This study was designed as an examination of teacher perceptions about factors affecting the successful teaching of the National Standards for Music Education. Subjects of the study were music specialists and fourth-grade classroom teachers—or generalists—from public elementary schools throughout Florida. A survey was administered to both groups to determine opinions regarding the feasibility of implementing each of the nine National Standards for Music Education (singing, playing instruments, improvising, composing/arranging, reading/notating, listening/analyzing, evaluating, understanding music as it relates to other subjects, and understanding music as it relates to history and culture) by rating seven items (contact time, resources, assistance, ability, training, interest, responsibility, and level of assistance). Results indicated that, with respect to all seven items, music specialists are considerably more amenable to the implementation of all nine standards than are general educators. Certain standards are more feasible for both music teachers and generalists to integrate, whereas others should be solely implemented by music teachers. Music specialists are less dependent on the assistance of generalists, but the generalists need the assistance of music specialists to successfully implement most standards. Both groups expressed a concern about the lack of time and resources to effectively teach what is required by most standards.

Susan J. Byo

Classroom Teachers' and Music Specialists' Perceived Ability to Implement the National Standards for Music Education

In March 1994, the United States Congress passed the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act,* which established the arts among the disciplines in which every young American should demonstrate competence. Music educators nationwide worked under MENC auspices to create voluntary standards in nine content areas; these standards were intended to provide a world-class model for states to adopt as they are

Susan J. Byo has served as the music superviser for the Broward Public Schools in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and is now the assistant principal of the Fine Arts Academy, Rio Rancho High School, Rio Rancho, New Mexico. She can be contacted at 165 Windmill Trail, Placitas, NM 87043.

or to use as a basis for developing their own standards if they chose to do so (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994). The State of Florida incorporated the national standards as a basis for its music curriculum, a move that was passed into law by state school board rule in May 1996 (State of Florida, Department of State, 1996). However, attempts to implement these standards have highlighted a number of complicated and important issues.

Despite national media attention and integration of the standards into state and local curricula, little progress has been made at the school-based level in the development and implementation of an organizational design through which these standards might be achieved. The expectations inherent in them are rigorous (Florida Department of Education, 1996b). The national standards, for all public school students, include singing, playing instruments, improvising, composing, reading/notating, listening/analyzing, evaluating, understanding relationships between music and other disciplines, and understanding music in relation to history and culture. Although performing arts magnet schools and some private schools might be more likely to effectively implement the standards because of increased funding and time already devoted to music, many public schools face a much more difficult struggle.

The Music Educators National Conference (now MENC—The National Association for Music Education), in an effort to address the challenges presented by the new standards, identified several critical factors for effective music curriculum implementation:

> Teachers, school systems, and policymakers will all have to address questions of how resources and opportunities (programs, teachers, materials, and most often neglected, time) will be allocated to assure that all children receive an education in the arts commensurate with the quality the standards point towards. (MENC, 1994b, p. 4)

MENC has also identified "opportunity-to-learn standards" to guide schools with respect to these resource and professional items. These opportunity-to-learn standards offer considerations for successful implementation of the national standards (MENC, 1994a), and they provide the framework for the study reported on in this paper. Organizational designs for curriculum and instruction during this time of change are inconsistent and not clearly defined. Some public elementary school decision makers place responsibility for teaching the music standards on classroom teachers—referred to in this article as generalists—regardless of limitations of time, training, interest, resources, perceived responsibility, and ability. Others hold music specialists, under similar limitations, solely accountable for delivery of instruction (MENC, 1994b). A third option supports integration of both parties, with few clear curricular blueprints (Pioli, 1991).

Nationally, 70% of public elementary schools that provide music education report that the subject is taught by certified music specialists only; 22% indicate the subject is taught by both music specialists

and generalists; and 8% provide instruction by generalists alone (National Center for Education Statistics, 1995). Many arts organizations and educational leaders support an integrated approach to delivering the arts curriculum (Boyer, 1989; Goodlad, 1983; Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994). Studies also indicate that shared responsibility is preferred by teachers and administrators (Pendleton, 1975/1976). Others, however, are more skeptical of the integrated design (Fero, 1994; McCarthy, 1994). In a national educational climate sensitive to public criticism, educators are expected to do more with less, which in many cases results in music instruction delivered solely by the generalist (Barry, 1992). Yet, generalists reject sole responsibility for teaching music (Smith, 1986). Furthermore, Vandenberg (1993) and Lippert (1996) report generalists initiating the political action necessary to reinstate music specialists.

When a generalist is assigned to teach music, that teacher's personal interest and sense of responsibility for teaching music influence the efficacy of curricular implementation (Saunders, 1992). The teacher, as custodian of what is taught, shapes curriculum by making daily decisions about topics to highlight or de-emphasize, while determining personal allocations of time and energy (Bennett et al., 1994; Goodlad, 1983). Saunders and Baker (1992) found that generalists value skills inherent in some standards (interdisciplinary applications and song-choice instruction), but others (notation and playing instruments) are not highly valued. McCarthy (1994) found that music was most often used by generalists for special occasions, but to a far lesser degree for music skill development.

Music specialists also have different levels of interest and curricular respect for various standards based on both personal and professional biases. Some find the teaching of particular standards beyond their level of comfort or areas of routine (Lehman, 1995). For example, those whose teacher-trainers emphasized musical performance during their training and early teaching may have to revisit what might have been secondary interests of analysis, history, relation of music to other disciplines, composition, and/or improvisation.

Researchers have found that a teacher's level of subject-matter competence is the prime predictor of student learning (Cassidy, 1989; Mullins, 1993) and should be the major component of teacher preparation (Reimer, 1993). Certified music specialists have spent a minimum of 4 years plus several precollegiate years training in music (Steinel, 1990), whereas generalists, in most cases, take a one-semester course as their preparation to teach music (Florida Department of Education, 1996a). Generalists realize their preparation in music is minimal (Vandenberg, 1993). Barry (1992) found that a teacher lacking confidence in his or her ability to teach music effectively will not provide students with the same number and quality of musical experiences as will a teacher exhibiting greater confidence. She also found that generalists lacked confidence in leading

unfamiliar songs, teaching without a recording, and teaching basic music concepts.

The music-teaching skills necessary to effectively implement the standards may need to be significantly increased for music specialists as well (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994). Music specialists receive comprehensive training in music performance and theory, along with pedagogical training in these areas; however, to adequately address all nine standards, more preparation will likely be needed in composition, improvisation, music history, and other arts disciplines (Hope, 1995; Lehman, 1995).

Providing appropriate materials and equipment for the instruction of elementary music represents one of the greatest challenges in our schools (Pioli, 1991). Also, the new standards require more advanced materials and more current equipment than previously available. Increased financial investment in acoustical instruments, textbooks, and technological items is necessary (Florida Department of Education, 1996b).

Instructional time for teachers and students to master music skills is minimal in most public schools where academic achievement is the priority (Bresler, 1994; MENC, 1994a). For example, the National Educational Commission on Time and Learning (1994) recognizes the arts among the core disciplines for every student. This group, however, distinguishes between the "academic day" and the "school day" and assigns the academic day a guaranteed 5.5 hours, while other studies—including the arts—are either sacrificed or scheduled outside of the academic day.

In the present study, the researcher sought to address the following questions:

1. How will the following seven professional and resource items influence effective implementation of the national standards: teacher training, interest, ability, sense of responsibility, resources, assistance, and perception of available time?
2. Are there statistically significant differences between the perceptions of elementary music specialists and fourth-grade generalists with respect to these professional and resource items?
3. What curriculum design for the delivery of the new elementary music standards would most effectively allow either the specialist or the generalist to meet the new standards successfully?

In this study, the investigator sought to draw curricular conclusions and present several curricular recommendations in an attempt to provide assistance to curriculum planners, trainers, and decision makers.

METHOD

A random sample of elementary music teachers (N = 122) and fourth-grade generalists (N = 122) was surveyed asking seven specific questions about each of the nine national standards (63 questions in all) for music at the elementary school level. Both groups of respon-

dents received identical sets of questions, and the seven questions were identical for each standard. The first null hypothesis tested was that there was no difference between music specialist responses and generalist responses. The second null hypothesis tested was that there was no difference in responses between any of the seven professional and resource items across the nine content standards. The third null hypothesis tested was that there were no interactions between mean values for music specialists' and generalists' responses to professional and resource issue questions across the nine standards.

Setting and Sample

This research study was conducted within the geographical boundaries of the State of Florida. For the purposes of this study, qualifying districts were defined as those that provide music instruction by a music specialist in their elementary schools. Of the 58 qualifying districts, 47 responded positively to the request to conduct this research in their county, one responded negatively, and ten counties rendered no response after two letters and a phone call. Therefore, 81% of the qualified schools agreed to participate in the study. Florida's largest county (Dade) and smallest county (Taylor) were represented.

Individual schools that qualified to participate in this study were defined as those providing to fourth-grade students a general teacher and a music specialist, both of whom met regularly with students. Performing arts magnet schools and private schools were excluded from this study due to the history of increased funding and generous time schedules dedicated to arts education in many of these settings. Of the 1,509 Florida elementary schools in the state that met the criteria, 1,361, or 90.1%, were in consenting counties. Schools were randomly selected from an equal distribution of an alphabetized list. Eight percent, or 122, of the qualifying elementary schools were sent survey packets.

The music teacher of each identified school was sent the following packets: (a) a music teacher packet, which included a cover letter, instructions, and a music teacher survey; (b) a generalist's packet of identical items for the generalist. To achieve a random selection of the generalists invited to participate, instructions for music teachers asked them to alphabetize, by last name, the fourth-grade generalists in their school and give the generalist packet to the second generalist on the alphabetized list.

Survey Instrument

A survey was developed specifically for use in this study following a review of the literature, a study of the issues relevant to curriculum delivery, and identification of potential barriers to effective music instruction. The survey lists the nine content standards of the National Standards for Music Education (singing, playing instruments, improvising, composing, reading and notating music, listening and

analyzing music, evaluating music, understanding music as it relates to other subjects, and understanding music as it relates to history and culture) and asks participants to evaluate their ability to address each standard relative to each of the seven professional and resource items (teacher's training, interest, ability, sense of responsibility, resources, assistance, and perception of available time). For each standard, the teachers were asked to respond on a Likert scale by circling the appropriate number: 1 (strongly agree), 2 (agree), 3 (no opinion), 4 (disagree), or 5 (strongly disagree).

For example, for the singing standard, teachers were asked if they agreed that they were trained, interested, and able to teach the standard; if they agreed that they felt professionally responsible to teach it; if they agreed that they had the resources to teach it; if they agreed that they would feel more able to teach it well with the assistance of the other teacher; and if they agreed that they had the time to teach it.

Data Collection Procedure

Music teachers served as facilitators for collecting and returning surveys. To achieve the required 70% minimum return rate, surveys and envelopes were coded by school to track returns. Music teachers who did not respond by a deadline date were personally contacted by phone 3 days later to request their responses. Teachers who did not respond within 2 weeks of the deadline date were sent a second survey for completion. These procedures spanned 6 weeks, by which time 72.5% of surveys had been received.

Data Analysis

Statistical procedures applied in the analysis of data were selected in light of the hypotheses to be tested. The first independent variable was defined as the areas of instruction, with music specialists and general educators representing two levels of this variable. A second independent variable was the National Standards for Music Education, with the nine content standards serving as nine levels of this variable. For each standard, the seven instructional ratings were summed to provide an overall perception of the specific curricular content. These summed ratings across the nine content standards for music and Grade 4 teachers were compared in a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures, with a between variable of teacher role and a within variable of content standard. Between-group comparisons identified differences with respect to teacher role, specifically, music specialists versus fourth-grade generalists. Within-group or repeated-measures comparisons reflected differences in responses to the nine content standards. An alpha level of .05 was determined a priori as the level of significance. Means of each of the seven levels (professional and resource items) were determined by content standard and role. A study of these means

resulted in the drawing of descriptive inferences that compare each of the seven repeated measures for each standard and each teacher group. Demographic information, while studied by role (music teacher compared to generalist), was determined to have no bearing on the results.

RESULTS

With respect to the independent variable of teacher role, there was a significant difference between the overall ratings of music specialists ($n = 89$) and generalists ($n = 88$) [$F(1, 175) = 503.54$, $p < .0001$]. Music teachers' responses were significantly more positive toward all of the standards ($M = 13.282$) than were the generalists ($M = 27.009$). Table 1 presents means of total ratings on a scale that ranges from a minimum of 7 to a maximum of 35.

Additionally, there was a significant difference due to the independent variable of content standard [$F(8, 1400) = 55.38$, $p < .0001$]. Improvising and composing (content standards 3 and 4) received the least favorable ratings, whereas understanding music in relation to history and culture (content standard 9) received the highest rating.

A significant two-way interaction occurred between the two independent variables of standard and teacher role [$F(8, 1400) = 10.55$, $p < .0001$]. High means denote a less favorable rating, indicating that generalists are considerably less comfortable than music specialists in teaching all of the content standards. And while the responses are proportionally similar with respect to certain standards, closer inspection highlights subtle but important differences for others. Music specialists indicated most favorable overall ratings for singing, listening/analyzing, and evaluating, while generalists most favorably rated understanding relationships between music and other subjects and understanding music in relation to history and culture. Music specialists were slightly more comfortable teaching evaluating than they were teaching listening/analyzing, while generalists were less comfortable teaching evaluating.

Table 2 more specifically indicates the differences between music teachers' and generalists' perceptions of their own ability and responsibility for teaching the music content outlined by the national standards. The mean ratings, from scales of 1 to 5, for each of the seven levels within the nine content standards are displayed. Overall, both music teachers and generalists rated the composing and improvising standards most difficult to implement. Music teachers rated the highest degree of interest, responsibility, ability, and training with respect to the singing and reading/notating standards, while generalists rated the understanding music as related to other subjects and the understanding music with respect to history and culture standards most favorably with respect to these same levels. It is important to note that while the relating music to other subjects and the history and culture standards were rated the most favorably by generalists, their overall mean ratings remained quite low on most levels.

Table 1
Means and Standards Deviations of Role by Standard Interaction

	Mean		Standard deviation		Standard error	
Standard	Music	General	Music	General	Music	General
Singing	11.83	26.08	3.44	5.62	.366	.599
Playing instruments	14.08	27.96	4.90	5.65	.522	.602
Improvising	16.86	30.07	5.12	4.20	.545	.448
Composing	16.15	29.24	5.68	4.47	.605	.477
Reading/notating	12.23	27.34	3.33	5.83	.355	.621
Listening/analyzing	11.63	26.15	3.45	6 27	.367	.668
Evaluating	11.02	27.48	4.05	5.50	.432	.587
Music and other subjects	13.44	24.78	4.88	6.42	.520	.685
History/culture	12.30	23.99	4.50	6.80	.480	.725

Note. Lower means represent higher ratings.

Music specialists felt a high degree of responsibility for teaching all standards, "agreeing" to "strongly agreeing" that they were responsible for teaching them. Generalists disagreed that they were responsible for teaching most standards. The two integrated standards were rated slightly more favorably with an average rating closer to a "no opinion" level of responsibility than "disagreement."

For six of the nine standards, music teachers felt less able to effectively implement the standards than their training indicated. Conversely, the generalists, for all standards, felt more able to implement the standards than their training indicated. This paradox may reflect increased responsibility felt by music teachers and higher expectations, both of which frequently result from increased training. Additionally, it is important to note that, overall, generalists "disagreed" to "strongly disagreed" that they were able and trained to deliver any standards while music specialists "agreed" to "strongly agreed" that they were both able and trained to deliver all standards.

Music specialists did not agree that they had time to effectively teach any of the standards. Generalists stated that their time to effectively implement instruction ranged from "disagreement" to "strong disagreement."

Table 2
Means Comparison of Professional and Resource Items by Content Standard and Role where 1 = Strongly Agree and 5 = Strongly Disagree

Standard	Role	Interested	Respon-sible	Able	Trained	Time	Conjunc-tion	Re-sources
Singing	Music	1.12	1.24	1.24	1.23	2.32	3.05	1.70
	General	3.05	4.00	3.84	4.15	4.44	2.34	4.26
Playing instruments	Music	1.27	1.45	1.46	1.53	2.67	3.43	2.25
	General	3.53	4.26	4.19	4.26	4.50	2.80	4.41
Improvising	Music	1.73	1.97	1.90	1.84	3.21	3.65	2.57
	General	4.05	4.49	4.57	4.63	4.64	3.17	4.53
Composing	Music	1.69	1.80	1.85	1.84	2.98	3.71	2.32
	General	3.91	4.42	4.42	4.51	4.57	2.97	4.44
Reading/ notating	Music	1.20	1.20	1.21	1.17	2.28	3.36	1.75
	General	3.60	4.33	3.82	4.05	4.49	2.73	4.33
Listening/ analyzing	Music	1.26	1.30	1.24	1.25	2.32	2.56	1.70
	General	3.07	4.18	3.75	4.10	4.26	2.64	4.15
Evaluating	Music	1.46	1.60	1.49	1.47	2.74	2.74	2.27
	General	3.49	4.22	4.02	4.24	4.41	2.90	4.21
Music and other subjects	Music	1.39	1.53	1.58	1.69	2.79	1.98	2.46
	General	2.72	3.59	3.71	4.05	4.10	2.55	4.08
History/culture	Music	1.27	1.40	1.49	1.59	2.44	1.88	2.23
	General	2.52	3.42	3.63	4.02	3.91	2.48	4.01

Note. Conjunction refers to the implementation of standard in conjunction with the teacher of the other role working in a team-teaching situation; in other words, a generalist preferring to work with a music specialist, and vice versa.

Generalists expressed a need for collaboration with music specialists for effective instruction of most of the content standards. The same was not true for music specialists; they indicated that delivering instruction in conjunction with the generalists might actually be more difficult, with the exception of standards concerning evaluating, understanding music in relation to other subjects, and understanding music in relation to history and culture.

Music specialists indicated fewest resources available for teaching improvising and understanding music in relation to other subjects. They also identified playing instruments and composing as poten-

tially difficult. Music specialists generally agreed that they were sufficiently equipped to implement the singing, reading/notating, and evaluating standards. Second only to time, generalists rated resources at the lowest level for most of the music standards; they believed that they had few to no resources available to teach any of the standards.

DISCUSSION

The development of the National Standards for Music Education and the great forward motion that has transpired in music education as a result of their creation are both very positive events, and this study is not intended to undermine them in any way. The results of this study do, however, point out the limitations that the educational system brings to bear on curriculum organization, delivery, and teacher training with regard to music education.

Although there are striking differences between the responses of the generalists and the music specialists, this study is not intended to polarize them. Generalists' responses were likely based upon scant prior knowledge about the existence, content, or implementation of the music standards. Music specialists' responses reflected significantly more familiarity with the standards' content and implications for implementation, while many expressed a lack of knowledge about their existence. It is important to accept these perceptions as genuine and having evolved because of limitations beyond the control of either generalists or music specialists.

This study provides evidence that supports a curricular delivery model in which the music specialist is the primary provider of music instruction. The most striking result of this study is the generalists' near-complete rejection of the music standards based on limitations of time, resources, training, ability, perceived responsibility, and interest. Their responses also indicate a reliance on the music specialist for effective teaching of most of the standards. Generalists admit they cannot effectively teach the content required by the national standards for music by themselves. Substantial investments in the resources of time, materials, and equipment necessary to equip generalists to teach the music standards in anything more than integrated ways must be made by administrators and curriculum planners.

These responses, coming from the very people—the generalists—who are assigned responsibility when music positions are eliminated, support the need, the cost effectiveness, and instructional preference for the inclusion of music specialists on elementary public school faculties. The breadth of this study—including data representing 81% of the school districts across an entire state—could render it useful as a political tool both in Florida and in other states.

The data support a design of curriculum delivery involving shared responsibility for some of the standards and sole music-specialist responsibility for others. Specifically, they suggest that curriculum

planners and educational leaders should recommend and implement a curriculum design that holds music specialists, with limited student contact time, largely accountable for emphasizing the skills-based standards (singing, playing instruments, improvising, composing, reading/notating music, listening/analyzing, and evaluating); but both generalists and music specialists should be accountable for implementing the integrated standards (understanding music in relation to other subjects, and understanding music in relation to history/culture).

The following conclusion can be drawn from the data:

* There is a shortage of instructional time reported by both music teachers and generalists.

* The generalists expressed higher levels of comfort with the standards concerning understanding music in relation to other subjects and understanding music in relation to history/culture.

* Overall, the music specialists are comfortable with the standards.

* The music specialists felt qualified to teach for all but the two integrated standards by themselves.

Due to the fact that this model assigns music specialists most of the responsibility, administrators should be cognizant of time limitations and make every effort to increase music instructional time, or they should schedule integrated instruction during nonmusic time slots. Generalists should incorporate the other music standards into their curriculum when possible, but it is unrealistic to expect them to lead students to mastery of all music standards without the substantial training commensurate with that of certified music specialists.

Teacher educators and curriculum planners should note that both generalists and music specialists expressed a need for additional training to successfully implement the standards. Generalists need skills teaching with and through music in meaningful ways and increased understanding of the benefits of music instruction and integration. Music specialists need increased ability to effectively teach all of the standards, emphasizing the standards with which they are least comfortable: composing, improvising, understanding music in relation to other subjects, understanding music in relation to history/culture, and playing instruments. Additionally, training should focus on the value of team models in the implementation of the music standards.

Finally, resources of time, equipment, and materials were ranked as extremely limited by both groups; this limitation, they believed, posed potential problems. Curriculum planners and administrators are strongly encouraged to design curricular models that result in increased instructional contact time for both generalists and music teachers, while increasing the resources available to generalists to implement the standards.

The national standards movement has brought heightened awareness to issues of curriculum, as well as a window of opportunity for improving the music education of our students. The development of

standards, which present a universal set of musical skills and concepts, is intended to minimize a random or casual approach to what is taught. If the standards are haphazardly or thoughtlessly implemented, the momentum achieved thus far may be seriously compromised. This study will have served its intended purpose if it indeed supports educators in their quest to implement the standards in effective and meaningful ways.

REFERENCES

Barry, N. H. (1992). Music and education in the elementary music methods class. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 2* (1), 16–23.

Bennett, P., Davidson, L., Davis, D., Graves, G., Kahlich, L., Moore, B., O'Brien, B., Palmer, M., Reimer, B., Schwartz, B., Seidel, K., & Selwyn, D. (1994). Visual and performing arts summary. In J. A. Walter (Ed.), *ASCD curriculum handbook.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Boyer, E. L. (1989). Making the connections: The arts and school reform. In *Why we need the arts* (pp. 21–31). New York: ACA Books.

Bresler, L. (1994). Music in a double bind: Instruction by non-specialists in elementary schools. *Arts Education Policy Review, 95* (3), 30–36.

Cassidy, J. W. (1989). Effect of intensity training on preservice teachers' instruction accuracy and delivery effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 38,* 164–174.

Consortium of National Arts Education Associations. (1994). *National standards for arts education.* Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Fero, T. (1994). A study of Missouri elementary school principals' perceptions of the interdisciplinary curriculum approach (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University, Music Teacher Education, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54* (08), 2818.

Florida Department of Education. (1996a). *Exemplary educators, successful students: A study of professionalism.* Unpublished report, Tallahassee: State of Florida, Department of State.

Florida Department of Education. (1996b). *Florida curriculum framework: The arts: Pre-K–12 Sunshine State standards and instructional practices.* Tallahassee: State of Florida, Department of State.

Goodlad, J. (1983). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lehman, P. R. (1995). The national standards for music education: Meeting the challenges. *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 6* (2), 5–15.

Lippert, L. (1996). *Sarasota County report.* Report to the Florida Music Supervision Association, Altamonte Springs, FL, 1996.

McCarthy, M. S. (1994). Music experiences in the elementary classroom as directed and reported by in-service elementary classroom teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54* (12), 235.

Mullins, J. E. (1993). The relationship between teacher qualification and student learning: A study of standard one classrooms in Belize, Central America (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54* (05), 1766.

Music Educators National Conference. (1994a. *Opportunity-to-learn standards for music instruction: Grades pre-K–12.* Reston, VA: Author.

Music Educators National Conference. (1994b). *Perspectives on implementation: Arts education standards for America's students.* Reston, VA: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1995, October). *Arts education in public elementary and secondary schools* (NCES No. 95-082). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Education Commission on Time and Learning. (1994). *Prisoners of time.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Pendleton, C.A. (1976). An investigation into the role of the classroom teacher in the elementary school music program (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1975). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 38,* 858A.

Pioli, R. T. (1991). The state of the arts in the elementary school. *National Association of Elementary School Principals Journal, 10* (2), 10–14.

Reimer, B. (1993). Avoiding extremes of theory and practice in music teacher education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 3* (1), 12–21.

Saunders, T. C., & Baker, D. S. (1992). In-service classroom teachers' perceptions of useful music skills and understandings. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 39,* 248–260.

Smith, H. B. (1986). The evaluation of music teacher competencies identified by the Florida Music Education Association and teacher assessment of undergraduate preparation to demonstrate those competencies (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47* (08), 05792.

State of Florida, Department of State. (1996). *Florida curriculum framework: The arts: Pre-K–12 Sunshine State standards and instructional practices.* Tallahassee, FL.

Steinel, D. V. (Ed.). (1990). *Data on music education: A national review of statistics describing education in music and the other arts.* Reston, VA: Author.

Vandenberg, G. C. (1993). Northern California classroom teachers' perceptions of their preparation to teach music in grades two and five (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54* (06), 2086.

Submitted November 10, 1997; accepted December 10, 1998.