or “rarely” traveled away for camp, with just 15% who stated that they “sometimes” or “frequently” traveled away for camp.

Participants reported that guest performers and masterclasses occurred irregularly, as 56% “rarely” or “never” provided the experience, while just 7% “frequently” provided it. Nearly half (48%) of band directors had students participating in outside classical music groups such as youth orchestra, community bands, or church groups, while 37% stated that their students “rarely” or “never” participated in ensembles outside of school.

Most band directors (71%) reported that college music recruiters “sometimes” or “frequently” visited their programs, while 29% stated that recruiters “rarely” or “never” visited. The majority (71%) of directors’ band parents participated in fundraising initiatives “frequently” or “sometimes”, while 29% had parents who “rarely” or “never” participated.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table 18

Descriptive Statistics for Frequency of Band Program Resources Offered (N=27)

Resource	Frequently	Sometimes	Very Rarely	Never	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
School-owned instruments are sent to repair shops	48.1% (<i>n</i> = 13)	40.7% (<i>n</i> = 11)	11.1% (<i>n</i> = 3)	0.0% (<i>n</i> = 0)	3.37	.69
Students attend Solo & Ensemble Festival	44.4% (<i>n</i> = 12)	25.9% (<i>n</i> = 7)	18.5% (<i>n</i> = 5)	11.1% (<i>n</i> = 3)	3.04	1.06
Supplemental instructors are provided for each instrument/group for additional instruction or sectional rehearsals	29.6% (<i>n</i> = 8)	33.3% (<i>n</i> = 9)	18.5% (<i>n</i> = 5)	18.5% (<i>n</i> = 5)	2.74	1.10
College music recruiters visit the band program to speak with students	14.8% (<i>n</i> = 4)	55.6% (<i>n</i> = 15)	22.2% (<i>n</i> = 6)	7.4% (<i>n</i> = 2)	2.78	.80
Supplemental staff is supplied for band arranging, drill writing, visual effect, etc.	33.3% (<i>n</i> = 9)	14.8% (<i>n</i> = 4)	14.8% (<i>n</i> = 4)	37.0% (<i>n</i> = 10)	2.44	1.31
Buses and/or planned transportation is provided for students attending festivals, honor bands, and/or auditions	48.1% (<i>n</i> = 13)	25.9% (<i>n</i> = 7)	7.4% (<i>n</i> = 2)	18.5% (<i>n</i> = 5)	3.04	1.16
Students travel away from school for differentiated instruction during band camp and/or marching band season	11.1% (<i>n</i> = 3)	3.7% (<i>n</i> = 1)	18.5% (<i>n</i> = 5)	66.7% (<i>n</i> = 18)	1.60	1.01
Guest performers and master classes are provided	7.4% (<i>n</i> = 2)	37.0% (<i>n</i> = 10)	40.7% (<i>n</i> = 11)	14.8% (<i>n</i> = 4)	2.37	.84

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table 18 (continued)

Resource	Frequently	Sometimes	Very Rarely	Never	Mean	SD
Students participate in outside classical music groups (youth orchestra, community band, church groups, etc.)	11.1% (n = 3)	48.1% (n = 13)	29.6% (n = 8)	7.4% (n = 2)	2.56	.93
Parents participate in fundraising initiatives	29.63% (n = 8)	40.7% (n = 11)	22.2% (n = 6)	7.4% (n = 2)	2.93	.92

Student intent to major in music.

All but two directors had students go on to major in music in college. The majority (71%) had up to six high school students become music majors in the past three years of when the survey was taken (2014), while 23% had more than seven students, with one of those directors having more than 15 students to major in music in this time period (see Table 19).

Table 19

Frequencies of Students Enrolling in University Music Programs after High School Graduation in Past Three Years (N=27)

Number of Students	n	%
None	2	7.4
1-3	8	29.6
4-6	11	40.7
7-10	5	18.5
11-15	0	0.0
More than 15	1	3.7

Correlations.

Spearman correlations were run between the percentage of minority enrollment that directors reported in their band programs and all resources indicators. Significant correlations were found between the percentage of minority students enrolled in band and the resources of supplemental staff being provided for sectional rehearsals and additional help ($r = -.720, p < .01$), the percentage of students using school-owned instruments ($r = .574, p < .01$), parental participation in band fundraising initiatives ($r = -.526, p < .01$), percentage of students taking

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

private lessons ($r = -.475, p < .05$), and the number of student teachers or interns the program had received in the past three years ($r = -.472, p < .05$). Significant correlations were also found between the percentage of minority students enrolled and the resources of supplemental staff being provided for band arranging, drill writing, and visual effect ($r = -.423, p < .05$), and students participating in outside classical music ensembles such as youth orchestras, community bands, or church groups ($r = -.403, p < .05$). Furthermore, the data showed a significant negative correlation ($r = -.383, p < .05$) between the percentage of minority students enrolled and the number of students who became university music majors in the past three years.

Significant correlations were also found between the number of students who became music majors and the following variables: Percentage of students using school-owned instruments ($r = -.439, p < .05$), parental involvement in fundraising initiatives ($r = .423, p < .05$), supplemental staff provided for marching band purposes ($r = .396, p < .05$), guest performers and masterclasses provided ($r = .384, p < .05$), and student participation in outside ensembles ($r = .383, p < .05$) (see Table 20 for significant correlations; see Appendix A for full matrix).

Table 20

Spearman Correlations between Percentage of Minorities in Band Program, Resources, and Number of Music Majors

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. % Minority	---									
2. No. stu. teachers	-.47*	---								
3. % Stu. use SO inst.	.57**	-.26	---							
4. % Private lessons	-.48*	.47*	-.45*	---						
5. Supp. instructors	-.72**	.46*	-.52**	.52**	---					
6. Supp. marching	-.42*	.22	-.66**	.62**	.58*	---				
7. Guest performers	-.34	.33	-.53**	.69**	.64**	.60**	---			
8. Parents fundraise	-.53**	.48*	-.55**	.42*	.67**	.50**	.56*	---		
9. Outside ensembles	-.40*	.39*	-.30	.47*	.38	.21	.45*	.44*	---	
10. No. music majors	-.38*	.32	-.44*	.37	.22	.40*	.38*	.42*	.38*	---

Note. Stu. = student; SO = school-owned; inst. = instrument; Supp. = Supplemental.
 * $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two tailed.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

No significant correlations were found between the percentage of minority students enrolled in band and instruments being sent to shops for repair, students attending Solo & Ensemble Festival, college music recruiter visits, bus transportation provided for outside experiences, students traveling away for band camp, or guest performers and masterclasses being provided (see Appendix A).

Correlations were also run between the percentage of minority students in band and all teacher preparation variables. For correlation purposes, teacher ethnicity was coded in SPSS as 1.00 for African American and 2.00 for Caucasian. Significant negative correlations were found between the percentage of minority students and the following variables: teacher ethnicity ($r = -.507, p < .01$), and the number of student teachers the program had received in the past three years ($r = -.472, p < .05$). Significant positive correlations were found between the percentage of minority students enrolled and teaching popular music ($r = .403, p < .05$) as well as comfort with culturally relevant instruction ($r = .399, p < .05$). Significant correlations were also found between teacher ethnicity and the number of student teachers a program received ($r = .454, p < .05$), and between culturally relevant instruction and teaching pop music ($r = .408, p < .05$). There were no significant correlations found between the percentage of minority students enrolled and teaching classical or world music (see Table 21, and see Appendix A for full correlation matrix).

Table 21

Spearman Correlations between Percentage of Minorities, Teacher Preparation, Type of Music Taught, and Number of Student Teachers

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. % Minority	---					
2. Teacher Ethnicity	-.51**	---				
3. Culturally relevant	.40*	-.31	---			
4. Teach classical	.07	.04	.18	---		
5. Teach pop music	.40*	-.23	.41*	.23	---	
6. Teach world music	-.01	.16	.23	.47*	.26	---
7. No. student teachers	-.47*	.45*	-.31	.22	-.24	.14

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two tailed.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

No significant correlations were found between the percentage of minority students enrolled and the teacher level of education obtained, the type of school in which participants completed field experience (urban or non-urban), the frequency that undergraduate coursework included topics on minority or low SES background students, or how often undergraduate music education programs encouraged applying for employment in urban schools. There were also no significant correlations found between percentage of minority students enrolled in band and teachers' initial level of confidence teaching minority students or whether or not teachers felt prepared by their undergraduate courses to teach in urban schools (see Appendix A for full correlation matrix).

Discussion

Band director and program demographics.

The representation of participants in this sample was widespread, with a nearly equal number of band directors from West Tennessee ($n = 12$) and East Tennessee ($n = 11$), and only a small portion from Middle Tennessee ($n = 4$). Most band directors who completed the survey were from non-urban schools ($n = 16$), while the remaining respondents represented urban schools ($n = 11$). All but seven participants identified as White. These data align with research that found that most music teachers, even in urban schools, were White, and that most high school instrumental music students who would choose to study or teach music professionally were White (Doyle, 2014; Sheldon & Hartley, 2012; Walker & Hamann, 1995). Most band directors (33%) had been teaching band for 4-10 years, and 44% of that majority had been teaching in their current schools for less than four years. Band directors who held a bachelor's degree ($n = 13$) were evenly split with those who held a master's degree ($n = 13$), while one director held a doctoral degree.

Minority student representation in participants' band programs was varied, as half ($n = 14$) of band directors had 25% or fewer minority students in band, with 7 of those directors having 0-10% minority students. Contrastingly, 12 band directors reported having over 55%

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

minority student enrollment in band, with 9 of those directors having 75-100% minority students enrolled.

Undergraduate teacher preparation for urban settings.

Participants tended to be comfortable teaching minority students, though they reported that their undergraduate coursework never (37%) or very rarely (56%) included topics on teaching minority students. Most band directors expressed that their undergraduate music courses did not prepare them to teach in urban schools, as only one person felt strongly prepared by their courses to work with high concentrations of minority or low SES background students. Band directors had received little undergraduate instruction on teaching in low SES situations. These findings support previous research that found inadequate preservice teacher training in both conceptual and contextual knowledge of urban settings (Doyle, 2012; Doyle, 2014; Johnson, 2008; Languell, 2018). Band directors reported that their field experience assignments were in urban schools (56%) more than non-urban schools (44%), a surprising finding. However, the majority of band directors were very rarely (44%) or never (30%) encouraged by undergraduate professors to apply for teaching positions in urban schools. This finding is similar to Robinson's (2012) study that showed that preservice teachers largely preferred to be placed in schools with middle income families, lower numbers of minorities, and suburban schools.

Despite reporting very little undergraduate preparation for teaching minority students or in urban environments, the majority (41%) of band directors reported feeling fully confident or at ease teaching minority students. In regards to comfort level by ensemble ethnic makeup, band directors tended to favor a mixture of ethnicities in their ensembles, as just 33% of band directors were comfortable teaching an ensemble comprised of either mostly White students or mostly minority students. Band directors (70%) were generally comfortable with creating relevant instruction for the interests and backgrounds of minority students, although 30% were not. This was the most varied result on the topic of teacher preparation, and agrees with Languell's (2018) study that showed the variance between the four participants on their comfort with incorporating

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

student interests into their music curricula, and also showed that the two participants who were comfortable creating culturally relevant material were the only ones who considered themselves successful and planned to teach long-term in their urban environments. In contrast, the other two participants were largely uncomfortable creating culturally relevant instruction and struggled with the disconnect between their classical training and varying student interests.

Teaching classical music frequently (74%) was favorable among nearly all band directors. Popular music was less frequently taught in programs (41%), and world music was even less frequently taught (22%). Similarly, Farmer's (2015) research on common discourse in music education highlighted that music education scholars treated non-Western classical music as "abnormal" or "nontraditional."

Band program resources.

Most band programs had received no student teachers ($n = 11$) or only one student teacher ($n = 6$) in the past three years. The outliers were the five band directors who had received three student teachers in this time, and three band directors who had received more than four student teachers in the past three years.

Most band directors ($n = 17$) had 50% or fewer students using school-owned instruments, meaning that most students were able to provide their own instruments for band without borrowing from the school. The other ten band directors had 50% or more of their students borrowing an instrument from the school, and of those ten, six of them had 80% or more of their students borrowing. Private lessons were not commonly occurring in participants' band programs, as 25 band directors had 30% or fewer students taking private lessons. Two band directors had 50% or more students in private lessons, with one band director having 100% of students studying privately. Of the band directors who had students in private lessons, 81% had lessons funded solely by the student's family.

Looking further into resources, all band programs represented ($N = 27$) funded repairs at shops for their school-owned instruments to some frequency, as no participants selected that this

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

“never” happened, and this result had the highest mean ($M = 3.37$). The majority (48%) sent their instruments in for repair frequently. Students “frequently” (44%) attended Solo & Ensemble Festival, and buses were frequently provided for attending festivals, honor bands, and auditions (48%). Some band directors ($n = 17$) were able to more frequently fund supplemental staff for each instrument group and/or sectional rehearsals than others ($n = 10$) who rarely or never provided this resource. Supplemental staff for marching band purposes was more evenly spread, as almost half ($n = 13$) frequently or sometimes funded extra drill-writing, visual effect, or band arranging staff, and the other half ($n = 14$) very rarely or never provided it. Similarly, most band programs (67%) did not travel away for marching band camp.

Band directors (41%) rarely provided guest performers and masterclasses, but students frequently participated in outside classical music groups. Only 10 band directors rarely or never had students participate in outside groups, while 16 directors sometimes or frequently had student participation in outside musical activities. Most band directors ($n = 19$) had parent participation in fundraising initiatives, while only 8 directors rarely or never had fundraising support from parents.

Student intent to major in music.

The majority of participants ($n = 16$) had 4-10 of their high school students become university music majors in the past three years. Ten band directors had 3 or fewer students become music majors, with two directors having none in the past three years. One participant reported having more than 15 students matriculate into university music programs in this time span.

Correlations between Demographics and Band Program Resources

Significant correlations indicated that the percentage of minority students tended to relate to the availability of program resources. Band programs with higher numbers of minority students had more students using school-owned instruments. This supports previous research that showed schools with larger populations of minority students having more students playing loaned

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

instruments, more students in the lowest SES quartile, and more students from single-parent households (Costa-Giomi, 2008; Doyle, 2014; Elpus & Abril, 2011). Because most band directors reported that they either frequently (48%) or sometimes (41%) funded school-owned instruments being sent to repair shops, this finding suggests that band programs with higher numbers of minority students (i.e., in urban schools) were spending more funds on repairs than programs with high numbers of students who could provide their own instruments and did not have to handle instrument repairs through the school. Other researchers have found that urban music teachers sometimes paid for instrument maintenance and equipment out of pocket (Languell, 2018). My finding also aligns with Costa-Giomi's (2008) finding that schools with lower numbers of minorities reported fewer inadequacies with instrument quality and instructional resources.

Significant correlations also indicated that programs with higher numbers of minority students had fewer students taking private lessons and fewer supplemental staff provided for sectional rehearsals or additional arranging or marching band resources. This finding is in accordance with previous research showing that students in urban music programs had inadequate resources and inadequate preparation for higher-level music classes and entrance auditions, and lower levels of self-efficacy when considering long-term musicianship (Calloway, 2009; Costa-Giomi, 2008; Ester & Turner, 2009).

Significant correlations showed that the more minority students a participant's band program had, the less often they participated in outside classical music groups or opportunities, pointing to previously researched discrepancies (Costa-Giomi, 2008; Kinney, 2010; Sheldon & Hartley, 2012). Furthermore, Delorenzo's (2012) research revealed that most professional musicians reported having grown up playing in youth orchestras, been surrounded by camps, and frequently exposed to opportunities to play recitals.

Likewise, significant correlation results indicated that programs with higher numbers of minority students had lower parental participation in band fundraising initiatives. Previous research (Costa-Giomi, 2008) found that parental and community support was higher in schools

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

with higher SES and lower minority representation, and that schools with lower SES and higher minority populations reported difficulty garnering parental support due to more employment obligations and financial stresses in single-parent homes.

Correlations between Demographics and Teacher Preparation for Urban Settings

The percentage of minority students in a band program also significantly correlated with teacher ethnicity (coded in SPSS with 1.00 for African American and 2.00 for Caucasian), as most band directors with high numbers of minority students were not minorities themselves. Correlations also showed that the percentage of minority students in band positively related to the band director's confidence in creating culturally relevant instruction for student interests. This finding supports researchers' work stating that most teachers in urban schools with high numbers of minority students were mismatched in ethnicity and SES with their students and may need to consider incorporating culturally relevant material to make students feel valued (Languell, 2018; Doyle, 2014; Fitzpatrick, 2012). Research also found that teachers who differed racially and/or economically with their students tended to have lower expectations of their students (Doyle, 2012).

Significant correlations showed that programs with fewer minority students tended to receive more student teachers for their band programs. Costa-Giomi's (2008) research highlighted this inequity, as the researcher found a significant difference between the number of student teachers received by schools with low SES and high numbers of minority students, and schools with high SES and mostly White students. The significant difference in the number of student teachers sent to schools meant not only less preservice teacher exposure to urban schools, but also a significantly different student-to-teacher ratio in the classroom—an advantage for schools receiving more student teachers. Additionally, correlations in my study indicated that band programs with White directors tended to receive more student teachers or interns than programs with Black directors.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Correlations between Intent to Major in Music, Demographics, and Program Resources

The number of students matriculating into university music programs was significantly correlated to the number of minority students enrolled in a band program. The higher the percentage of minority students enrolled, the lower the number of students who became music majors in college. Previous research supports a lack of self-efficacy in long-term musicianship (Costa-Giomi, 2008), underrepresentation of classical music role models of color in academia (Sheldon & Hartley, 2012), and low percentages of minority students choosing to pursue music as a college major (Walker & Hamann, 1995).

Significant correlations also showed that having large numbers of students who became music majors after high school related to the percentage of students using school-owned instruments. That is, the more students that owned their own instrument in band programs, the higher the number of university music majors. Programs that had high percentages of students using school-owned instruments tended to have fewer students becoming music majors after high school. Research supports this finding, as Ester and Turner (2009) found that more students who owned their instruments agreed with the statement “I will keep playing my instrument when I am an adult,” than students who were using school-owned instruments. Furthermore, Kinney (2010) found that even with school-owned instruments, costs of supplies, concert attire, and trips tended to provide a negative outlook on long-term music participation for economically-challenged students and families.

Significant correlations revealed that the number of students who became music majors in the past three years was related to the resources of guest performers and masterclasses, supplemental staff for band arranging, drill-writing, and other marching band purposes, participation in outside classical music opportunities, and parental involvement in fundraising. Band programs that had these resources tended to have more students matriculating into university music programs. Research points to the need for more exposure to classical music

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

experiences for student success (Delorenzo, 2012), and reported that suburban schools tended to be more supported by parents, community, and administration (Doyle, 2014).

Finally, significant correlations indicated that band programs in schools marked as non-urban schools (lower percentages of minority students, fewer than 50% eligible for free lunch) had more students continuing music study as university music majors than those marked as urban schools. This finding relates to a culmination of research, as access to resources (Walker & Hamann, 1995; Johnson, 2008), access to outside experiences (Delorenzo, 2012), parental support (Doyle, 2014), teacher attitudes toward culturally relevant teaching (Languell, 2018; Fitzpatrick, 2012), and models (or lack thereof) of minorities in musical leadership (Sheldon & Hartley, 2012), can all factor into students' decisions to choose instrumental music as a profession.

Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine high school band directors' preservice preparation for teaching in urban schools in the context of the inclusion of urban school topics in their undergraduate coursework, undergraduate encouragement to apply for jobs in urban schools, and how comfortable they are or would be with teaching in urban schools. The study also investigated program resources in high school band programs to determine whether or not disparities existed between programs in urban and non-urban schools. The study aimed to display inequalities between the two independent variables: a) extent of teacher preparation for the music program, and b) extent of program resources (e.g., instruments resources, additional instructors, private lessons, camp privileges, travel opportunities, and parental resources), with the dependent variable: student intent to study music at the university level.

This study investigated relationships between the two independent variables: a) extent of teacher preparation for the music program, and b) extent of program resources (e.g., instruments resources, additional instructors, private lessons, camp privileges, travel opportunities, and parental resources), and the dependent variable: student intent to study music at the university level.

The study's population consisted of 94 high school band directors from public schools in eligible school districts in West, Middle, or East Tennessee. In April 2014, a questionnaire created with Survey Monkey was distributed by email and mail delivery to each band director's high school inbox and mailbox. Reminder emails and hand-delivered surveys were distributed throughout the collection process. Of the 94 band directors invited to complete the survey, 27 responses were collected, with a total response rate of 29%.

A researcher-created questionnaire was used for this study. The questionnaire contained 20 questions to collect data on teacher background, band program demographics, perspectives on preservice preparation, perspectives on teaching in urban settings, band program resources, and

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

student musical achievement (in this study, measured by the number of students entering universities as music majors). All participants ($N = 27$) completed all questions except for Question 17, which teachers completed only if their students were taking private lessons ($n = 21$).

SPSS 25 software and Survey Monkey were used to compute all results. The main results of the study are the following:

1. Participants were widespread across Tennessee, with 44% from West Tennessee, 41% from East Tennessee, and 15% from Middle Tennessee.
2. The majority of the band directors were White, representing 74% of the sample.
3. Over half of the band directors taught in non-urban schools, representing 59% of the sample.
4. Participants held a wide range of teaching experience, with 19% in their first four years of teaching, 33% between four and ten years of teaching, and 19% who had taught for more than 25 years.
5. Most participants (56%) had taught in their current schools for more than four years, with 19% having taught in their current schools for more than ten years.
6. Band directors represented a variety of minority enrollment in their band programs, with approximately half having 25% or fewer minority students in band, while 44% of directors had 56% or more minority enrollment.
7. Topics on teaching minority students were largely omitted from participants' undergraduate music education training. The majority of band directors (56%) very rarely experienced topics on teaching minority students, and 37% indicated that the topics never occurred.
8. Undergraduate topics on teaching students from low SES backgrounds were included slightly more than topics about teaching minority students. The great majority (70%) of band directors reported that it very rarely or never happened.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

9. More than half of band directors had completed field experience in an urban school, while the remaining participants (44%) completed field experience in a non-urban school.
10. Most band directors (74%) were very rarely or never encouraged by undergraduate professors to apply for teaching positions in urban schools.
11. Most band directors (70%) felt that their undergraduate music courses did not prepare them to teach in urban schools with high concentrations of minority students and/or students from low SES backgrounds.
12. Classical music was taught most frequently by participants (74%), and none reported that they rarely or never taught this genre. Popular music was frequently taught by only 41% of participants, followed by world music, which was frequently taught by only 22% of participants.
13. Slightly less than half of participants (41%) had received no student teachers or interns in the past three years of taking the survey, while the remaining participants had received at least one, with three of those participants (11%) having received more than four student teachers or interns in this time span.
14. Just over half of participants had 50% or fewer of their students using school-owned instruments, while just under half had 50-100% of students using school-owned instruments.
15. Very few band students were reported to have been taking private lessons, as 30% of band directors had zero students in lessons, and 52% had fewer than 30% of students taking private lessons. Only one band director had 50% of students in lessons, as well as one band director who reported 100% of students in private lessons.
16. Most band directors (89%) sent school-owned instruments to repair shops for work.
17. Providing supplemental staff was more common for the purpose of sectional rehearsals and/or additional help for each instrument group than it was for marching band purposes such as band arranging, drill writing, or visual effect. Band directors (63%)

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

selected that they supplied supplemental instructors for instrument groups with 19% very rarely or never supplying it; whereas, 37% of band directors selected that they never supply supplemental staff for marching band purposes.

18. College music recruiters only sometimes (56%) or rarely (22%) visited high school band programs often to speak with students.

19. Most band directors (67%) did not take their bands to a different location for special instruction for band camps.

20. More than half of band directors rarely or never provided guest performers or masterclasses for their students, while 37% sometimes did.

21. Almost half of band students represented in the survey sometimes (48%) participated in outside classical music groups such as youth orchestras, community bands, or church groups, followed by very rarely (30%), or never (7%). Three band directors (11%) had students who frequently participated in outside groups.

22. A third of band directors frequently had parents participating in fundraising initiatives, followed by sometimes (41%), very rarely (22%), and never (7%).

23. Regarding high school band students who had matriculated into universities to major in music in the past three years, the numbers were encouraging. Only 7% ($n = 2$) of band directors had no students major in music, while 90% had between one and ten students become music majors.

24. Participants with higher percentages of minority students in their programs had significantly higher ($p < .01$) percentages of students using school-owned instruments.

25. Band programs with higher percentages of minority students had significantly lower ($p < .05$) percentages of students taking private lessons.

26. The more minority students enrolled in a program, the less likely the program was to have supplemental instructors or additional help for each instrument group or sectional

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

rehearsals ($r = -.720, p < .01$), or supplemental staff for band arranging, drill writing, or visual effect in marching band ($r = -.423, p < .05$).

27. Participants with higher percentages of minority students had significantly lower ($r = -.403, p < .05$) percentages of students participating in outside classical music groups such as youth orchestras, community bands, or church groups.

28. Band programs with higher percentages of minority students were more likely to have less parental participation in fundraising initiatives ($r = -.526, p < .01$).

29. Band programs with higher percentages of minority students had significantly fewer students becoming music majors after high school ($r = -.383, p < .05$).

30. Band directors with a larger population of minority students were significantly more comfortable ($r = .399, p < .05$) creating relevant instruction for the interests of their students.

31. Band programs with higher percentages of minority students were less likely to receive student teachers or interns at their schools ($r = -.472, p < .05$).

32. Participants with higher percentages of minority students were more likely to teach popular music than those with fewer minority students ($r = .403, p < .05$).

33. Participants who identified as White were more likely to receive student teachers than those who identified as African American ($r = .454, p < .05$).

34. Students who used school-owned instruments were less likely to become music majors after high school ($r = -.439, p < .05$).

35. Participants who provided guest performers and masterclasses had significantly higher numbers of students ($p < .05$) becoming music majors after high school.

36. Programs that had more students participating in outside classical music groups had more students becoming university music majors ($r = .383, p < .05$).

37. Programs that had more parental involvement in fundraising initiatives had more students becoming university music majors ($r = .423, p < .05$).

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

38. Band programs in non-urban schools had more students becoming university music majors than those in urban schools ($r = .393, p < .05$).

In sum, the answers to the five primary research questions follow:

Research question 1: How much university training have high school band directors received on teaching minority/low SES students and/or in urban schools, and what does this training include? Participants received little to no training on teaching in urban schools or teaching minority/low SES populations. Topics on teaching minority students were largely omitted from participants' undergraduate music education training. The great majority of band directors (93%) very rarely or never experienced topics on teaching minority students. Topics on teaching students from low SES backgrounds were included slightly more than topics about teaching minority students, as band directors reported that it sometimes happened (26%), but 70% indicated that it very rarely or never happened. Band directors (74%) were very rarely or never encouraged to apply for teaching positions in urban schools, though over half (56%) reported completing field experience in an urban school. Most band directors (70%) felt that their undergraduate music courses ill-prepared them to teach in urban schools with high concentrations of minority students and/or students from low SES backgrounds.

Research question 2: How comfortable are music teachers with culturally relevant instruction? Are they comfortable developing methods or repertoire deviating from those learned in traditional music teacher training programs? Band directors with higher minority student enrollment were more comfortable creating culturally relevant material than those with lower numbers of minority students ($r = .399, p < .05$). While classical music was the most frequently taught genre (74%), 41% of band directors stated that they frequently taught popular music. World music was least frequently taught (22%). Band directors with higher minority enrollment taught popular music significantly more often ($p < .05$) than those with fewer minority students.

Research question 3: Are resources for instrumental music learning (supplemental staffing, parental resources, access to honor bands, festivals, and events, facilities, owned instruments,

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

quality equipment) different between schools with higher percentages of minority students and those with lower percentages of minority students? Band programs with higher percentages of minorities had significantly less supplemental staffing for each instrument group or for sectional rehearsals ($r = -.720, p < .01$). Also, band programs with higher minority enrollment had more students using school-owned instruments ($r = .574, p < .01$), though all band directors reported funding instrument repairs at music shops. Participants with larger minority populations had lower parental involvement in fundraising ($r = -.526, p < .01$), and less supplemental staff for marching band purposes ($r = -.423, p < .05$), and lower participation in outside classical music opportunities ($r = -.403, p < .05$). Lastly, programs with higher percentages of minority students took private lessons significantly less often ($p < .05$) than programs with fewer minority students.

Research question 4: What are the relationships between the extent of urban and non-urban band program's resources (i.e., quality instruments, additional instructors, camps, and travel opportunities) and the intent of their students to study music in college? Students who used school-owned instruments in their high school band programs were less likely to continue music study as music majors after high school ($r = -.439, p < .05$). Furthermore, the more that programs had parental involvement in fundraising initiatives ($r = .423, p < .05$), supplemental staff for marching band purposes ($r = .396, p < .05$), guest performers and masterclasses ($r = .384, p < .05$), and students participating in outside classical music opportunities ($r = .383, p < .05$), the higher their numbers were of students becoming music majors after high school.

Research question 5: What is the relationship between the number of students who become university music majors from a high school band program and the program's percentage of minority students enrolled? Band programs with higher percentages of minority students were less likely to have students become university music majors after high school ($r = -.383, p < .05$).

Many limitations emerged during the performance of this study. The survey sample size ($N = 27$) was small and provided only a narrow view of high school band programs across the state of Tennessee. Though 94 band directors were invited to participate, the study garnered less

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

than half of the desired participation. Also, the online measure (k12rate.com) used in March 2014 to categorize schools as urban or non-urban based on the school's percentage of minority students and free lunch eligibility is no longer available online to the public in the state of Tennessee (though it is still available in other states). If this study were to be replicated later, it may be more difficult to collect the same information.

Many questions on the survey about resources and views on teaching minority students may have been intimidating to band directors, especially after having been asked to identify their school at the top of the survey. Moreover, some questions were confusingly worded and possibly could have been omitted altogether. Lastly, this study could have focused on either teacher preparation for instrumental music in urban schools or disparities in band program resources between urban schools and non-urban schools, instead of both topics.

Conclusions

This study supports previous research that music teachers received inadequate training to teach in urban environments (Doyle, 2012; Doyle, 2014; Languell, 2018). Participants were largely underprepared by their undergraduate coursework to teach in urban schools, as their courses included few to no topics on teaching minority students or students from low SES backgrounds. Teachers had not been encouraged to learn about or apply for positions in urban schools, which supports to some extent previous research on music teacher preferences for placement (Robinson, 2012), where teachers indicated that they would rather be placed in suburban schools over urban schools. Teachers who had more minority enrollment were more comfortable incorporating culturally relevant instruction, while others taught primarily traditional instrumental music, similar to Languell's (2018) findings.

This study also supports previous research that highlighted disparities in resources and access to additional experiences between band programs in urban schools and those in non-urban schools (Costa-Giomi, 2008; Ester & Turner, 2009). Programs with fewer minorities had more instrument ownership, participation in outside classical music opportunities, and more

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

supplemental instruction and private lessons. Likewise, programs with smaller percentages of minorities reported more financial parental involvement, and received more student teachers or interns than bands with higher percentages of minorities.

Another conclusion was that program resources and access relate to high school students' matriculation into universities as music majors, as previously researched (Delorenzo, 2012; Ester & Turner, 2009; Sheldon & Hartley, 2012; Walker & Hamann, 1995). Programs that had fewer students using school-owned instruments tended to have more students choosing to be college music majors. Similarly, programs that provided guest performers and masterclasses and supplemental staff for marching band purposes tended to have more students choosing music majors after graduation. Moreover, band programs that had more participation in outside classical music groups and more parental involvement had higher numbers of students becoming music majors. Lastly, the number of students becoming music majors after high school was related to the number of minority students enrolled, and the type of school represented (urban or non-urban).

Implications

This research holds several implications for band directors and their programs. Although band directors who taught larger proportions of minority students were more comfortable teaching their minority students, more training is necessary in undergraduate coursework and field experience to prepare preservice teachers for urban environments, and to prepare them to effectively instruct and garner resources for larger numbers of minority students or students from low SES backgrounds. The inclusion of the following topics in undergraduate music education coursework may be useful: Building a band program in an urban school with limited financial resources, cultural competency and knowledge of the school community and history, and fostering student interest in traditional band music while building on students' prior musical experiences and history. There is a need for highly qualified teachers, after having received adequate training and field experience in urban school settings, to be encouraged to apply for

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

positions in urban schools. If these needs were met in preservice music education, teachers might remain in their urban schools for longer than 1-3 years (Eros, 2009), and give band students and their programs more stability, positivity, and musical success. University music education programs should broaden student teacher and intern placement to include assignments in urban schools to provide not only experience for the preservice teacher, but also an extra resource for the band program.

Resources and access to musical experiences were lacking in urban band programs when compared to non-urban programs. Students in non-urban settings were benefiting from more instructional and supply resources, which likely affected their decisions to pursue a career in music. More financial support from principals, athletic departments, and district representatives needs to occur to bridge the gap between access to supplemental instruction, quality instruments, and travel opportunities for band students in urban schools and non-urban schools. If band programs in urban schools are completing the same fundraising efforts as those in non-urban schools but are still lacking resources due to needing to provide more school-owned instruments, repairs, and access to opportunities for students who may be at a socioeconomic disadvantage, more district funds should be allotted to those urban band programs.

Likewise, inequity in the quality of instruments students were using was highly evident, as programs with higher numbers of minority students were producing sounds on school-owned instruments more than non-urban schools. Because school-owned instruments usually see years of repeated use, it is safe to infer that students in urban schools are playing on poorer quality instruments than their non-urban peers. This finding can also suggest that band directors in urban schools may need to use more of their budget to maintain and repair school-owned instruments than non-urban band directors who may have fewer school-owned instruments in use and more student ownership of instruments. Conversations need to occur among band directors, administrators, district-level appointees, and all other stakeholders to assess the inequities between urban and non-urban band programs within their districts. Principals, district music staff,

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

and other district-level representatives should continually assess disparities between its districts band programs and vote to allot funding that will close the gaps and serve all students equally.

Recommendations

The following research recommendations can be made based on the limitations and results from this study:

1. In order to compare a broader population of urban and non-urban band programs, more participants should be surveyed. Though a good variety of urban and non-urban respondents were included (16 band directors in non-urban schools, 11 in urban schools), more schools in more districts and states need to be assessed to gather a better understanding of disparities in resources.
2. When replicating this study, one should consider gathering data from band directors during non-festival times. Most concert assessments in WTSBOA, ETSBOA, and MTSBOA occur in March or April, thus, this is a busy season for band directors. Researchers are likely to receive more responses from band directors in break times between performances, such as late December to early January, or during the month of June.
3. When sending a questionnaire concerning urban and non-urban schools, the researcher should include operational definitions for urban schools and non-urban schools. This will help participants respond more accurately.
4. Questions about comfort level by ensemble ethnic makeup should be reimagined and reworded. Wording in the questions for “I am most comfortable teaching in a classroom of mostly White students” and “I am most comfortable teaching in a classroom of mostly minority students” left room for much confusion and misinterpretation, as well as potentially-biased responses.
5. In further research on this topic, a question is needed for whether or not the band directors are the only band staff at their schools, or if they have assistant, head, or other

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

band directors daily in their schools. Findings in this area will likely differ between urban and non-urban schools as well.

6. Further research should be done to examine the issue of urban schools having large numbers of minority students in the school but lower numbers of minorities enrolled in the band ensembles.

7. Further research is needed to identify the types of topics and experiences that are included about urban schools and/or environments with low SES students and minority students in undergraduate instrumental music education programs.

This study provided evidence of disparities in resources and musical achievement between urban and non-urban band programs across the state of Tennessee. This research contributes to the field of music education an outlook on of the status of equity and social justice within the discipline, and hopefully leads to more examination and discussion of this topic, particularly in the context of instrumental music. With additional research, beneficial methods could be identified to increase equity and representation in professional music careers for students of color and/or from low SES backgrounds.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

References

- Calloway, J. (2009). In search of music equity in an urban middle school. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 147-n/a. doi: 305176916.
- Costa-Giomi, E. (2008). Characteristics of elementary music programs in urban schools: What money can buy. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 177, 19-28.
- DeLorenzo, L. (2012). Missing faces from the orchestra: An issue of social justice? *Music Educators Journal*, 98, 39-46.
- Doyle, J. (2012). Music teacher perceptions of issues and problems in urban elementary schools. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 194, 31-52.
- Doyle, J. (2012). The effects of teacher background, teacher preparation, and support on attitudes and expectations of K-12 urban music educators. *ProQuest Dissertation and Theses*, 1-199. doi: 1023124306.
- Doyle, J. (2014). Cultural relevance in urban music education: A synthesis of literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 32, 1-8.
- Elpus, K. & Abril, C. (2011). High school music ensemble students in the United States: A demographic profile. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 59, 128-145.
- Eros, J. D. (2009). A case study of three urban music teachers in the second stage of their teaching careers. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 1-301. doi:304928143.
- Ester, D. & Turner, K. (2009). The impact of a school loaner-instrument program on the attitudes and achievement of low-income music students. *Contributions to Music Education*, 36, 53-71.
- Farmer, D. M. (2015). Urban music education: A discourse analysis. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 1-284. doi: 3700184.
- Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2011). A mixed methods portrait of urban instrumental music teaching. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 1-357. doi: 304544579.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

- Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2012). Cultural diversity and the formation of identity: Our role as music teachers. *Music Educators Journal*, 98, 53-59.
- Frierson-Campbell, C. (2006). *Teaching music in the urban classroom, volume 1: A guide to survival, success, and reform*. Lenham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gayles, P. L. (2011). Title I elementary school principals' perspectives on teacher preparedness: University-based alternative teacher preparation for urban schools. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 251. doi: 899269034.
- Hamann, D.L. & Walker, L. (1993). Music teachers as role models for African-American students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 41, 303-314.
- Hornig, E. L. (2009). Teacher tradeoffs: Disentangling teachers' preferences for working conditions and student demographics. *American Education Research Journal*, 46, 690-717.
- Johnson, K. E. (2008). An examination of factors impacting the quality of music education in the urban environment. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 1-67. doi:89283738.
- Kinney, D. W. (2010). Selected nonmusic predictors of urban students' decisions to enroll and persist in middle school band programs. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 57, 334-350.
- Languell, A. B. (2018). Music teacher preparation for the urban classroom: A qualitative study. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 1-108. doi:10811848.
- Lehmberg, L. J. (2008). Perceptions of effective teaching and pre-service preparation for urban elementary general music classrooms: A study of teachers of different cultural backgrounds in various cultural settings. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 371-n/a. doi: 304461127.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

- Miksza, P. (2007). Music participation and socioeconomic status as correlates of change: A longitudinal analysis of academic achievement. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 172*, 41-58.
- Miksza, P. (2010). Investigating relationships between participation in high school music ensembles and extra-musical outcomes: An analysis of the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 using a bioecological development model. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 186*, 7-25.
- Minority. (2011). In OxfordDictionaries.com. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/minority>
- Mixon, K. (2005). Building your instrumental music program in an urban school. *Music Educators Journal, 91*, 15-23.
- Rickels, D. A., Brewer, W. D., Councill, K. H., Fredrickson, W. E., Hairston, M. H., Perry, D. L., Schmidt, M. (2013). Career influences of music education audition candidates. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 61*, 115-134.
- Robinson, N. (2012). Preservice music teachers' employment preferences: Consideration factors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 60*, 294-309.
- Sheldon, D. & Hartley, L. (2012) What color is your baton, girl? Gender and ethnicity in band conducting. *of the Council for Research in Music Education, 192*, 39-52.
- Stewart, C. (1991). Who takes music? Investigating access to high school music as a function of social and school factors. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. doi: 9208660.
- Walker, L. & Hamann, D. L. (1995). Minority recruitment: the relationship between high school students' perceptions about music participation and recruitment strategies. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 124*, 24-38.
- Young, W. T. (1974). Musical development in preschool disadvantaged children. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 22*, 155-169

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Appendix A: Correlation Tables

Table 22

Spearman Correlations between Percentage of Minorities in Band Program, Resources, and Number of Music Majors

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. % Minority	---															
2. Urban or Non	-.87*	---														
3. No. stu. teachers	-.47*	.44*	---													
4. SO inst. repair	-.02	-.03	-.13	---												
5. % Stu. use SO inst	.57**	-.50**	-.26	.17	---											
6. % Private lessons	-.48*	.45*	.47*	-.01	-.45*	---										
7. Solo & Ens. part.	.23	-.15	.07	.07	-.17	.22	---									
8. Supp. instructors	-.72**	.60**	.46*	.23	-.52**	.52**	-.04	---								
9. College recruiters	.26	-.27	-.07	.16	-.14	.17	.26	-.01	---							
10. Supp. marching	-.42*	.35	.22	-.19	-.66**	.62**	.20	.58*	.37	---						
11. Guest performers	-.34	.38	.33	-.04	-.53**	.69**	.26	.64**	.29	.60**	---					
12. Provided trans.	-.06	-.01	-.13	-.18	-.32	.16	.38	.07	.40*	.28	.31	---				
13. Band camp away	.06	-.05	-.20	.03	-.20	.21	.34	.05	.29	.31	.44*	.35	---			
14. Parents fundraise	-.53**	.41*	.48*	.22	-.55**	.42*	.09	.67**	.38*	.50**	.56*	.35	.24	---		
15. Outside ens.	-.40*	.22	.39*	.07	-.30	.47*	.02	.38	.05	.21	.45*	.23	.03	.44*	---	
16. No. mus. majors	-.38*	.39*	.32	-.10	-.44*	.37	.01	.22	.18	.40*	.38*	.21	.20	.42*	.38*	---

Note. Stu. = student; SO = school-owned; inst. = instrument; Ens. = Ensemble; Supp. = Supplemental; trans. = transportation; mus. = music.
 * $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two tailed.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Table 23

Spearman Correlations between Percentage of Minorities, Teacher Preparation, Type of Music Taught, and Number of Student Teachers

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. % Minority	---														
2. Teacher Ethnicity	-.51**	---													
3. Education level	.02	-.04	---												
4. Ugrad. min. topics	-.04	-.15	.19	---											
5. Ugrad. SES topics	-.05	.00	.34	.45*	---										
6. Field exp. type	.17	-.02	-.15	.16	.05	---									
7. Ugrad urban apply	.11	.06	-.11	.22	.33	.14	---								
8. Starting minority	.09	-.19	.21	-.04	-.00	.27	-.21	---							
9. White comfort	-.05	.18	-.50**	-.10	-.16	-.21	.13	-.39*	---						
10. Minority comfort	.11	.15	-.15	.15	-.36	.04	-.09	-.10	.39*	---					
11. Culturally relevant	.40*	-.31	-.08	.04	-.13	.11	.19	-.11	.04	.20	---				
12. Ugrad. prepared	.14	-.21	-.04	.50**	.26	.21	.26	-.08	-.10	.11	.23	---			
13. Teach classical	.07	.04	.12	.27	.31	.15	.31	-.10	-.03	.20	.18	.08	---		
14. Teach pop	.40*	-.23	.29	-.14	-.05	.18	.26	-.04	.07	.27	.41*	-.04	.23	---	
15. Teach world music	-.01	.16	-.02	.14	-.01	.26	.19	-.30	-.02	.01	.23	-.14	.47*	.26	---

Note. Ugrad = undergraduate; S.O. = school-owned; inst. = instrument; Ens. = Ensemble; Supp. = Supplemental; trans. = transportation.

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two tailed.

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Appendix B: Pilot Study

Fairview Project Undergraduate Student Questionnaire

1. Please indicate your year in college: FR SOPH JUNIOR SENIOR
2. Please circle your field of music study: Performance Music Education
Music Theory Musicology Other _____
3. Please circle your ethnicity:
Native American
Pacific Islander
African American
Caucasian
East Indian
Hispanic/Latino
Asian
Multiracial
Other _____
4. Did you have any experience teaching minority students or students with low income before working with the Fairview Project? YES NO
5. Have your undergraduate music courses discussed teaching minority students?
Never Very Rarely Sometimes Frequently
If yes, how many courses?

6. Have your undergraduate music courses discussed teaching low-income students?
Never Very Rarely Sometimes Frequently
If yes, how many courses?

7. Upon starting your teaching at Fairview, how comfortable did you feel with the students of color?
A fish out of water Somewhat Apprehensive At ease Very Confident

(PLEASE CONTINUE TO OTHER SIDE)

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

8. Circle the level that you feel best answers each of the questions below (SD=strongly disagree, D=disagree, A=agree, SA=strongly agree):

I am interested in teaching in an urban school with a large number of minority students in my career. SD D A SA

I am interested in teaching in an urban school with a large number of low-income students in my career. SD D A SA

My current music program encourages applying for music jobs in urban schools or environments. SD D A SA

I am most comfortable teaching music in a classroom of mostly white/Caucasian students. SD D A SA

I am comfortable creating music instruction relevant to the backgrounds and interests of my current Fairview students. SD D A SA

I am comfortable creating music instruction relevant to backgrounds and interests of a concentrated population of minority and/or low-income students. SD D A SA

9. Did you have assumptions of the students and environment at Fairview upon starting the program? YES NO

If yes, have those assumptions changed? Please explain:

10. Please provide any additional comments you feel necessary:

**(END OF SURVEY)
THANK YOU! ☺**

Appendix C: Invitation to High School Band Directors

Indiana University
Jacobs School of Music
Simon Center, M145B
Bloomington, IN 47405
April 7, 2014

Dear [Band Director],

My name is Charlie Edmonds and I am currently a graduate student at Indiana University, and an alumnus of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville's music education program. For my master's thesis, I am examining the effect of teacher preparation and access to resources on student musical achievement and decision to continue music study after high school. This is a paramount issue of music education, but has been rarely studied in the high school band sector. Because you are a band director in a district with a mix of urban, suburban, and rural programs, your views are vital to this research. I am requesting for you to participate in this research study by completing the linked survey. Only one completed survey from each school is needed.

The following questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. There is no compensation for responding nor is there any known risk. Information regarding the name of the district, band program, and teachers will remain confidential and will not be identified upon write-up. If you choose to participate in this project, please answer all questions as honestly as possible. The link to the online survey is: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/9MDF9XL> .

Please take time to assist me in my educational endeavors and in the goal to provide research on a topic that I deeply care about, having been a student in Tennessee high school band programs myself. Completion of the questionnaire will indicate your willingness to participate in this study. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Charlie S. Edmonds
(731) 267-0248
csedmond@indiana.edu

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Appendix D: Band Director Questionnaire in Paper and Online Formats

Paper Format

1. High school where you teach _____

2. Total number of years teaching band _____

3. Number of years teaching in current school _____

4. Total number of students enrolled in your bands, grades 9-12 _____

5. Estimate the percentage of minority (African American or Latino) students enrolled in your program:

Less than 10%

10-25%

26-40%

41-55%

56-75%

More than 75%

6. Please circle your ethnicity:

Native American

Pacific Islander

African American

Caucasian

East Indian

Hispanic/Latino

Asian

Biracial/Multiethnic

Other (please specify) _____

(PLEASE CONTINUE TO OTHER SIDE)

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

7. Please indicate the level of education you obtained and the major you studied at each level:

Bachelor's Degree _____ Master's Degree _____
 Doctorate _____

8. How often did your undergraduate **music** education courses include topics concerning teaching minority (African American or Latino) students?

Never Very Rarely Sometimes Frequently

9. How often did your undergraduate **music** education courses include topics concerning students of low socio-economic status?

Never Very Rarely Sometimes Frequently

10. Did you complete undergraduate field experience/observation hours at an urban school?

YES NO

11. How often did your undergraduate music education professors encourage applying for jobs at urban schools with low-income and/or minority students?

Never Very Rarely Sometimes Frequently

12. Upon starting your teaching at your current school, how confident did you feel in teaching your students with minority backgrounds?

A fish out of water Somewhat apprehensive At ease Fully confident

13. Circle the level that you feel best and honestly answers each of the questions below (SD = strongly disagree, D = disagree, A = agree, SA = strongly agree):

I am most comfortable teaching music in a classroom of mostly white/Caucasian students.

SD D A SA

I am most comfortable teaching music in a classroom with a large population of minority students.

SD D A SA

I am comfortable creating music instruction relevant to the backgrounds and interests of an ensemble of mostly minority students.

SD D A SA

My undergraduate music courses well-prepared me to teach in urban schools with low-income and/or high concentrations of minority students.

SD D A SA

(PLEASE CONTINUE TO NEXT PAGE)

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

14. How many student teachers/interns has your band program received in the past 3 years?
(circle one)

None 1 2 3 4 More than 4

15. Estimate the percentage of your students using school-owned instruments (circle one):

0% (all students own their instruments)

10-20%

30-40%

40-50%

50-60%

70-80%

80% or more

My program does not provide school-owned instruments

16. Estimate the percentage of your students taking private lessons on their band instrument
(circle one):

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

17. If you have students taking private lessons, how are the lessons supplied (circle one)?

Provided by the student/family

Partially funded by the band program (either district or booster funds)

Completely funded by the band program (either district or booster funds)

Other (please specify) _____

(PLEASE CONTINUE TO OTHER SIDE)

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

18. Rate the frequency with which the following occurs in your band program (N = Never, R = Rarely, S = Sometimes, F = Frequently):

I teach classical music to my students	N	R	S	F
I teach popular music to my students	N	R	S	F
I teach world music to my students	N	R	S	F
School-owned instruments are sent to repair shops	N	R	S	F
Students attend Solo & Ensemble Festival	N	R	S	F
Supplemental instructors are provided for each instrument/group for additional instruction and/or sectional rehearsals	N	R	S	F
College music recruiters visit the band program to speak with students	N	R	S	F
Supplemental staff is supplied for band arranging, drill writing, visual effect, etc.	N	R	S	F
Buses and/or planned transportation is provided for students attending festivals, honor bands, and/or auditions	N	R	S	F
Students travel away from school for differentiated instruction during band camp and/or marching band season	N	R	S	F
Guest performers and master classes are provided	N	R	S	F
Students participate in outside classical music groups (youth orchestra, community band, church groups, etc.)	N	R	S	F
Parents participate in fundraising initiatives	N	R	S	F

19. How many of your students have become university music majors after high school graduation in the past 3 years? (circle one)

None 1-3 4-6 7-10 11-15 More than 15

20. Please provide any additional comments that you feel necessary:

END OF SURVEY. THANK YOU! ☺

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

Online Questionnaire Format Using Surveymonkey.com

Band Director Questionnaire

1. High school where you teach:

2. Total number of years teaching band:

3. Number of years teaching in current school:

4. Total number of students enrolled in your bands, grades 9-12:

5. Estimate the percentage of minority (African American or Latino) students enrolled in your program:

6. Indicate your ethnicity:

Other (please specify)

7. Please indicate the level of education you obtained and the major you studied at each level:

Bachelor's Degree	<input type="text"/>
Master's Degree	<input type="text"/>
Doctorate	<input type="text"/>

8. How often did your undergraduate music education courses include topics concerning teaching minority (African American or Latino) students?

9. How often did your undergraduate music education courses include topics concerning students of low socio-economic status?

10. Did you complete undergraduate field experience/observation hours at an urban school?

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

11. How often did your undergraduate music education professors encourage applying for jobs in urban schools with low-income and/or minority students?

12. Upon starting your teaching at your current school, how confident did you feel in teaching your students with minority backgrounds?

- A fish out of water
- Somewhat apprehensive
- At ease
- Fully confident

13. Select the option that you feel best and honestly answers each of the questions below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I am most comfortable teaching music in a classroom of mostly white/Caucasian students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am most comfortable teaching music in a classroom with a large population of minority students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am comfortable creating music instruction relevant to the backgrounds and interests of an ensemble of mostly minority students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My undergraduate music courses well-prepared me to teach in urban schools with low-income and/or high concentrations of minority students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. How many student teachers/interns has your band program received in the past 3 years?

15. Estimate the percentage of your students using school-owned instruments:

- 0% (all students own their instruments)
- 10-20%
- 30-40%
- 40-50%
- 50-60%
- 70-80%
- 80% or more
- My program does not provide school-owned instruments

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

16. Estimate the percentage of your students taking private lessons on their band instrument:

17. If you have students taking private lessons, how are the lessons supplied?

- Provided and funded by the student/family
- Partially funded by the band program (either district or booster funds)
- Completely funded by the band program (either district or booster funds)
- Other (please specify)

18. Rate the frequency with which the following occurs in your band program:

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently
I teach classical music to my students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I teach popular music to my students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I teach world music to my students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
School-owned instruments are sent to repair shops	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students attend Solo & Ensemble Festival	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supplemental instructors are provided for each instrument/group for additional instruction and/or sectional rehearsals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
College music recruiters visit the band program to speak with students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supplemental staff is supplied for band arranging, drill writing, visual effect, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Buses and/or planned transportation is provided for students attending festivals, honor bands, and/or auditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students travel away from school for differentiated instruction during band camp and/or marching band season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guest performers and master classes are provided	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students participate in outside classical music groups (youth orchestra, community band, church groups, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parents participate in fundraising initiatives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

COMPARISON OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN BAND PROGRAMS

19. How many of your students have become university music majors after high school graduation in the past 3 years?

- None
- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-10
- 11-15
- More than 15

20. Please provide any additional comments you feel necessary:

Done

Powered by



See how easy it is to [create a survey](#).

[Privacy & Cookie Policy](#)