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The purpose of this study was to determine the state of music education in the Basic General Public schools in Ecuador from the perspective of the school administrator. A survey distributed via e-mail to 1,800 school administrators yielded a response rate of 27.4%. Administrators were asked to indicate the degree to which a list of music learning outcomes and broad educational outcomes in music were being met in current and ideal conditions. Results of the survey revealed that only a small percentage of the respondents (N = 475) offered music instruction at their schools. However, a further analysis showed significant differences between current and ideal conditions, which implies that administrators believe that improvements in a number of areas of music education are possible. When asked to indicate the degree to which numerous factors impacted their music programs, administrators indicated that budget and the lack of music teachers were negatively impacting music instruction. These responses were corroborated and expanded upon in two open-ended questions, which revealed that policy, resources, budget for music teachers, and parents and community were factors negatively impacting music education in schools.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Issue

Early writings of philosophers such as Confucius, Plato, and Aristotle have discussed the role of music in education (Blackman, 2015). Greek and Roman philosophers underscored the role of music education in the development of ideal citizens, to preserve cultural values, and the influence of this perspective on society (Mark, 1982). The study of music in schools has been justified throughout time for its utilitarian, social, and aesthetic values.

Schools are interconnected to the overall economic and political structures of their societies and as such, these institutions do not only undertake responsibility for student development, but are also expected to meet the various needs of their societies at large. Beyond scientific and technological advances, the increasingly global effects of human development and action, particularly on economics, national development, communal and individual autonomy, culture, democratization, and globalization, have become points of attention among scholars and political leaders. Formal education, therefore, has been considered a key element in providing students with the kinds of knowledge valued by society as well as opportunities for personal fulfillment as citizens (Kubow & Fossum, 2007). When a nation focuses its attention on its ability to
compete economically and politically, education reform becomes an international concern (Carnoy, 1999; Hughes, 2006; Sahlberg, 2011; Segrera, 2010). Although educational reforms constitute a response to the changing needs of a nation, it is only with the active participation of every citizen in the educational process that any modification can succeed. No matter how well educational reform plans are designed, the achievements of reforms are only as good as day-to-day work in the schools.

**Policies in Music Education**

Music education has been part of the Ecuadorian general curriculum since 1912 and its place in the school system has been critiqued as inconsistent. During the early 40s Segundo Luis Moreno, an Ecuadorian musicologist, composer, and pedagogue, claimed that although schools in Ecuador offered music instruction, it was superficial and unsuccessful (Moreno, 1940, as cited in Bustos, 2014). According to national law and curriculum documents issued by the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education in 2015, music education falls within the area of Cultural and Artistic Education, which is mandatory and functions under a national arts curriculum. Educational reforms in Ecuador have responded to the objectives and ideologies of political leaders. In 2011, the government of President Rafael Correa approved the *Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural LOEI* (Organic Law of Intercultural Education, 2011) with the aim of improving the state of general education of many of the cities and provinces in the country. The president declared that significant investments should be made in education, as a way to decrease the poverty index and improve the economic status of the country’s citizens (Correa, 2013).
One of the main objectives of the Ecuadorian national curriculum for National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education (NCCAE) is to foster the democratization of art, which historically has been confined to the “cultural elites” (Ministry of Education, 2014, as cited in Montero, Gavilanes, & Cadena, 2015). In the National Curriculum, the Ministry of Education states that culture and arts play a vital role in the lives of people and, as such, they promote basic learning experiences for every citizen. Accordingly, the document maintains that the arts are a meaningful resource when discovering who we are and how we relate to each other, which facilitates rigorous forms of thought related to sciences and mathematics, as well as divergent forms of thought such as philosophy and literature (Ministry of Education, 2016).

The quality and extent of music learning experiences in the Ecuadorian Basic General schools¹ is tied to the accessibility of music or arts specialists, given that the Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural (LOEI) does not enforce the presence of arts specialists. Although some music education resources are accessible for Basic General classroom teachers, the quality of arts and music education depends on the expertise of a teacher. The National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education (NCCAE) is understood as a space that promotes awareness and participation in both culture and contemporary art. Through constant dialogue and interaction with local and ancestral expressions, the Ecuadorian State aims to enhance the enjoyment and respect for the diversity of traditions and expressions in the arts. The NCCAE is focused on project-based activities that integrate the different areas in the field of arts and culture: music,

¹ Basic General Schools refer to the United States’ system from Kindergarten through the 10th grade
film, visual arts, theater, dance, photography, gastronomy, languages, and crafts among others (Ministry of Education, 2016).

**Music in Schools**

There is little consistency in the types of music education students are offered in public schools. In some secondary schools, music education consists of choirs and other ensembles, such as popular music ensembles. In some primary schools, instrumental music lessons are not typically a part of public school music programs but instrumental performance opportunities are provided by other institutions (i.e., conservatories of music). Parents wishing for their children to have specialized music instruction usually opt for after school instruction, which takes place in these state-funded or private conservatories of music. Music conservatories, public and private, are part of an educative tradition that follows a specific curriculum and certifies the completion of degrees and levels of achievement in music. Students from age seven to about 21 attend these institutions, where they receive classes such as music theory, ensembles, instrumental music education, and choir, among others.

Theorists, educators, and advocates of music education have built strong arguments for why music is meaningful in the lives of students. Traditionally, music conservatories have been charged with providing these types of learning experiences. However, school music education should provide rich learning experiences for students who are not part of the conservatory system of education. It is clear that the Ecuadorian State is concerned about the accessibility of arts education for every student (Correa, 2013).
Wiggins and Wiggins (2008) emphasized the need for presenting policy makers with descriptions of music programs, so that they have accurate criteria for making decisions about the future of music education in the schools. Understanding administrators’ perceptions would provide a rich source of information about the state of music education in the Basic General schools of Ecuador, given that they would provide information that could positively affect the future of the Ecuadorian Basic General schools’ music programs. There are only a few studies to date (Bustos, 2014; Montero, Gavilanes, & Cadena, 2015) that have analyzed the music education practices in Ecuador, but they have been limited to specific cities. No studies to date have assessed and analyzed the state of music education on a national level and after the implementation of the new national curriculum.

**Need for the Study**

Music and arts in the general school system of Ecuador have improved over the last 100 years (Vázquez, Betancourt, Chávez, Maza, Herrera, Zúñiga, 2014). The development of music advocates who focus their attention on the role that music has on people’s lives has produced regular expansions of substance and scope. Policies supporting school arts programs that demand the work of professionals in the field have been an unquestionable success for education, arts, music, and culture more generally. Education in Ecuador is structured to provide as much opportunity as possible for as many students as possible (Correa, 2013). These goals result from policies that favor a certain amount of standardization, which implies that educators and students, should be able to provide and acquire the same education quality in different parts of the country.
Two studies were conducted before the implementation of the new curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education. One of these studies focused on the implementation of the music curriculum in 14 schools in the city of Cuenca. Bustos (2014) surveyed 13 Basic General school teachers with the aim of profiling the students’ musical experiences. This descriptive investigation showed that Ecuadorian school principals have the power to make decisions in relation to budget, resources, and their utilization in order to have successful music programs. Another study examined the implementation of the previous curriculum of Aesthetic Education in the city of Milagro (Montero, Gavilanes, & Cadena, 2014). Researchers surveyed 236 classroom teachers from 96 schools in Milagro, of which 96% did not have a music specialist or professional development opportunities in music for classroom teachers. Both studies showed a lack of support for music programs, which undoubtedly affects the presence or quality of music learning experiences in the classroom.

Discussions about school music education have become more commonplace following the educational reform of 2011, which resulted in the development of the Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural (Presidencia de la República de Ecuador, 2011). Current universities have showed an increased interest in offering music instruction for music and general school educators. Moreover, with the creation of a national curriculum for arts and culture, the government has demonstrated its commitment to and value for the arts in education—on some level at least (Correa, 2013). President Correa stated that the governmental investment and support for the arts is grounded in the idea that the arts promote a better understanding of science and knowledge in general and that it is both a source of enjoyment and cultural identity (Correa, 2014).
Given the recent curriculum and policy reforms in arts education described earlier, it is an ideal moment to investigate current practices and perceptions of Ecuadorian music education. There is a need to know to what extent music is offered in the Basic General schools as well as to understand the factors that influence the success or failure of these programs. School administrators constitute a rich source of information. School administrators, supervisors, and school boards are responsible for making a variety of organizational and curricular decisions that will affect the way teachers meet their curricular objectives (Abril, 2009). Administrators are not only responsible for making decisions about program development and evaluation, procedures, policies, or schedules, they are also the leaders that provide direction and paths for success within their institutions. According to Habegger (2008), school administrators should (1) assure that instruction is aligned to academic content standards, (2) maintain continuous improvement in the institution, (3) design instruction for student success, (4) develop partnerships with parents and the community, and (5) nurture a culture where each individual feels valued. But beyond these roles, school administrators also have the responsibility of making decisions that directly impact the different fields of instruction. This is especially relevant for arts or music programs, which usually respond to financial and academic limitations.

School Administration in Ecuador

In the “Reglamento General a la Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural” (General Regulations to the Organic Law of Education) published in Official Gazette No. 754 in July 26th, 2012, the Ecuadorian State determines that the need for administrators is dictated by the level of education offered by the schools. Basic General Education
schools have four types of administrators: (1) Principal, (2) Assistant Principal, (3) School Inspector (Dean of Students), and (4) Assistant School Inspector. However, the official regulation also states that Basic General Education schools with less than 120 students will be in the charge of a temporary administrator, which in most cases is one of the school teachers (Reglamento General a la Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural, 2012). On the other hand, Basic General Education schools with a student population of 121 to 500 students will be completely in the charge of a school principal. Lastly, there are a number of communal schools (one-room school houses) with small student populations, in which case, all the administrative, academic, and teaching duties are overseen and implemented by one teacher.

Within the educational system in Ecuador, principals are responsible for the management of school affairs. Ecuadorian school principals make decisions regarding staff, scheduling, and educational resources, among others. It is the assistant principal who is usually charged with monitoring and managing every aspect related to the school’s academic areas and is responsible for gathering information about planning, staff, curriculum, students, and parents.

**Rationale, Purpose, and Research Questions**

President Obama (U.S. Department of Education, 2015) once claimed that reforms in education happen when policymakers modify weaknesses from previous reforms. It is essential, then, to emphasize the need for providing policy makers with feedback that would strengthen their rationales for making decisions about arts and music education in school system. Being aware of the current state of music education in the Basic General school system will encourage policy makers to create thoughtful
educational plans and make informed decisions about future goals and music practices in schools. School administrators’ beliefs constitute a rich source of information for public school teachers, music teachers, parents, and policy makers. The current study will have the potential to inform and influence decisions on music and arts teaching policies, music and arts teacher education, and professional development possibilities. Hence, it is my objective to provide information about the current state of the music curriculum in the Basic General schools in Ecuador from the perspective of the assistant principal or the administrator in charge of the school academic duties. Given the nature of the Ecuadorian school administration system, I will use the term ‘administrator’ to refer to the assistant principal or the school academic supervisor. The purpose of this study was to determine the state of music education in the Basic General public schools in Ecuador from the perspective of the school administrator. As managers and overseers of the school, they should be aware of the classroom practices and policies regarding arts and music education. They should also have a good sense of the effects of the current policy changes on the music curriculum. It was assumed that the participants in this study will provide honest responses depicting the state of music education in their respective schools.

This study was designed to determine which musical and broad educational goals are perceived to be met in the Basic General School classrooms of Ecuador, and how the achievement of said goals compares with the ultimate goals for music programs (ideals) held by school administrators. The study will also examine the challenges administrators face in supporting the music curriculum at their schools.

The following research questions guided this study:
1. What are administrators’ perceptions of the current national policies in art education?

2. What are administrators’ perceptions of the current state of the music curriculum?

3. Is there a difference between administrators’ perceptions of current and ideal states?

4. What are administrators’ perceptions of the degree to which numerous variables impact their music curriculum?

5. What are the obstacles and challenges that administrators’ face in supporting the music curriculum?

6. Are there differences by political zone in the ways administrators implement policies and oversee arts education instruction in their schools?

Knowledge of the Context

Research on administrators’ views of music programs in Ecuadorian Basic General public schools is limited. Therefore, examining studies that profile administrators’ perceptions of music education systems around the world is pertinent to this study. Abril and Gault (2006) reported that elementary public school principals in the U.S. were generally satisfied with music programs in their schools as well as their music teachers’ capabilities to meet music education standards and broad educational goals. However, significant differences between the current and ideal situations showed that there was potential for improvement in the mind of administrators. A large number of principals surveyed also perceived the following factors to have a major impact on their ability to support the music program: (1) the No Child Left Behind Act (U.S. national
(45.1%); (2) financial/budget constraints (55.2%); (3) scheduling issues (40.1%); and (4) standardized testing (34.4%) had a negative effect in music programs.

Kevin Gerrity (2007) examined the effect of NCLB on the Ohio public schools (U.S.). Gerrity claims that the NCLB legislation has had a punitive effect on arts education. Thirty-seven percent of principals very strongly believed that music was a vital part of every child’s education. When considering systems of accountability, 79% of the principals acknowledged that they did not track the students’ achievement in music and most of them were not aware of the *Opportunity-to-Learn Standards for Music Instruction* published by the National Association for Music Education. On average, principals considered the arts to be the least important subjects in the general education of students, with 71% of the respondents assigning music and the arts the lowest ranking as compared to other core subjects recognized by *No Child Left Behind*.

Although there was a reduction in the number of music teachers working in their schools and a slight increase in instrumental music programs, principals reported that general music courses were most commonly eliminated. Principals reported that since music was not a tested subject, it has become less important. With the schools’ emphasis on the mandates of a national education policy, increasing resources had been directed to tested areas, which resulted in cuts for arts education (Gerrity, 2007).

Blackman (2015) describes the status of music education in Trinidad and Tobago. Through a replication of Abril and Gault’s study (2008), Blackman found significant differences between current and ideal conditions. Principals claim that students are not meeting the standards for music learning outcomes in a satisfactory manner. Furthermore, they claimed that the lack of resources for music education and the difference in status as
compared to other areas, affected the quality and extent of musical experiences in secondary schools.

On the other hand, Martineza (2015) claims that elementary administrators from Delaware (U.S.) demonstrated strong support of music education. This was confirmed by the administrators’ willingness to facilitate music instruction on a weekly basis from a music specialist with a variety of music resources. Additionally, all administrators supported general music monetarily through their school budget.

In contrast to some researchers (Gerrity, 2007; Spohn, 2010; Thomas, 2014) who have claimed that NCLB has forced administrators to make cuts to the arts in their schools, Martineza’s study showed that state standardized tests as a result of NCLB were not an impediment. Furthermore, administrators reported they would not eliminate the music program at their school if faced with serious financial problems. The rationale behind this is based on the belief that music instruction gives opportunities for self-expression and creativity. This conclusion aligns with research conducted by others (Abril & Gault, 2006, 2008).

**Educational Reform in Ecuador: Context**

The last educational reform for basic general and secondary schools in Ecuador was in 1983, four years after Ecuador returned to democracy. The National State created the “Ley Orgánica de Educación” (*Organic Law of Education*), which was published in the Official Gazette No. 484 in May 3, 1983. In 1985, the UNESCO, together with the World Bank, analyzed the Ecuadorian educational system and determined that there was a clear educational growth in the country since 1940, especially in relationship with an increase in student population. They also stated some deficits such as unequal
opportunities for urban and rural sectors, low quality education for Basic General and secondary schools, a clear disconnection between school and job market, budget limitations, and lack of appropriate teaching methodologies (Organization of Ibero-American States, 1994).

The government of 2007 proposed the creation of a new Constitution, which was officially approved on October 10, 2008. With the new Constitution, the Ecuadorian State situated education as one of the Basic General focuses of national development. In Article No. 26, the Ecuadorian Constitution recognized education as a right and as a duty of the State, which guarantees equality and social inclusion (Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, 2008). Under this premise, the government initiated educational reforms that promoted a national economy based on human talent rather than solely on limited resources such as agricultural or industrial production (Vázquez, Betancourt, Chávez, Maza, Herrera, Zúñiga, 2014).

Accordingly, the State developed the “Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural (LOEI), published in the Official Gazette No. 417 of March 31st, 2011. With this new educational law, the State aimed to promote an inclusive educational system, which is articulated with individual and collective necessities. President Correa stated that an early investment in Basic General and secondary education was one of the best ways a government could promote national development. He further stated that it was better to spend millions of dollars in early childhood education than the same amount of money in higher education (Correa, 2014).

The basic parameter in support of education was the Program for the Promotion of Educational Reform in Latin America and the Caribbean –PREAL. Accordingly, the
government committed to improving the allocation of resources in order to reach 6% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Vázquez, Betancourt, Chávez, Maza, Herrera, Zúñiga, 2014). This premise was based on the idea of making Ecuador the educational equivalent to Finland (Ministry of Education, 2014). According to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, between the years 1999 and 2012, the Ecuadorian State increased the investment in education from 1.5% to 4.2% of the GDP (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization Institute for Statistics, 2012).

The increase in social investment is evident, and it is based on several premises such as:

• People’s accessibility to free education, uniforms, and school texts. Before the educational reform, parents were required to make a contribution of 25.00 USD to cover additional staff, material, and maintenance costs. Since 2007, the Ministry of Education assumed this value as one of the programs that aims to eliminate barriers between children and schooling. Additionally, the Ministry of Education has also become responsible for giving uniforms to students from rural areas as well as school texts for all Basic General and secondary public schools.

• Accessibility to free breakfast and lunch for students of public Basic General schools that are located in marginal urban areas as well as rural areas with greater social vulnerability.

• The construction and improvement of schools and school buildings that aim to improve the situation of areas where people have limited access to education as well as to different teachers and modern technologies.
To enact these changes, the Ecuadorian government revamped its political administration by dividing it into 10 political zones, choosing not to focus solely on the four geographical regions that historically have defined the country. The nature of this subdivision is based on the ideal of decentralizing education by making it more accessible, inclusive, and equitable (Vázquez, Betancourt, Chávez, Maza, Herrera, Zúñiga, 2014). Accordingly, the Ministry of Education, as the highest educational authority, grouped the 24 Ecuadorian provinces into ten defined zones with their respective regional and district centers, as well as school governments that have their own systems of information. Considering the Ecuadorian ethnic diversity (Mestizos, Montubios, Indigenous, White, Afroecuadorian, Mulatos, Black, and other), the political zones involve a combination not only of provinces but also cultures and ethnicities.

Table 1 Administrative Planning Zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zones</th>
<th>Provinces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Esmeraldas, Carchi, Imbabura, Sucumbíos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pichincha, Napo, Orellana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cotopaxi, Tungurahua, Chimborazo, Pastaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Manabí, Santo Domingo de los Tsáchilas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bolívar, Guayas, Los Rios, Santa Helena, Galápagos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Azuay, Cañar, Morona Santiago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>El Oro, Loja, Zamora Chinchipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Guayaquil, Samborondón, Durán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Distrito Metropolitano de Quito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Non delimited zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the political zones include several provinces in the country (except for Zones 8, 9, and 10). Guayaquil, Samborondón, and Durán, from Zone 8, are three cities from the province of Guayas (included in Zone 5). On the other hand, the Distrito Metropolitano de Quito, the country’s capital, belongs to the province of Pichincha (included in Zone 2). Lastly, Zone 10 involves non delimited areas of the
country, which will be omitted from the population. The four above-mentioned cities constitute the economical and political centers of the country.

The current educational reform seems to promote a high quality and pertinent system of education that is sustained in values that align education with people’s daily lives. According to the Ecuadorian Constitution (2008), the State aims to foster the development of talents and individual skills in an effort to create a culturally sensitive society. The Article No. 343 of the Constitution establishes a national education system that promotes the development of individual and collective skills and capacities that enable the generation and use of new knowledge, techniques, arts, and culture (Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, 2008). Accordingly, the Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural (LOEI) establishes that the goals of education in Ecuador are focused on fostering a holistic, autonomous, sustainable, and independent education, which ensures individual and collective fulfillment under the politics of welfare.

Additionally, through Article No. 6, section (m), the LOEI determines that the Ecuadorian State will promote scientific, technological research and innovation, artistic creations, the practice of sports, the protection and preservation of cultural, natural, and environmental heritage, and cultural and linguistic diversity. In section (x) it establishes the State’s obligation to ensure that plans and programs for early childhood education, elementary, and high school, expressed in the curriculum will promote the development of skills and capacity to create knowledge and incorporate citizens in the world of work.

Within this context, Article No.19 of the same law states that an objective of the National Education Authority is to design and ensure the mandatory application of a
national curriculum, both in public institutions, municipal, private, and fiscomisionales.²

The curriculum design will always consider the vision of a multinational and intercultural State and will consider to be complemented in regards to cultural specificities and characteristics of each region, canton, or community of the various educational institutions that are part of the National Education System.

**Structure of Ecuadorian Basic General Schools**

The *Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural* (LOEI) describes schooling and education as a progressive and cumulative process that leads to a specific degree completion. This education responds to standards and curricula defined by the highest educational authority, the Ministry of Education, together with the National Plan of Education. This education provides citizens with development throughout several levels of education: Initial, Basic, and Baccalaureate. LOEI in Art. 27 determines three levels of general education: initial, basic, and baccalaureate, as depicted in Figure 2.

Figure 2 *Ecuadorian Educational System*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIAL EDUCATION</th>
<th>3 – 5 years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASIC GENERAL EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREPARATORY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ELEMENTARY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade: 5 years old</td>
<td>2nd, 3rd, and 4th grades: 6-8 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BACCALAUREATE/HIGH SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td>3 years for students 15 – 17 years old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² An institution that is equally sponsored by the government and a private entity
This structure of basic general education mirrors that of the United States system, from Kindergarten through to the 10th grade. The ages stipulated by the Ecuadorian regulations are those suggested for education at each level, however, students’ access to a grade or course by age should not be denied. In cases such as repetition of a school year, special educational needs, young people and adults with unfinished schooling, among others, students must be accepted, regardless of their age, in the corresponding grade or course.

**National Curriculum for Basic General Schools**

The current national curriculum is grounded upon two previous curricular reforms. The first curricular reform was in 1996 and it provided guidelines in regards to skills and content required for every school year. This reform also offered methodological recommendations for each area of study. However, it was perceived that the curriculum lacked a clear connection between content and skills as well as specific evaluation criteria. For this reason, the Ministry of Education led a reform process for both Basic General and secondary education, which updated and strengthened the curriculum.
Table 2 *Basic General school curriculum in 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and Literature</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Social Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new curriculum was approved in 2009 under Ministerial Agreement No. 0611-09 and was focused on eight core areas: (1) Language and Literature, (2) Mathematics, (3) Natural and Social Environment, (4) Science, (5) Social Studies, (6) Aesthetic Education, (7) Physical Education, and (8) Foreign Language. Additionally, the students were required to attend to extracurricular hours or “clubs” focused on music, arts, or sports.

This curriculum stated that the plan for Physical Education would take effect in 2012, while Aesthetic Education would maintain the requirements of the 1997 curriculum. Once the curriculum was implemented, working teams from the Center of National Curriculum and the Ministry of Education, visited different institutions in order to gather information about the teachers’ experiences in implementing the curriculum.
Furthermore, through a sample of teachers from diverse institutes throughout the country, the National Center of Educational Research collected data in order to examine the teachers’ perceptions of the curriculum. The researchers showed that the majority of teachers perceived the need of creating a more flexible curriculum, which can be adapted to the students’ sociocultural contexts and needs (Ministry of Education, 2016).

As result, The Ministry of Education along with Ecuadorian teachers, experts in different disciplines, and experts from universities nationally and internationally, revised the curriculum, compared it to curricula from different countries, and determined the scope of the new curricular adjustment. This adjustment was based on the perceptions of teachers with curricular and educational experience on six specific areas: (1) Language and Literature, (2) Mathematics, (3) Science, (4) Social Sciences, (5) Cultural and Artistic Education, and (6) Physical Education (Ministry of Education, 2016).

Researchers found that teachers in charge of the “clubs” had difficulties in implementing project-based methodologies since the subject itself was related to extra curricular activities and disconnected from the general curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2015). Consequently, in the revised version of the curriculum, “school projects” replaced “clubs.”

According to Article No. 2 of the Ministerial Agreement No. 2015-00055-A (2015), all “School Projects” must aim to achieve interdisciplinary products that respond to the students’ interests and that evidences the knowledge and skills that they acquired throughout the academic year. These projects will enable students to work creatively and collaboratively with the aim of disseminating their work at national or international educational events.
The revisions of the curriculum resulted in a reorganization of the Basic General school, which now consists of four sublevels of Basic General education: (1) Preparatory, (2) Elementary, (3) Middle, and (4) Superior. This new educational plan for Basic General schools establishes a curriculum with specific workloads and schedules for the different subject areas.

Table 3 *Preparatory curriculum 2016.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparatory Sublevel</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Weekly hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary curriculum that involves the 7 subject areas of the Elementary, Middle, and Superior sublevels</td>
<td>Cultural and Artistic Education</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural and Artistic Education</td>
<td>Cultural and Artistic Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublevels</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weekly hours per grade level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Literature</td>
<td>Language and Literature</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Artistic Education</td>
<td>Cultural and Artistic Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education**

The National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education is proposed as a set of guidelines that can be contextualized according to the diverse necessities of cultures and subcultures of the country. Contrary to prescribed curricula such as those from the national conservatories, the NCCAE offers flexible standards with an interdisciplinary perspective that aims to create environments in which students are able to articulate their learning experiences to their living experiences outside of school (Ministry of Education, 2016).
The NCCAE states that the aim of the curriculum is not to develop professional artists since there already exist institutions that focus on that objective. However, this curriculum does not discard the option of directing students with a clear artistic vocation into specialized studies if needed. Hence, the NCCAE promotes holistic opportunities in which students will be able to enjoy, appreciate, and understand the products of art and culture, as well as express themselves through diverse artistic and cultural languages.

The NCCAE maintains that the integration of arts in education has an overriding impact on the wellbeing, education, and economy of the Ecuadorian society. Under this perspective, the NCCAE focuses on a set of goals that will allow students to:

- Communicate ideas and emotions through the use of diverse artistic languages,
- Actively participate in the cultural and artistic life of an intercultural and multinational society,
- Develop critical and reflective thinking in relation to the different artistic productions, their genres, and cultures,
- Integrate contemporary cultural and artistic activities in their personal lives,
- Encourage the development of artistic creations that contribute to the national and international cultural heritage,
- Analyze, experiment, and investigate about different artistic languages, and
Develop a tolerant and resilient attitude, as well as emotional and personal skills that promote respect to the self, other people, and diversity (Ministry of Education, 2016).

The purpose of the current study was to determine the state of music education in the basic general public schools in Ecuador through the perspectives of those who are responsible for overseeing the implementation of the curriculum—school administrators. As the curricular leaders of their institutions, they were assumed to be aware of the classroom practices and policies regarding arts and music education, as well as the effects of those policies on the music curriculum. Furthermore, it was thought that they would provide honest responses regarding the state of music education in their respective schools.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are administrators’ perceptions of the current national policies in art education?
2. What are administrators’ perceptions of the current state of the music curriculum?
3. Is there a difference between administrators’ perceptions of current and ideal states?
4. What are administrators’ perceptions of the degree to which numerous variables impact their music curriculum?
5. What are the obstacles and challenges that administrators’ face in supporting the music curriculum?
6. Are there differences by political zone in the ways administrators implement policies and oversee arts education instruction in their schools?

Limitations of the Study

This study examined the state of music education in Ecuadorian Basic General public schools. Generalizations and implications of this study are limited to Ecuador and its Basic General public educational system. Although private institutions are also required to follow the national curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education, there are several variables that differentiate the implementation of the educational plan. Nonetheless, this study may provide information for private institutions or other educational systems that integrate arts and music in the mandatory school curriculum.

This study focused uniquely on administrators’ perceptions of music education in the Basic General school system of Ecuador. Although students’ and teachers’ perceptions would promote a deeper understanding of the current state of music education in the Basic General schools of Ecuador, those perceptions are beyond the scope of this study.

Definition of Terms

Administrator. Refers to a person in charge of managing elements related to staff, schedules, budget, and academic factors within the school. For the purposes of this study, administrator refers a school building employee charged with administrative duties that include overseeing curriculum and instruction.

Basic General Education. In Ecuador, the Basic General Education System comprises four levels of education: (1) Preparatory (5 years old), (2) Elementary (6-8
years old); (3) Middle (9-11 years old), and (4) Superior (12-15 years old). In Ecuador, there are 13,870 public institutions that offer Basic General Education.

**Music Education.** In this study, music education refers to music instruction provided at the Basic General Education System of public schools. This clarification is significant given the prevalence of specialized music education at the Ecuadorian national conservatories of music, which are also a part of the public school system in Ecuador.

**National Curriculum.** This refers to the official document from the Ministry of Education, which comprises content-descriptions, goals, objectives, and scope of the different subjects in the Basic General Education system in Ecuador.

**Organic Law of Intercultural Education (LOEI) [Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural].** This refers to the policy document regulating all areas of study in school education, which includes: Initial Education, Basic General Education, and High School.

**General Regulations to the Organic Law of Education [Reglamento General a la Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural].** This refers to a policy document regarding principles and regulations mandated by the law.

**National Curriculum for Culture and Artistic Education.** This refers to the official document from the Ministry of Education, which comprises content-descriptions, goals, objectives, extent, and scope of the Culture and Artistic subject. School music education in Ecuador falls in this broad subject.

**Administrative Zones.** This refers to the political division of the territory into sections that act as administrative centers. Each administrative zone comprises several educational districts and school governments involved in the country’s educational
management system. While being administrative centers, the Ministry of Education stays as the highest educative authority.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies on the state of music education in Ecuador are limited, thus this review of literature will focus on research studies and policy documents related to music instruction and curriculum in schools primarily, but not limited to, Latin America. Studies reviewed in this chapter were located using Google Scholar, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, SAGE Publications, and JSTOR. This chapter is divided into four main sections: (1) Impact of policy on music education programs, (2) Administrators’ perceptions of school music programs, and (3) Music education in hands of the classroom teacher.

Music educators understand and have advocated for the inclusion of music in public schools. Policy makers, administrators, school boards, and parents might also understand its importance but may not understand the implications of its inclusion in the curriculum, which might impact the role and effectiveness of music programs within the general curriculum.

According to Zandén and Thorgersen (2015), curricula are situated in a dynamic field of tension between varied societal demands and concrete teaching activities. In Ecuador a number of curricular reforms have been performed during the 20th and 21st century and have been the result of different political agendas as well as scientific and societal views.

Most countries have been through educational reform, which has influenced the status of the school music curriculum. New educational policies and national standards for education often determine administrators’ attitudes towards the different fields of education. There is a robust body of literature concerning administrators’ attitudes
towards arts or music education. Administrators’ decisions are often related to educational policies that control factors such as standards, evaluations, budget, schedules, among others. Although there are two small scale studies (Bustos, 2014; Montero, Gavilanes, & Cadena, 2014) focused on the nature of school music programs in Ecuador, this is the first to do so from the perspective of school administrators.

Alexandra Kertz-Welzel (2008) claims that questions about how to implement standards in schools or how to deal with educational policies are urgent issues with a global scope. She states that if the design of a curriculum or the transformation of teacher education programs are thought to be crucial, then there is no time for research on music education in ‘other’ countries. Thus, the first section will encompass studies related to educational policies and reforms and their influence on school music education. As this will be the first study of its type in Ecuador, I will review the influence of educational policy from an international perspective.

The second part of this review will focus on the organization and management of schools from a local viewpoint. This refers to administrators’ beliefs, attitudes, and decision making processes regarding music instruction in their institutions. Having an understanding of how administrators perceive the music curriculum of their schools is crucial given their role as leaders of their educational communities. The third part will review studies that characterize music education when the school classroom teachers are responsible for teaching it. Several researchers (Aicher, 2014; Bresler, 1993, 1994, 1995a, 1995b; Herbst, de Wet, & Rijsdijk, 2005; Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008) have examined the state and nature of the school music curriculum in the absence of a music specialist. These studies will be relevant to the current study given that the Ley Orgánica
*de Educación Intercultural* does not require the presence of a specialist and consequently, it can be assumed that several schools would impart arts and music education through the classroom teacher.

The last part of this review will focus on the school music curriculum when it is taught by music specialists. This section will focus on the nature of music classes as directed by specialists, their approaches, and factors that may impact the effectiveness of their classes.

**Impact of Policy on Music Education Programs**

Music educators and researchers have noted the impact of educational reform, its consequent policies, and especially those in the field of music, the administrators, the teachers, and the students (Abril & Gault, 2006, 2008; Abril & Bannerman, 2014; Aguilar & Richerme, 2014; Elpus, 2014; Gerrity, 2007; Kratochvil, 2009). Discussions surrounding educational reform have shown that the effects of policy change affect school administrators’ decisions and consequently the curriculum. This is particularly interesting in the field of music education, which traditionally has depended on advocacy movements to justify its existence in the general school curriculum.

The impact of curricular reform in music has been different in each country, and it relies on the importance that policy makers give to the subject within the general curriculum. Studies in England, the United States, and Hong Kong have shown that instruction, curriculum, and evaluation change rapidly when there are strong external pressures such as economic incentives, inspections, school choice, and the publication of the schools’ and students’ achievements (Alexander, 2011; Fautley, 2013; Fork, Kennedy & Chan, 2010; Ozga, 2009; Ravitch, 2010). Zandén and Thorgensen (2015) reported that
a new curricular reform initiative in Sweden included a new grading system that affected the nature of the school music curriculum. They also found that music teachers perceived the new curriculum to demand much more individual work than syllabi from older curricular reforms. Accordingly, they concluded that teachers seemed to be engaged in the implementation work to a high degree and saw the curriculum as a doorway to possibilities when it came to new and old ways of teaching and promoting musical learning. Despite the positive effects of the new curriculum on some aspects of music teaching, teachers also contended that in order to achieve the stated curricular goals, strong interdisciplinary work would be necessary. However, this aspect would be challenging because there is limited contact time and resources, which can make it difficult to give the students the continuity that they need to improve their musical skills and to experience progression in their work (Zandén & Thorgensen, 2015).

Hebert and Heimonen (2013) claim that the problem of time and support for music in Finland is closely connected to economic cosmopolitanism, which represents a global question of how strongly market-based aims influence educational politics in the arts. Hence, it has become challenging for advocates to justify music education in an era of global corporations and educational policies that aim to accommodate a global market (Hebert & Heimonen, 2013).

One of the concerns of music teachers in Finland has been that there is insufficient time allocated to music instruction. The limits of time have made the aims in the written curriculum sound ideal but unrealistic (Hebert & Heimonen, 2013).

Historically, governmental leaders and the societies in general have associated their country’s development to the level of education that it offers. Globalization, and
more specifically, economic globalization has influenced policymakers and administrators’ decisions around educational legislations. As Hebert and Heimonen (2013) point out, this cosmopolitanism leaves music and other “complementary” areas at risk and dependent on core areas such as sciences. Time allocation for music has been a topic of debate even when music is one of the core subjects of the public school curriculum.

Policy makers, however, have discussed the nature of education in Finland and have taken it as a role model for improving and modernizing their own educational processes. According to Sahlberg (2009), the Finnish curriculum reform has made schools a place where play and learning are combined with alternative pedagogical approaches to help children master basic academic knowledge and skills. Unlike many other education systems, test-based accountability and externally determined learning standards have not been part of Finnish education policies. In Finland, it is the responsibility of politicians to make decisions about school loads per subject, which also includes arts and music education. Thus, despite some people debating the support given to music teachers and pedagogues, educational policies in Finland focus on health, social, and emotional welfare as part of a good life, an approach that is considered to also apply to artistic activities. Within such system, the state ensures equal educational opportunities for every student, which also includes general music education (Hebert & Heimonen, 2012).

It is important, then, to note that time allocation for music has not only been discussed from the perspective of the amount of music time within the curriculum but also from how and in what ways it is included, propagated, and treated through
educational reforms. These actions can surely be beneficial or detrimental, depending on the conditions in which music is included in the curricular plans. Moreover, academics around the world have determined that the inclusion of music in the curriculum is only one step among many other actions. Because reforms imply change, they cannot be treated as absolutes but as evolving processes subject to more changes that respond to the necessities of society. That was the case of the Finnish Ministry of Education, which in June 2012, declared that arts subjects, music included, will be allocated more lesson hours in schools, whereas hours for lessons in religion were diminished (Hebert & Heimonen, 2013). In this new curriculum, music is seen as part of cultural education and as such, it aims to get students to understand that music can have different meanings and uses given its connection to both time and place. Consequently, policy makers foster the connection of music not only to school experiences, but also to daily life experiences outside school (Hebert & Heimonen, 2013).

Liane Hentschke (2013) examined educational reforms in Brazil. She reported on a national policy of 2008 that made music instruction compulsory in all basic education (from kindergarten to the end of secondary school). This change was the result of advocacy movements led by the Brazilian Association of Music Education, individual artists, music educators, professional music associations, and the International Society for Music Education. During this process, policymakers expressed concerns about making music compulsory because there was insufficient time in the school schedule to include a new compulsory subject. Moreover, they believed that if music was made compulsory, they would have to make other arts compulsory as well. Eventually, advocacy movements were effective and music was included in the curriculum. However, as
Hentschke points out, radical changes in education, especially in the case of the inclusion of music in the curriculum, are complex processes that can take several years to develop effectively. She argues that countries without music education requirements should “stage a national campaign to have music education put back into the schools and then work out effective ways to implement it” (p.122).

Eric Branscome (2012) studied patterns of development in education and music education through a comparison of educational legislation and documents from the field of music education that resulted from educational reforms in the United States of America. He identified trends that indicated a reaction or response among the music education community to economic, societal, or educational needs. He also determined that since 1983, educational reforms resulted in consistent patterns related to economical and developmental problems in the United States, which have caused political leaders to propose solutions based on educational changes that have eventually resulted in reforms in music education.

Researchers and music educators have gathered throughout history at venues such as the Yale Seminar, which led to the development of the *Juilliard Music Repertoire Project* (1994), and the Tanglewood Symposium, which focused on creating guidelines that would delineate the role of music in schools. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, the National Commission on Excellence in Education presented the report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform*, which led to the 1991 document *Growing Up Complete: The Imperative for Music Education*. Throughout this last document, music educators expressed their desire to embrace music as a core curricular subject by arguing
that music’s aesthetic qualities promote the development of areas that the five basics cannot.

Lehman (1993) wrote about the Goals 2000 U.S. legislation and its potential positive effects on music education. He argued that with the inclusion of music in the core curriculum and the creation of the National Standards, music would stop being marginalized in the curriculum and would secure a firm position on the schools. By 2000, leaders in U.S. music education gathered at the Florida State University for the Housewright Symposium. During the symposium, representatives created the Housewright Declaration (NAfME, 2000), which stated the necessity for maintaining the integrity of music education for its own sake and to emphasize the notion that music classes deserve allocated times for instruction.

Time allocation for music education, however, has been particularly problematic given the political emphasis on accountability systems that rely on specific areas such as language and mathematics. This is the case in the United States of America, where as a result of policies such as No Child Left Behind, officials have reduced music time or even eliminated music positions in order to ensure funds for reading and mathematics (Gerrity, 2007). The increased focus on the “tested” subjects has provoked a decrease of attention on “non-tested” subjects such as music, arts, social studies, and foreign language (von Zastrow & Janc, 2004). Since NCLB did not include the arts in the tested areas, schools and districts, fearful of a decrease in funding or other type of sanctions, have focused their attention almost exclusively on reading and mathematics. Several researchers have investigated the impact of the legislation on music education in schools and administrators, curriculum and instruction (Abril & Gault, 2006, 2008; Gerrity, 2007;
Spohn, 2008; West, 2012), and on music enrollments (Elpus, 2014). Paula Adams (2005) claims that the overemphasis on data and state tests in the United States has led administrators and teachers to narrow the curriculum to focus on tested subjects and, as a consequence, non-tested areas such as music have been affected because contact time with the music teacher is decreased or even eliminated.

Lum and Dairianathan (2014) examined the policies and philosophies behind music education in Singapore. The authors claim that a significant part of the discourse surrounding national education in Singapore is tied to “an ideal Singaporean that transcends the respective ethnic cultures that constitute the population” (p. 279). The main concern is to unite its ethnically diverse population and the construction of an overarching national identity based on the ideology of multiculturalism. Accordingly, the Minister of Education has contended that arts education, especially music and visual art, are key areas of focus in pursuing the goal of holistic education of a primary school child. The national educational policies focus on strengthening the quality of art, music, and physical education as these subjects enable students to develop physical robustness, enhance their creative and expressive capacities, as well as shape their personal, cultural, and social identity (Lum & Dairianathan, 2014).

In the Singapore education system, music is a compulsory subject within the Basic General and lower secondary schools, with at least half to an hour a week devoted to music lessons within curriculum time. These music lessons are taught by music specialists in the Basic General schools. Many schools were reported to have extracurricular bands, choirs, orchestras, and a wide-range of music clubs and ensembles for students to participate in, taught by external music instructors.
Despite this holistic approach to music instruction, analyses of the state of music education in Singapore concluded that institutions and policy makers should strive for enhancing the quality of music instruction through optimal deployment of qualified teachers and the provision of funds, resources, and equipment for music-based activities in schools, which leads to another policy factor impacting music education and that have to do with resources, budget, and professional trainings required in order to have effective music programs.

Edgar Cajas (2007) conducted a mixed-method examination of the state of music education in three countries of Central America: Guatemala, Honduras, and Costa Rica. His purpose was to determine the role of music education in the general curriculum of the public school system of each country as well as thoroughly analyze the situation of the subject in terms of the number of music teachers, ratio of music teacher/students, time allotments and scheduling, facilities, and instructional materials. After interviewing policymakers, administrators, teachers, and music teachers, he found that Guatemala had an educational deficit illustrated by a very low number of music specialists teaching at public schools in the country, which meant that only a small fraction of the population had access to music education. Although the Guatemalan government had included music in the curriculum as part of a broad area of arts education, teachers felt that there was not a specific curriculum for music and, moreover, music teachers were not expected to teach music. Cajas stated that although there is a music curriculum that was written in 1970, few music teachers were familiar with it or used it. This lack of familiarity with the curriculum was perceived to be the result of the lack of or inadequate teacher training. From a sample of 104 teachers, 50% indicated that they had attended workshops and
In the case of Honduras, Cajas (2007) indicated that there was a small place for music in the curriculum and that classroom teachers were responsible for providing instruction. Teachers and administrators claimed that there was a lack of human and material resources as well as a specific budget for music instruction, which was considered an activity for school functions such as patriotic holidays or special days such as Mother’s and Father’s Days. Another factor negatively affecting music instruction in Honduras was the lack of teachers specialized in music education.

Participants of the study indicated that graduates from schools of music and conservatories of music were in charge of music education at the elementary and secondary levels. They were hired even though they are not trained as educators. Furthermore, participants critiqued the governmental position around this issue since there was a perceived lack of interest in improving the situation by creating more music teaching positions, motivating more interest in music education, and offering training and development in music education. Cajas (2007) surveyed a small population of music teachers ($N = 20$), from which 35% had attended workshops and conferences. Ten percent had been sponsored by the Honduran Ministry of Education and the rest by private organizations and music teacher associations. Cajas concluded that although music has been incorporated as a component in the new national curriculum, the lack of music specialists and the limited training in music offered to classroom teachers meant
that music education remained unavailable to the majority of the student population at the elementary level.

The situation of music education in Costa Rica differed from the situation in Guatemala and Honduras in that music had been compulsory for 120 years, which makes Costa Rica the country with the oldest music education system in Central America. Cajas (2007) reported that there was a national curriculum for music with five areas: voice, bodily expression, music appreciation, sight-reading, and applied music. Interviewees from Costa Rica indicated that beside content, the Costa Rican music curriculum contains a section on attitudes and values, and an evaluation component. One of the participants said “this is a parallel subject in the current curriculum. That means that musical activities should guide the child to be more tolerant, respectful, and able to work in a team. Music also emphasizes an integrated education that includes moral, social, and cultural values” (p. 105).

Cajas reported that although music is compulsory and students are required to have two 40-minute periods of music every week, budget and teacher training were major obstacles. Participants critiqued the quality of teacher training by stating that there are not enough courses in music education and that the majority of education subjects were taught by the Faculty of Education with no background in music. However, from 240 music teacher surveyed, 60% indicated that they had attended workshops and conferences, of which a considerable percentage (43%) were sponsored by the Costa Rican Ministry of Education and the rest by private organizations and music teacher associations.
Cajas’ (2007) findings relate to Rubén Flores’ findings. According to Flores (as cited in Cajas, 2007), Guatemalan music education has been negatively impacted by a lack of professional training in music for music teachers. Accordingly, he stated that the majority of graduates in music are performers with insufficient teaching skills. These musicians are sometimes hired to teach in private schools with low salaries, which in short and long term results in inadequate music education. Additionally, he found that with some exceptions, music teachers had limited pedagogical resources and knowledge of approaches, methodologies, and evaluation techniques in music.

Another study conducted by Carlos Abril and Julie Bannerman (2014) examined the effect of several factors in elementary school music programs. The authors surveyed school music teachers in order to determine the challenges they face in delivering the music curriculum. This study adopted a socioecological framework that helped determine the level to which these factors affect the music program. Results indicated that teachers perceived their programs and positions were impacted most greatly by factors at the micro level. Micro-level actors are people with whom music teachers have personal, regular contact, including school administration, parents, and other teachers within the school. Micro-level factors, such as scheduling, school facilities, and instructional time, were also deemed as having substantial impact and were closely intertwined with qualitative comments about school administrators and other teachers. Teachers considered themselves the most influential individual or group positively affecting the music program, which also aligns with principals’ perceptions (Abril & Gault, 2006, 2008). Between the meso- and macro-levels, teachers believed district administrators had a positive impact. Describing activities at district-wide interactions, general music
teachers mentioned receiving curricular and instructional support from interacting with their music colleagues within the district. Some teachers reported that these meetings provided professional developments, opportunities for curricular alignment, and supported district-wide communication and coordination in districts both with and without arts/music supervisors

**Administrators’ Perceptions**

Several studies have attempted to determine the attitudes of administrators towards music programs in their schools since music teachers normally depend on administrators in order to support their music curricula and programs. In countries going through educational reform, the thoughts and knowledge of school administrators are informative since they are confronted with a series of decisions that might affect music curricula and instruction and, consequently, the overall state of their institutions.

One of the first studies that examined the beliefs of principals, music teachers, and professors of music education was conducted in Ohio (Jones, 1961). He conducted this study during an era in which sciences and mathematics were the main focus of attention in education. As a result of international competitiveness, the government sought to fill a technology and scientific gap that put the United States behind the Soviet Union when this country launched *Sputnik*. From a sample of 143 principals, 274 music teachers, and 35 college professors, Jones found out that 70.6%, 62%, and 46%, respectively, thought that although music is important for students, it should be considered an elective subject, at the same level as trigonometry, physics, advanced chemistry, and foreign language. This same study revealed that only a small percentage (9%) of secondary school principals offered music instruction in their schools.
Fields (1982) conducted a study that examined the relationships between budget limitations, school community support school policy, school student-to-teacher ratio, and the reduction or elimination of instrumental music in public elementary schools in San Mateo County, California. Results of this study showed that administrators were concerned about budget limitations, which particularly affected special programs like instrumental music. Fields found significant relationships between administrators’ attitudes and the instrumental program, particularly in terms of time constraint in favor of core subject areas.

Educational reforms and the consequent educational policies focused on mathematics and sciences have led administrators allocate specific times and budget for core and non-core subject areas. Additional time has been thought of as a remediation for low achieving students. Students have been pulled out from classes such as music, art, foreign language, or physical education to accommodate intervention for reading and math. Research has generally supported the notion that increased instructional time positively affects learning (Hossler, Stage, & Gallagher, 1988). However, policymakers should not expect large gains to result from increasing the amount of instructional time in the school day/year as the relationship between time and learning is not strong.

McDill, Natriello, and Pallas (1985) were concerned about the ways increased school time and homework might interfere with students’ extracurricular activities by intensifying dropout rates in special areas. Educators have also feared that by increasing school time and requirements on at-risk students that have jobs, they would feel pressured to choose between school and work. Although some researchers (Wiley & Hamischfeger, 1974; Hanson & Schutz, 1975; Karweit, 1976; Fredrick & Walberg, 1980) have showed
that more days in school did significantly increase comprehension, mathematics, and verbal skills, it has been also found that an unintentional outcome of a high-demand classroom is that some low-achieving students do not work as hard as they might because they are more likely to feel lost or left behind (Dornbusch, 1984). Instead, low-achieving students must be provided with additional direct help if they are to succeed in more demanding classrooms (Hossler, Stage, & Gallagher, 1988), which might imply that educational reforms should be more concerned about instructional quality than on time or homework increase.

Greenwood’s (1991) survey of 431 principals’ opinions of music education and bands in the public school curriculum revealed that administrators considered that music programs and bands should be responsible for accomplishing both musical and non-musical goals. Among the highest rated non-musical goals were: teaching cooperation (96%), encouraging students to be more disciplined (95%), transmitting national heritage to succeeding generations (83%), promoting good public relations (91%), and school spirit (83%). Greenwood concluded that principals evaluated bands based on the students’ musicianship and on having realistic expectations for the music program.

In 1994, the era of standards-based education, Monroe found out that although principals believed that music was valuable for students, it should be an elective since music is too specialized to be part of the school curriculum. In the Goals 2000 legislation put forth by President Clinton’s administration, every state was the locus of standards and assessment. According to the legislation, throughout standards, the federal government was holding states accountable for educational policies that were once controlled by each state. Several studies (Hanley, 1987; Payne, 1990; Greenwood, 1991; Milford, 1995)
have examined the perceptions of principals and administrators about the role of music, the degree of students’ exposure to music education within the general curriculum, and the implementation of curricular values in music education practice. Overall, these studies indicated that while most of the administrators supported the idea of having music in their schools, their goals and objectives were dissimilar to those of music teachers.

Scholars in the field of music education have contended that standards-based education has focused almost obsessively on core curriculum subjects. They perceive that although music education and the arts have been recognized as being of value, the place of these subjects in the curriculum has not been prioritized (Plummeridge, 2001). With the No Child Left Behind Act, the federal government aimed to raise educational standards, specifically on reading and mathematics. Accountability systems have been focused on assessment programs designed to measure students’ achievement of specific curricular standards. High-stakes testing has consistently been considered as an instrument to change classroom practices and improve curriculum and education. According to Madaus (cited in Au, 2007), tests are high-stakes when they have an impact on decisions that affect districts, administrators, teachers, students, and the community. Research has shown that policies that include high-stakes testing, such as the No Child Left Behind Act, were perceived by administrators to have a detrimental impact on music and arts programs in elementary and secondary schools because of the overemphasis that federal policies and accountability systems put on reading, mathematics, and sciences (Abril & Gault, 2006, 2008; Gerrity, 2007).

Abril and Gault (2006) reported that elementary public school principals were generally satisfied with their music programs and their capability to meet music
education standards and wide educational goals. However, significant differences between the current and ideal situations suggested possibility of progress and improvement. Throughout a national survey, the authors reported that from the principals stated that: (1) The No Child Left Behind Act (45.1%); (2) financial/budget constraints (55.2%); (3) scheduling issues (40.1%); and (4) standardized testing (34.4%) had a negative effect in music programs.

Although principals have shown positive attitudes towards music programs, a study conducted by the Music for All Foundation (2004) showed that student participation and the number of music teachers in school declined dramatically since 1999. The authors of this study attribute this decline to the NCLB Act’s emphasis on testing the limited areas of reading, mathematics, and science, as well as budget restrictions. According to the National Center on Educational Policy, NCLB policies have had a positive effect on students in the United States (Rentner, Chudowsky, Fagan, Gayler, Hamilton, & Kober, 2003). However, it was not until 2005 (Rentner, et al., 2005) that the Center on Educational Policy reported a negative effect of the legislation on music education. In this report, researchers showed that 23% of the districts reduced instructional time for arts and music "minimally," while 11% of the districts report their reductions as "somewhat," whereas 9% of the districts reduced art and music "to a great extent." By 2006, Rentner et al. continued to cite the narrowing of the public school curriculum. In this year, however, 46% of schools lessened instructional time for art and music, indicating a 3% increase over the previous year, 24% minimally, 13% somewhat, and 9% to a great extent.
Kevin Gerrity (2007) examined the effect of NCLB on the Ohio public schools. He reported that although research has shown certain increased achievement in areas like reading and mathematics, the legislation has had a punitive effect towards music education and the arts. This study shows that overall, a great majority of principals believed that music education was important in the education of their children. Thirty-seven percent of principals believed that music was a vital part of every child’s education.

When considering systems of accountability, 79% of the principals acknowledged that they did not track the students’ achievement in music and most of them were not aware of the *Opportunity-to-Learn Standards for Music Instruction* published by the National Association for Music Education. Overall, principals consistently considered music to be the least important subject in the general education of students with 71% of the respondents assigning music and the arts the lowest ranking as compared to other core subjects recognized by *No Child Left Behind*.

Although there was a low reduction in the number of music teachers working in their schools and a slight increase in instrumental music programs, principals reported that general music courses were most often eliminated. Principals contend that since music is not part of the testing subjects, it has become less important. With the schools’ emphasis on the legislation’s mandates, increasing resources have been directed to tested areas, which resulted in cuts for arts education. Accordingly, Abril and Gault (2008) reported that No Child Left Behind has provoked a significant decrease of music course offerings, student involvement, and the number of music teachers. Secondary public school principals believed that these declines were the result of limited budgets and
increased attention to tested subjects. Respondents also perceived that standardized tests in other core areas have led to a limited number of course offerings, which often depended on each school’s socioeconomic status profile (Elpus & Abril, 2011; Miksza & Gault, 2014).

A study of principals and teachers in Michigan has shown that music teachers perceive decreasing support for their subject if the school fails to meet AYP (Spohn, 2008; West, 2012). One of the teachers believed that before the school’s failure, his music class was more important and was considered to be a class along with other subject areas. Many music teachers believed that the increased focus on mathematics and reading has produced not only a decrease in music time but also scheduling problems for low-achieving students who want to take music classes. Some administrators contend that if more time for music is needed, then they would need to accommodate everything after school (Spohn, 2008). The issue with this perspective, however, lies with the amount of time that students spend preparing themselves for general testing.

Although the arts have been included in the U.S. curriculum since both the Goals 2000 and NCLB Acts were approved and put into law, research has reported significant budgetary reductions and funding for music programs (Chapman, 2004; Heffner, 2007). According to Heffner (2007), music programs have been fundamentally linked to the lack of inclusion on testing.

In another study on the perceived importance of music education within a K-12 educational community, Ciorba and Seibert (2012) found that music educators’ overall perceptions toward music education were significantly higher than those indicated by administrators, teachers of other subject areas, and support staff. Non-music educators
and administrators seemed to disagree with the music teachers on the impact of four factors in music education: (1) standardized testing, (2) music’s importance in relation to reading and math, (3) music’s role in the core curriculum, and (4) the influence music had on people’s development. Participants were also asked to describe the ways they would improve music education in their schools. The most frequent response was to increase funding. These findings corroborate findings from other studies (Abril & Gault, 2006, 2008; Gerrity, 2009) that show funding as one of the biggest challenges administrators face in supporting a music curriculum.

Ciorba and Seibert (2012) also found that although budgetary issues were the number one response from administrators, music educators, and support staff, non-music teachers had suggestions for improvements in curriculum and scheduling. These participants believed that time allocation for music instruction should be increased even though schools have been immersed in a culture of standardized testing, which impacts the contact time between music teachers and students. It was also perceived that music programs would benefit from a continuous curriculum integration, which shows an important evolution from previous studies (Payne, 1990; Lorde, 1993) that indicated that music educators were the only population stating the practicality of music and its affect on learning other subjects.

Music should have a secure place in the curriculum given administrators’ perceptions of music education. Fields (1982) reported that administrators' opinions and values play a crucial role in keeping or cutting music programs. Major's study (2013) partially supports this assumption and states that valuing music education is not enough to ensure its place in the curriculum, especially when schools face budgetary limitations.
When accountability measures are strict and educational standardization is accompanied by limited budgets and fewer funds, subjects such as math and reading receive more funding and instructional time in public schools, whereas nonacademic subjects like music, face reductions or elimination in budgets, programs, and staffing. Martineza (2015) concluded that school administrators that value music education would find paths in order to keep music in the curriculum. This perspective was based on the belief that music instruction gives opportunities for self-expression and creativity. This conclusion aligns with prior research with administrators (Abril and Gault, 2006; Beveridge, 2010; Penning, 2008; and Thomas, 2014).

Bowe (2014) investigated the current provision of music education in Irish schools as reported by school principals. She determined three types of principals: (1) Progressives (managing schools with exemplary music programs); (2) Maintainers (struggling to develop music in their schools); and (3) Disinclined, unwilling, or unable to implement music in their schools. The great majority of principals surveyed for this study expressed positive attitudes towards music education and its place in the school curriculum. Eighty-seven percent of the principals surveyed for this study agreed or strongly agreed that schools have a responsibility to provide diverse music-making experiences to students, while 93% indicated that music should have the same significance as other subjects in the school curriculum. Moreover, 95% of principals do not believe that music could negatively affect the students’ academic progress. A lower, but still high percentage of principals (77%) agreed with the fact that music-making opportunities should take place in the school, while 83% indicated that practical music-making experiences should be taught only during school hours.
Principals also provided a list of perceived benefits of offering music in the school, which were coded and categorized by the researcher (Bowe, 2014). Accordingly, the principals believed that music education: (1) Provides a well-rounded education (37%), (2) Contributes to social/personal emotional development (32%), (3) Enhances creative expression (32%), (4) Builds and contributes to cultural identity of student and school (26%), and (5) Contributes to cognitive/academic development (11%).

Bowe stated that although school principals seemed to be appreciative of music instruction in the school curriculum, not all of them were willing to take action in regards to its implementation and the improvement of its conditions. She further concluded that regardless of the educational policies, if administrators believe in music education and act upon it, they will find creative ways to support their music programs.

**Music Education in the Hands of the Classroom Teacher**

Many education systems around the world rely only on general teachers (i.e., classroom teachers) to teach music and other arts in primary schools. According to Wiggins and Wiggins (2008), during the late 1980s, the idea of generalist teachers teaching music was supported under the suggestion that just as music should be for all children, it also should be for all teachers. However, a study (Barnes & Shinn-Taylor, 1988) showed that generalist teachers felt uncomfortable and wanted to be relieved of the responsibility for teaching music.

It is quite common to find systems of education in which music instruction is the responsibility of the classroom teacher. Research has shown that this happens primarily because educational policies do not always require a music specialist to be in charge of music instruction or because they have funding limitations. Moreover, many countries
have integrated music in the curriculum by including it in a broad area of arts education, which in many cases has been detrimental for music instruction, especially if policymakers and upper administration leaders do not delineate a plan focused on the training and development of those who would be in charge of music education in the school system.

Classroom teachers that are required to teach music and other arts to specific levels require specific skills and knowledge. In a recent study about aesthetic education in one minor city in Ecuador, Montero, Gavilanes, & Cadena (2014), showed that from a sample of 236 teachers, only 16% were trained to teach aesthetic education and 52% were aware of the amount of time they had to teach this subject each week. This situation showed a clear disconnection between the school administration and the upper administration system, which in consequence, limits the actions of teachers and lowers the quality of music instruction.

There is little information about generalists’ perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, and competences to teach music in primary schools in Ecuador. Wiggins and Wiggins (2008) emphasize that if music or other arts are taught by non-specialists, it “would be good to know whether these teachers are up to the task because the place of music instruction in primary schools often reflects its marginalized status in the broader frame of educational policy and the teaching done by generalists may contribute to music remaining ‘on the fringe’” (Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008, p. 2).

There are a number of studies that focus on the preparation generalists receive (DeGraffenrenreid & Kretchmer, 2002, as cited in Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008; Gauthier & McCrary, 1999; Herbst, de Wet, & Rijsdijk, 2005, as cited in Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008)
and on the implications and characteristics of a music class taught by non-specialists (Bresler, 1993; Holden & Burton, 2006; Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008; Aicher, 2014).

Primary school teachers who teach music have the power of delivering music content that they think is appropriate for their students (Aicher, 2014). There are three main ways in which teachers implement the music curriculum: (1) as an individual subject, (2) integrated into a broad “arts” curriculum, or (3) from an interdisciplinary approach, in which they integrate musical knowledge into other curricular subjects such as math or history. Considering that most school systems count on a music curriculum or an arts curriculum that integrates music education, it is important to know in what ways classroom teachers deliver musical content (Aicher, 2014).

Liora Bresler (1993) examined the instruction of music by elementary (nonspecialist) classroom teachers, its explicit and implicit messages, and the role of music within the school. This three-year ethnography took place in three schools from Chicago, Washington, and Danville, Illinois. These schools were selected due to their variety of demographics. Bresler spent 120 hours in Danville and 120 hours in Chicago during a full school year for data collection, which was mainly based on observations.

Data included transcribed interviews, district guidelines for music curricula, music textbooks, and resource books for songs. She observed classroom teaching, school programs, and performances. The examined contexts included teachers’ background and expertise, financial resources and school and community values. The findings of the study revealed that in spite of district and state curricular expectations, music instruction was scant. When music was present, it was delegated to the role of a vehicle for other
ends: (a) to illustrate a subject matter, (b) to change pace, and (c) to provide a background activity; rather than cherished for its intrinsic aesthetic/cognitive value.

Barriers to an improved music curriculum include teachers’ lack of knowledge, resources, and appropriate structures, which in an overall climate of pressure for academics. According to Bresler (1993), this pressure placed music in a double-bind: on the one hand, music is not valued for its own sake, and on the other hand, it ends up marginalized and considered a mere source of entertainment. Most teachers did not feel comfortable teaching music due to their lack of background, which led to the elimination of music from the curriculum.

In a next study, Bresler (1995a) differentiated the functional complementary and expansive curricular orientation of music. She concluded that music education in schools was provided primarily to support the development of nonmusical factors related to social matters and other academic areas. Subsequently, in another study (1995b), Bresler identified four ways in which classroom teachers integrated arts into the academic curriculum. These styles were: (1) subservient, (2) conequal cognitive, (3) affective, and (4) social integration. Music’s subservient role in the curriculum referred to teachers using music to teach academic content of other subjects, such as singing a song to memorize the numbers or the alphabet. Most teachers in her study fell into this category given that little expertise in music was necessary.

Some teachers used music as a way of regulation of emotions and mood, which allowed the students to be creative or for relaxation while they switched activities. Teachers in this category showed interest in the integration of music into the classroom
activities. However, this interest was somehow affected when teachers felt that they did not have enough expertise or preparation for the delivery of specific musical material.

When teachers used a social integration style, music was primarily used to enhance community activities within the school. On the other hand, the coequal style, referred to the integration of music into the curriculum “in ways that draw and build on the characteristics of art, requiring classroom teachers to provide direction and guidance that often transcend their visions and current abilities” (Bresler, 1995b, p. 36). Since this involves the mastering of a set of specific skills, this teaching style was the least common in schools.

Based on Bresler’s study (1993), Wiggins and Wiggins (2008) conducted a study of primary music teaching in a national system that relies almost entirely on generalist teachers to teach music at the primary level. They found that the nature of the availability of music instruction at those institutions was serendipitous and highly impacted by geographical location and availability of qualified teachers. While the majority of teachers self-identified as non-music specialists, a small percentage of teachers qualified themselves as generalists and music specialists since they have had studied music outside the school system, played on or more instruments, and were musical leaders in the community, working as private teachers or church musicians. They also found what they called “hidden specialists,” who were generalist teachers or principals who had a clear orientation towards teaching music and some type of prior musical experience, which made them feel the “likely people to teach music in their schools” (p. 10). The researchers noticed through conversations with administrators and teachers, that
sometimes the excitement for music was grounded in the cultural background of the teachers since the population came from an indigenous culture.

Sixty-one percent of the participants in the study indicated they had access to a regional music advisor that was employed by the government, but only 11% of those teachers reported having worked with the advisor as often as once a year, which can be considered scarce. The lack of teacher training was also observed in the small amount of time designated for arts education. This meant that when students entered teacher education programs with the limited background knowledge or prior experience.

Wiggins and Wiggins (2008) offered descriptions of three core issues that affected the nature and quality of the music instruction in the schools they observed and surveyed. The first one was the teachers’ misguided visions of what it means to be a musician, to teach music, and to learn music. The majority of teachers expressed that the music experiences they delivered in the classrooms were influenced by the musical experiences they had as children in schools. Additionally, they indicated that the majority of experiences were singing-based due to their lack of knowledge of music teaching.

The second issue was a lack of aural and contextual frameworks during music instruction. Through their observations, the researchers noticed that many teachers would teach rhythms by only chanting/counting the beats instead of contextualizing them with musical activities. It was perceived that the students were being taught symbols without any meaningful context. Some teachers expressed that these actions were the result of a lack of musical, theoretical, and pedagogical knowledge among the teachers in charge of music instruction, which leads to the last issue of concern.
The last issue was the teachers’ lack of knowledge of the subject. Most of the participants in this study openly expressed that they did not feel qualified to teach music. According to the researchers, some principals and university instructors considered that teachers were hesitant and not confident about teaching music. However, the observations performed during the study revealed that “their hesitance and resultant lack of confidence were truly well founded” (p. 18).

A survey profiling the state of music education in Austria (Aicher, 2014) revealed that from a sample of 652 teachers, 87.6% were responsible of teaching music and only 16% of those teachers attended music classes during their teacher education. It was also revealed that any teacher with some level of musical experience was required to teach music, which was perceived by Aicher as a lack of interest from the institutions in hiring a music specialist. One of the most relevant findings of this study was the teachers’ self-perception of their competency in teaching music as compared to their self-perceptions of their competency in other subjects. This perceived competence in music teaching relied on their competency in playing classroom instruments and singing. Aicher states that this competence in music teaching predicted if teachers were responsible for teaching music, as those with higher self-rated competence ratings in music were more likely to teach music. Aicher (2014) states that those teachers responsible for teaching music indicated they enjoyed doing so. However, the majority (57%) was uncomfortable and did not want to take that responsibility. Moreover, they expressed a desire to “hand over music teaching to colleagues or music specialists” (p. 160). Teachers perceived that their education and professional development had prepared them slightly above the average.
Herbst et al. (2005), studied the nature of music teaching in elementary schools in Cape Peninsula, South Africa. After a reform of the national curriculum, classroom teachers were required to integrate music into the teaching of other disciplines. The authors of this study concluded that most teachers felt that they lacked qualifications for teaching music given that they had little or no music training. Hebst et al. (2005) used a survey approach in order to identify issues that general teachers had in implementing music in their curricula. The authors concluded that 75% of the classroom teachers expressed that they had to teach music given the limited availability of music specialists. The classroom teachers also mentioned that the music subject fell into the category of arts and culture, in which singing was the main activity. Although the national curriculum in South Africa expected general teachers to teach the full content of the arts and culture learning areas, most of the teachers were not able to provide music instruction beyond singing.

These results align with what Wiggins and Wiggins (2008) found through an examination of general classroom teachers. Through interviews, questionnaires, and observations, they found that only 20% of the teachers felt confident teaching music and less than 50% reported they were at least fairly confident. The authors contended that in general, the music instruction provided by general classroom teachers was mostly shaped by their own prior experiences as primary school students.

**Summary of the Chapter**

The studies presented in this chapter were a combination of self-reported survey responses and qualitative observations and interviews of principals, music teachers, and general teachers that are in charge of music education in some way. Although the present
study consisted of a self-administered online survey, it was essential to ground it in discussions and qualitative descriptions about the practices of primary school music education.

The first section of this review of literature focused on the impact of educational policies and reforms in music education programs. Educational policies are designed to improve educational quality and learning outcomes, and to create educational opportunities that have a positive effect on the nation’s development. President Obama stated that reforms in education happen when policymakers modify weaknesses from previous reforms (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Education policies are typically focused on general education, yet music educators, scholars, and researchers, should stay abreast of trends and the possible effects of general policies on music education. Wiggins and Wiggins (2008) contend that policy makers would benefit from documentation and information that guide them through decision-making processes in regards to music education regulations.

Many factors are involved in the success of a music program and analyzing the impact of educational reform in music education is crucial to understanding the ways educators can facilitate administrators with necessary information and resources to achieve state or national imposed regulations. Advocacy in music education has become a constant topic of debate since music educators often express their discontent with the role that music has in school. Music teachers have turned their heads to the role that administrators play in making crucial decisions for their programs. This has been justified with the assumption that principals have the power to facilitate the implementation of the music curriculum.
Curricular reforms in education and music education have clearly impacted music teaching practices. However, in eras of educational reform, advocacy for music education must also examine and attack the problem at the root, offering administrators solutions for the difficult dilemmas they must solve regarding public policy and funding management. While educational reforms have aggravated the state of music education in schools, it would be inappropriate to attribute it only to educational laws. Regelski (2006) contends that school music has in many ways been disconnected to what students experience outside school. While administrators and educators must respond to educational reforms, they must also take into account opportunities that would improve their teaching practices. Music teachers must strive to deliver content in ways that are meaningful for students that confront other sides of educational reforms.

The studies reviewed in the second section of this review of literature focused on administrators’ perceptions of music programs in their schools. The studies reviewed have revealed the critical role administrators have in shaping the profile of music school programs. Studies such as those of Abril and Gault (2006), Gerrity (2007), and Bowe (2014), concluded that despite administrators’ positive beliefs about their music programs, there are policies and regulations that negatively impact the extent to which these individuals can support the music curriculum and their music teachers. This is particularly important to the Ecuadorian context, since administrators are many times limited by the regulations provided by the educational policy and the Ministry of Education.

Other authors (Bowe, 2014; Martineza, 2015, Thomas, 2014) suggest that administrators’ beliefs significantly impact music programs regardless of some
legislations or policies that favor other areas such as math and sciences. These authors contend that if administrators value music for their students, they will be willing to take actions in an effort to support the curriculum. School administrators’ perceptions are not only a rich source of information about the state of music education in different countries, but also serve a way of determining the gaps or needs that should be taken care of by policy makers.

The third and last section of this chapter focused on studies that determine the nature and quality of music education programs when music instruction is being implemented by classroom teachers. Research suggests that classroom teachers have been reluctant to teach music and in most of the cases it has been because their self-perceptions of having limited knowledge and lack of expertise in the subject area. This circumstance has led them to feel that music specialists would be better suited to teach music.

Another reason for their reluctance was the perceived high pressure in other academic areas. As a result of this and other factors, teachers tended to use music for nonmusical purposes, such as support learning in other subjects such as language and math, or for recreational and social purposes. Research conducted by Bresler (1993), Herbst et. al. (2005), and Wiggins and Wiggins (2008) showed that teachers focus music instruction primarily on singing or listening. Only a small number of teachers included creative activities, or more sophisticated musical knowledge such as reading or music theory.

Overall, all of the studies presented in this chapter influenced in some way the development of the present study. The studies that were the most influential were those
focusing on policy and curricular implementation and consequently, the impact of those regulations on school administrators’ perceptions and attitudes towards music programs.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This chapter will describe the methodology and procedures of the research. I will start with a restatement of the purpose and research questions, followed by a rationale for using this methodology, and the details of the sampling design. Finally, I will describe the development of the questionnaire, the content of the survey instrument, data collection process, and an overview of the analysis procedures.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the state of music education in the Basic General public schools in Ecuador from the perspective of the school administrator. Through a national survey, I examined the current state of music education programs, perceptions of music learning outcomes, and the factors impacting the music curriculum.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are administrators’ perceptions of the current national policies in art education?
2. What are administrators’ perceptions of the current state of the music curriculum?
3. Is there a difference between administrators’ perceptions of current and ideal states?
4. What are administrators’ perceptions of the degree to which numerous variables impact their music curriculum?
5. What are the obstacles and challenges that administrators face in supporting the music curriculum?

6. Are there differences by political zone in the ways administrators implement policies and oversee arts education instruction in their schools?

**Rationale for Conducting a Survey**

Many researchers have employed survey research methods to examine the perceptions of and conditions of music in schools both nationally and regionally (Abril & Gault, 2006, 2008; Aicher, 2014; Blackman, 2015; Bowe 2014; Hash, 2010; Herbst, de Wet, & Rijsdijk, 2005). This study is intended to characterize music education in Basic General public schools in Ecuador from the perspective of administrators around the country. This study is descriptive, exploratory, and large in scale, hence, a survey design in the form of a self-administered questionnaire seemed an appropriate tool for data collection.

Survey research methodologist, Fowler (2014), states that surveys intend to make inferences from a sample representative of the entire population. A survey design is also used to assess thoughts, opinions, and feelings on a determined subject (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister, & Jeanne, 2011). Rea and Parker (1997) state that “surveys have broad appeal, particularly in democratic cultures, because they are perceived as a reflection of the attitudes, preferences and opinions of the very people from whom the society’s policymakers derive their mandate” (p. 3).

Survey research often involves self-reported information from people and about themselves. Some researchers have questioned the validity of self-reported data collected in a questionnaire, suggesting that social desirability plays a vital role (Aicher, 2014).
However, literature on survey research design indicates that self-reported data are mostly accurate when the survey’s questions: (1) correspond to what they are intended to measure, (2) are reliable and provide consistent measures in comparable situations (Fowler, 2014), and (3) when the researcher maintains the anonymity of the respondents (Chan, 2009). A survey design seemed to be the most logical research approach to understand the perceptions of administrators related to their schools’ music programs in a given nation.

**Sampling Design**

According to Fowler (2014), a major development in the process of making surveys useful is learning how to sample: researchers must select “a small subset of a population representative of the whole population” (p. 4). Sampling is vital in designing surveys and impacts the extent to which the data collected can represent the population. It is essential to give all (or nearly all) members of a given the same chance of being selected for the study (Fowler, 2014). Hence, using probability sampling is key in meeting that goal. This design strategy will strengthen the potential for making generalizations to the population—Ecuadorean schools.

**Target population**

Drawing a representative sample is dependent on the “sampling frame, the sample size, and the specific design of selection procedures” (Fowler, 2014, p. 14). The sample frame is the set of people that will have a chance to be selected for the study. Hence, the population from which the sample for this study will be restricted to administrators from Basic General public schools in Ecuador.
To select participants, I visited the AMIE\textsuperscript{3} section of the Ministry of Education webpage (http://web.educacion.gob.ec/CNIE/), from which I obtained a database containing information from all schools in Ecuador. This database called “Registros-Administrativos 2014-2015” was generated in 2015, at the end of the academic year 2014-2015. The database contains a list of 23,288 schools including private, public, and fiscomisionales.

Using Microsoft Excel pivot tables, I filtered the list to public Basic General schools that offer full time in-school education and that represent the nine delimited political zones of the country. The remaining schools constitute a population of 13,870 schools from which the sample was drawn. Since the Ecuadorian government divides the country into nine political zones, I sorted the final population (13,870) into their respective administrative zones. Table 5 displays the number of schools per political zone (in total nine political zones) and the percentage of schools per political zone in relation to Ecuador in total. These political zones served as strata for sampling procedures.

\textsuperscript{3} Archivo Maestro de Instituciones Educativas (Master Archive of Educational Institutes)
Table 5 Number of Basic General Education public schools per administrative zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>% of the Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>11.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>6.915%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>10.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>19.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>17.881%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>11.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>13.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 8</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 9</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,870</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sampling Size

The next step in the sampling process is the creation of a representative sample of the population. One of the main concerns among researchers is to define a sample from which information can be generalizable for the target population. Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) state that there may be some differences between the sample and the population, but if the sample is randomly selected and of sufficient size, those differences will be relatively insignificant and incidental. Hence, a minimum number of participants must be calculated in order to draw valid and reliable findings through statistical analysis.

Fowler (2014) states that one usual misconception in sampling design is that the appropriateness of a sample depends on the fraction of the population included in that sample. Rather, he argues that it is the statistical calculation of the margin of error and the confidence level that should determine the size of a sample. A great number of surveys
involve small fractions of populations that represent less than 10 percent of the population. In those cases, Fowler (2014) suggests making small increments in the sample, which will have no effect on the ability of a researcher to generalize from a sample to a population.

I used a sample-size calculator (https://www.CheckMarket.com) to determine the number of participants needed for the study. For the population of 13,870 schools, I chose a margin of error of 5% and a 95% confidence level. This computation resulted in a required sample size of 374 respondents in order to adequately represent Ecuadorian Basic General public school administrators.

Assuming that 30% of the selected administrators would return a complete survey, I would have had to send out 1,247 questionnaires. However, since some of the political strata represent very small fractions of the population, it was appropriate to adjust the numbers in order to achieve at least the 10% of each stratum. For this purpose, I selected 200 administrators from each political zone, which resulted in disproportionate sampling by stratum for the study’s target population. Table 6 displays each political zone with the number of administrators selected, as well as its percentage in relation to the fractions of the population.
Table 6 Sample size per stratum and their respective percentage in a given zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>% of the zone population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>13.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>31.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>41.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order for the information to be generalizable, these samples were selected randomly from the nine different sampling frames within the total population. In essence, I selected nine distinct random samples. Therefore, I used the list of schools sorted into the nine political zones, and through Excel, assigned a random number to each school. These numbers were then sorted from the smallest to the largest, which allowed the selection of a random sample of 200 schools per stratum.

**Special Permissions**

After creating all randomized samples, I requested permission from the Ministry of Education to conduct this study. I filled out an online form available at the webpage of the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education (http://mineduc.urbea.org), which required my background and academic information, as well as letters of support from my dissertation
advisor and a letter from University of Miami. I manually added each institution’s AMIE code, name, and district code into the online form in order to get approval from the Ministry of Education to conduct this study. During this process I worked closely with analysts from the National Center for Research in Ecuador and the Ministry of Education since the database needed to be updated. They provided me with the most recent list of email addresses, codes, and phone numbers of the 1800 participants of the study. Once the list of schools and associated information was accurate for every school, the Ministry of Education was able to process permission for the study and proceeded to send me a letter of authorization and a commitment letter. This authorization was effective the first week of February, and with the letter I was able to get IRB approval, which was granted the second week of February.

**Survey Development**

The main research instrument for this study was a self-administered questionnaire for Ecuadorian public school administrators. The design of the questionnaire was informed by three main sources: (1) an examination of questionnaires used in prior studies about administrators’ perceptions of school music education programs (Abril & Gault, 2006; Blackman, 2015; Bowe, 2014), (2) the National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education (2016) implemented in Ecuadorian Basic General Education Schools, and (3) a review of various sources on survey design (Fowler, 2014; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Rea & Parker, 1997).

Additionally, a draft of the survey instrument was reviewed by my dissertation advisor, one school principal, one Ph.D. professor in Education, and one Ph.D. candidate in Music Education. Comments and revisions were considered at the moment of revising
the final version of the questionnaire. The contribution of the school principal was particularly helpful, as she helped to clarify a wide array of details regarding the political, administrative, and academic areas in the Ecuadorian public school system.

**Validity and Reliability**

Validity refers to the relationship between an answer and the measure that is going to score it (Fowler, 2014). Due to the large-scale nature of this study, a validation plan was designed. This plan for content validation included: (1) the revision of relevant empirical data and previous survey instruments, and (2) the opinions of an expert group of informants. According to Fowler (2014), ensuring a pertinent content validity will make the error term as small as possible so the answers reflect true scores. Therefore, feedback was received from each individual regarding the precision and/or vagueness of each question. Comments and revisions were considered for the construction of the final version of the instrument.

On the other hand, reliability refers to how consistent the scores obtained are for each individual from one administration of an instrument to another and from one set of items to another (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). To ensure that the results of the perception items were reliable, meaningful, and accurate, the internal consistency of the instrument was calculated using Cronbach’s Alpha. General principles indicate that an alpha value of .70 or higher is considered “acceptable,” which indicates that 70% or more of the observed score variance is a result of the true score and not of the error (Chatterji, 2003). For this study, I calculated an alpha coefficient for the sections two, three, and four of the survey.
Focus Group

As a method of inquiry, a focus group is an interview on a topic with a group of people who have knowledge of the subject (Merriam, 2009). The advantage of this type of interview is that it can be coordinated, conducted, and analyzed in a short period of time (Edmunds, 1999, as cited in Aicher, 2014). Data obtained from a focus group is socially constructed given the interaction of the group, thus a constructivist approach is necessary. Patton (2002) claims:

Unlike a series of one-on-one interviews, in a focus group participants get to hear each other’s responses and to make additional comments beyond their own original responses as they hear what other people have to say. However, participants need not agree with each other or reach any kind of consensus. Nor is it necessary for people to disagree. The object is to get high-quality data in a social context where people can consider their own views in the context of the views of others. (p. 386)

As Macnaghten and Myers (2004) assert, focus groups are a pertinent methodology for topics people could talk about to each other in their daily lives, but do not. In contrast to individual interviews, focus groups can benefit from the synergy among participants, resulting in a wide array of ideas and thoughts from different perspectives (Nassar-McMillan & Borders, 2002, as cited in Aicher, 2014).

Rea and Parker (1997) suggest conducting a focus group prior to the development of a survey instrument so the researcher can gather information about the subject matter from interested parties and key individuals. During the Summer 2016, I conducted a focus group with 10 classroom teachers from one public school in Cuenca, Ecuador. This
focus group seemed appropriate, since classroom teachers would be a rich source of information about the current status of the music education program.

The main objective of this focus group was to: (1) determine the current perspectives of the philosophy and practice of music instruction in Basic General schools in Ecuador, (2) determine what are the ways teacher approach music activities and learning experiences; (3) determine what questions are worth asking administrators and what answers would be of most value to policy makers, and (4) inform the development of individual questionnaire items to be posed to school administrators.

The first part of the focus group revealed teachers’ perceptions about the role of music in school and their reasons for bringing musical activities to their classrooms. The classroom teachers expressed their interest in creating musical activities because music “makes the children happy” and facilitates learning of other subjects. One of their biggest concerns corresponded to the place that music occupies in the curriculum, particularly now that the National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic education places music within a broad field of arts and culture to be taught for two hours per week.

The second part of the focus group revealed the type of activities that teachers bring to the classroom. Teachers felt limited in the number of activities in music they could facilitate given their lack of specialized training. They seemed to focus mostly on singing and dancing. It seems that teachers who had specialists in their schools were less concerned about music. Nonetheless, teachers expressed interest in having professional development opportunities in music, especially since the education law does not require a music specialist. They wanted to be prepared to teach music in case their school chose not to hire a music specialist.
The last part focused on the teachers’ perceptions of the impact of educational policies on their curriculum—specifically the music curriculum. Given that their school had a music specialist, they were not aware of all the effects of the law in the music curriculum. However, they did express their discontent about the limited amount of time that the students have for music instruction. Additionally, they felt uncertain about the impact of the changes that the new curriculum for culture and arts education proposes, especially in relation to allocation of time and human and material resources.

This focus group revealed that there is a need for information from administrators and educational leaders, since they are the ones making decisions that affect many instances in the educational system. The teachers’ opinions, experiences, and concerns informed the construction of the survey instrument. The questionnaire for the focus group can be found in Appendix 1.

**The Survey Instrument**

The survey instrument used in the study was divided into five sections. The first section collected demographic information about the administrators and the school music programs. The second section was used to collect information about the administrators’ familiarity and knowledge about the implementation of policies and curriculum in Arts Education.

Section three consisted of four subsections. The first subsection collected information about the extent to which administrators believe their program currently helps students achieve a set of seven music learning outcomes. Using a Likert-type scale (4 = Strongly Agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree) administrators indicated to what degree they believe the seven music learning outcomes were being met.
at their institutions. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated to measure the internal consistency of this section, which was found to be reliable ($\alpha = .92$).

The second subsection collected information about the extent to which administrators believe it would be important for their students to achieve the same set of seven learning outcomes, this time in ideal conditions. Administrators were provided with a Likert-type scale ($4 = \text{Strongly Agree}, 1 = \text{Strongly Disagree}$) to indicate the degree to which they believed those goals were being met as a result of music instruction at their schools. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated to measure the internal consistency of the survey items in this subsection ($\alpha = .97$).

The third subsection collected information about the extent to which administrators believe music instruction at their school helps students meet 13 broad educational outcomes in current conditions. Administrators were provided with a Likert-type scale ($4 = \text{Strongly Agree}, 1 = \text{Strongly Disagree}$) to indicate the degree to which they believed those goals were being met as a result of music instruction at their schools. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated to measure the internal consistency of the survey items in this subsection ($\alpha = .99$).

Lastly, the fourth subsection was used to collect information about the extent to which administrators believe music instruction at their school helps students meet 13 broad educational outcomes in ideal conditions. Administrators were provided with a Likert-type scale ($4 = \text{Strongly Agree}, 1 = \text{Strongly Disagree}$) to indicate the degree to which they believed it would be important for their students to achieve those goals. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated to measure the internal consistency of the survey items in this subsection ($\alpha = .99$). For all four sub-sections, administrators were
given the option to select a *Can’t Answer* option if they felt like they did not have enough information or background to answer the questions. All sub-sections examining administrators’ values of importance were analyzed and inferred as if their students were to meet music learning outcomes and broad educational outcomes in ideal conditions. Thus, for analysis purposes, I labeled these responses as “Ideal Conditions.”

The fourth section of the survey collected information about administrators’ perceptions of the effect 10 factors have on the music program. Administrators were provided with a Likert-type scale (5 = *Very Positive*, 4 = *Positive*, 3 = *No Effect*, 2 = *Negative*, 1 = *Very Negative*) in order to determine the degree to which 10 factors (e.g. administration, policies, policymakers, budget) influence the music programs. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated to measure the internal consistency of this section (\(\alpha = .91\)).

Lastly, the fifth section of the survey consisted of two open-ended questions: (1) Please, describe the greatest obstacle(s) limiting your ability to fully support music at your institution; (2) Please, describe any action that might eliminate those obstacles and improve the state of music education at your institution. The responses from these questions were coded and categorized into four different factors related to the factors in the previous section.

**Plan for Data Collection: An Online Survey**

The use of web-based methodologies for collecting data in academic fields is becoming increasingly common (Bowe, 2014). Increasingly, researchers are turning to web-based software to collect information from their target population (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). Wiersma and Jurs (2009) emphasize how web-based surveys are a viable
alternative to mailed surveys. Benefits of this mode of data collection include: (1) convenience, (2) reduced costs, (3) faster turnaround, (4) reduced time, (5) multimedia interface, (6) more flexibility in the survey design, (7) wide distribution, (8) mobile administration (for portable devices), (9) unobtrusive nature, and (10) reduced data entry (Bowe, 2014; Creswell, 2003; Fraenkel, et. al., 2012).

Given the large sample in the current study, this method of data collection seemed suitable in generating raw baseline data. Critiques of this method of data collection are mostly focused on its difficulty in achieving a high-response rate due to incorrect e-mail addresses and people’s accessibility to the internet (Fowler, 2014). Many of the initial e-mails and follow-up reminders sent to the administrators went through email filters and thus, there is no guarantee that all of the administrators received the link to the questionnaire. However, this method of data collection seemed appropriate due to logistic and financial limitations.

**Overview of Analysis Procedures**

After obtaining permission from the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education, the National Center for Educational Research, and the Institutional Review Board from University of Miami, electronic surveys were sent to sampled school administrators. After registering the survey responses through the software Qualtrics, I used the response codes provided by the software and designed the code for demographic information that existed in the original database from the Ministry of Education and that was not part of the survey instrument, which was information concerning the school predominant ethnicity and school location. Next, I entered and analyzed data into SPSS Statistics Premium GradPack 24.
For the open-ended questions, I analyzed and categorized the responses by identifying recurring themes and codes. For both questions, every response was broken down into factors (e.g., curriculum), or actors (e.g., classroom teacher), which grouped, created four main categories. Statements such as curriculum, time allocation, administration, and teachers’ workload were categorized into the category “Policy.” Factors such as music instruments, space, pedagogical resources, and professional developments were comprised in the category “Resources.” The third category “Budget for music teacher” did not include more statements than budget for a music specialist since this was the most frequent statement in both open-ended questions. Lastly, a small percentage of administrators stated “Parents and Community,” which stood as the fourth category.

After a thorough analysis of the surveys, I categorized them into three: (1) sent out, (2) returned, and (3) usable. Incomplete questionnaires were counted as part of the response rate and some were included in the analysis, yet the majority was categorized as “unusable” surveys. Questionnaires were considered incomplete if administrators started responding to the survey but did not indicate whether or not they offer music instruction. For inferential analyses, only complete questionnaires were used.
Analysis for Research Question 1

What are administrators’ perceptions of the current national policies in arts education?

The first research question corresponded to the second section of the survey instrument. This section consisted of three questions, in which administrators indicated their familiarity and knowledge about policies in arts education, its implementation, as well as the implementation of the national curriculum in arts. Data collected will be displayed in frequency distribution tables (Rea & Parker, 1997). These tables represented a summary presentation of the frequency response of each category of a variable. These
data were divided into three categories: (1) all schools, (2) schools that offered music, and (3) schools that did not offer music. This division was considered necessary in order to determine with more precision the level of familiarity and knowledge of the policy and curriculum from administrators in both conditions.

**Analysis for Research Question 2 and 3**

*What are administrators’ perceptions of the current state of the music curriculum?*

*Analysis for Research Question 3: Is there a difference between administrators’ perceptions of current and ideal states?*

The second and third research questions examined possible differences between current and ideal conditions for seven music learning outcomes and for 13 broad educational outcomes in music. Means, standard deviations, and confidence intervals for both current and ideal conditions were calculated for schools that offered music and will be displayed in a table. For schools that did not offer music, means, standard deviations, and confidence intervals were calculated and will be presented only for ideal conditions. Additionally, paired $t$-tests were performed to determine whether there were or were not significant differences between current and ideal conditions in schools that offered music instruction. Lastly, Cohen’s $d$ values were calculated to represent the magnitude of the effect sizes.
Analysis for Research Questions 4 and 5

What are administrators’ perceptions of the degree to which numerous variables impact their music curriculum? What are the obstacles and challenges that administrators face in supporting the music curriculum?

The fourth and fifth research questions of the survey examined administrators’ perceptions of the degree to which 10 factors have on their music program or the lack of it, in the case of schools without music instruction. For the purposes of the analysis, the data were collapsed into two variables: “Positive” and “no effect,” and the analyses were conducted for three different categories: (1) all schools, (2) schools that offered music, and (3) schools that did not offer music. Means, standard deviations, and Confidence Intervals were calculated and will be displayed in different tables for all three categories, respectively. Additionally, Chi-squared tests of goodness of fit were performed to determine if there were significant differences between “positive” and “negative” answers. Data will be presented on each selected factor, as an effect category, such that each factor will be recognized as having a positive or negative effect on the music program, or that administrators are neutral towards identifying a factor that has a positive or not positive effect on the program.
Analysis for Research Question 6

Are there differences by administrative zone in the way administrators implement policies and oversee arts education instruction in their schools?

The last research question examined policy and curriculum implementation among the nine different administrative zones in Ecuador. As with the previous sections, I divided the data into three categories: (1) all schools, (2) schools with music, and (3) schools without music in order to get more accurate information about the administrative zones and the way administrators implement policies and curriculum. To test for significant differences, I conducted Chi-square tests of independence, where I cross-tabulated the information collected in section two of the survey with the nine administrative zones.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to profile the state of music education in the Basic General Education schools of Ecuador by analyzing the perspectives of the school administrators. A national survey was administered to a stratified random sample of 1,800 school administrators from February to March 2017, yielding a 27.4% response rate ($n = 494$). The research questions guiding the survey were the following:

1. What are administrators’ perceptions of the current national policies in art education?
2. What are administrators’ perceptions of the current state of the music curriculum?
3. Is there a difference between administrators’ perceptions of current and ideal states?
4. What are administrators’ perceptions of the degree to which numerous variables impact their music curriculum?
5. What are the obstacles and challenges that administrators’ face in supporting the music curriculum?
6. Are there differences by political zone in the ways administrators implement policies and oversee arts education instruction in their schools
Review of Methodology

A random sample of 1,800 participants was drawn from a list of 13,870 General Basic Education active public schools that offer full time in-school education in Ecuador. In order to attain a representative sample from the nine administrative zones, I stratified the sample by nine zones, drawing a simple random sample of 200 participants per zone. The main research instrument for this study was a self-administered questionnaire informed by: (1) a focus group conducted during Summer 2016, which included 10 classroom teachers from one public school in Cuenca, Ecuador; (2) existing questionnaires used in prior studies on administrators’ perceptions of school music education programs (Abril & Gault, 2006, 2008; Blackman, 205; Bowe, 2014); (3) the National (Ecuadorian) Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education (2016); and (4) a review of various sources on survey design (Fowler, 2014; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Rea & Parker, 1997). Additionally, a draft of the survey instrument was reviewed by my dissertation advisor, one school principal, one Ph.D. professor in Education, and one Ph.D. candidate in Music Education. Comments and from these individuals were considered in the revisions of the final questionnaire.

The final version of the survey instrument was divided into five sections. The first section was designed to collect demographic information about the administrators and the school music programs. Section two of the survey was used to collect information about the administrators’ familiarity with and knowledge about the implementation of policies and curriculum in Arts Education.

The third section of the survey consisted of four subsections. The first subsection consisted of seven music learning outcomes based on previous surveys and on the
National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education (Ministry of Education, 2016). Administrators were provided with a Likert-type scale ($4 = \textit{Strongly Agree}, 1 = \textit{Strongly Disagree}$) to indicate the degree to which they believed those goals were being met as a result of music instruction at their schools. They were also given the option to select a \textit{Can’t Answer} option. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated to measure the internal consistency of the survey items in this subsection ($\alpha = .92$). In the second subsection, administrators were provided with a second Likert-type scale ($4 = \textit{Strongly Agree}, 1 = \textit{Strongly Disagree}$) to indicate the degree to which they believed it would be important for their students to meet a number of music learning outcomes in ideal conditions. They were also given the option to select a \textit{Can’t Answer} option. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated to measure the internal consistency ($\alpha = .97$). The third subsection consisted of a list of 13 broad educational outcomes informed by previous studies (Abril & Gault, 2006) and the National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education. Administrators were provided with a Likert-type scale ($4 = \textit{Strongly Agree}, 1 = \textit{Strongly Disagree}$) to indicate to what degree they believe those broad educational outcomes were being met at their institutions. They were also given the option to select a \textit{Can’t Answer} option. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated to measure the internal consistency ($\alpha = .99$). Lastly, the fourth subsection focused on the same 13 broad educational outcomes for which a Likert-type scale ($4 = \textit{Strongly Agree}, 1 = \textit{Strongly Disagree}$) was used to indicate the extent to which administrators believed it would be important for their students to meet the 13 broad educational outcomes in ideal conditions. They were also given the option to select a \textit{Can’t Answer} option. A
Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated to measure the internal consistency ($\alpha = .99$).

The fourth section of the survey was used to determine the administrators’ perceptions of the impact that a number of factors have on music education. Administrators were provided with a Likert-type scale ($5 = \text{Very Positive}, 4 = \text{Positive}, 3 = \text{No Effect}, 2 = \text{Negative}, 1 = \text{Very Negative}$) in order to determine the degree to which 10 factors impacted music education at their schools. Lastly, the fifth section of the survey consisted of two open-ended questions: (a) Are there any other factors that impact music education at your institution? (b) Please, describe any actions that might eliminate any obstacles and improve the state of music education at your institution.

After obtaining permission from the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education, the National Center for Educational Research, and the Institutional Review Board from University of Miami, I proceeded to send out the survey to the school administrators. For the initial distribution and the following reminders, I used individual survey links through a function provided by Qualtrics, and then proceeded to use another function for email distributions, which allowed me to send out the survey to all of the participants at once. This initial distribution, three reminders, and the action of the district coordinators in Ecuador yielded a 27.4% response rate.

After registering the survey responses through the software Qualtrics, I used the responses’ codes provided by the software and designed the code for demographic information that existed in the original database from the Ministry of Education and that was not part of the survey instrument, which was information concerning the school
predominant ethnicity and school location. Next, I entered and analyzed data into SPSS Statistics Premium GradPack 24.

For the open-ended questions, I analyzed and categorized the responses by identifying recurring themes and codes. For both questions, every response was broken down into factors (e.g., curriculum), or actors (e.g., classroom teacher), which grouped, created four main categories. Statements such as curriculum, time allocation, administration, and teachers’ work load were categorized into the category “Policy.” Factors such as music instruments, space, pedagogical resources, and professional developments were comprised in the category “Resources.” The third category “Budget for music teacher” did not include more statements than budget for a music specialist since this was the most frequent statement in both open-ended questions. Lastly, a small percentage of administrators stated “Parents and Community,” which stood as the fourth category. Most administrators used the second open-ended question as an extension of the first open-ended question. Many administrators indicated possible solutions for overcoming obstacles in the shape of statements similar to those presented in the previous question (i.e., narrowing the curriculum, providing schools with budget for a music teacher, or supporting schools with musical instruments, pedagogical resources, or autonomy for collecting money from parents and community). Those with incomplete responses were included in the data analysis, however, they were treated and labeled missing responses (Fowler, 2014). Unusable surveys were 19 in total. Of the 494 returned surveys, only 475 were used in the analysis. Table 7 provides a detailed description of surveys that were sent out, returned, and usable.
Table 7 *Detail of surveys usable for study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>% Returned (By Zone)</th>
<th>Usable</th>
<th>% Usable (By Zone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile of Schools and Administrators

Research question one aimed to profile the current state of music education in the Basic General Education public schools of Ecuador. Starting from this section, the analysis of the results will be based only on valid surveys. Participants \( n = 475 \) indicated their years of experience as administrators to be as follows: under one year (39.2%), one to under five years (43.4%), five to under 10 years (9.1%), and 10 or more years (8.4%). The majority of administrators had between zero and five years of experience.

Frequencies and percentages of teachers’ administrative experience are displayed in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to under 5 years</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to under 10 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 475; M = 1.87; SD = 0.9 \)

The database provided by the Ministry of Education revealed that proportions of urban and rural schools were relatively equal, with 51.8% and 48.2%, respectively. Frequencies and percentages of urban and rural schools are presented in Table 9. Table 10 shows that 71% of the schools are low socio-economic institutions, 28.8% medium, and only 0.2% high socio-economic.
Table 9 Descriptive statistics for school location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 475

Table 10 Descriptive statistics for school Socio-Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 475

According to the Master Archive of Educative Institutions (AMIE) database from the Ministry of Education of Ecuador, which contains the information about the entire school population, the majority of the schools in this study were of mestizo background. Of the participants’ responses, 89.9% of the sample was predominantly mestizo, 9.9% Indigenous, 0.2% white, 0.5% black, and 0.5% identified as “other.” Table 11 displays descriptive statistics for the predominant ethnic background of the schools.
Table 11 Descriptive statistics for student predominant ethnicity by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mestizo</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *N = 475*

Profile of Music at Basic General Public Schools

For this analysis, starting in this section, I will differentiate the responses according to the schools that offer music instruction and the schools that did not. The majority of surveyed schools did not offer music instruction (75.4%); approximately a quarter of the schools did offer music instruction (24.6%). Table 12 presents descriptive statistics regarding offering and requirement of music instruction.

Of the schools that did offer music instruction, 70.9% offered music as a required subject. When asked about the primary responsible teacher for music instruction, 50.4% of the 117 schools that offered music indicated that music classes were primarily taught by classroom teachers; 23.1% said that music classes were taught by music specialists; and 21.4% said music classes were taught by arts teachers. Participants who selected “other” indicated that they use other teachers to teach music. One administrator said: “sometimes, when we have cultural events at our school, we would hire a music teacher to get our students ready for something, and we do so through self-management.”
they explained their choice, the four administrators reported that music was taught by any teacher at their school.

Administrators were asked to indicate the time allocation for music. Of the 115 administrators that offered music at their institutions, 49.6% indicated that the time allotted to music instruction was between half an hour to under one hour per week, 27% indicated students received half an hour to one hour a week of music, 9.6% said students received one or more of music instruction per week. Table 12 presents descriptive statistics for time allocation in the Basic General Education public schools.

Table 12 *Time allocation for music in Basic General Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time allocation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under ½ hour per week</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ hour to under 1 hour per week</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour or more per week</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of administrators (88.7%) indicated that music was taught during school hours in a regular classroom (84.3%) (See Table 13).
Table 13 Sessions and place for music instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During school hours</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school hours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular classroom</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music classroom</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 115 \)

Administrators who offer music at their schools were also asked to select what other art subjects were taught at their schools. Administrators were given the option of selecting more than one option if applicable. The following are percentages of schools that offered a given instruction in the arts: 37.4% visual arts, 67.8% dance, 35.6% drama/theater, and 5.2% selected film.

**Results for Research Question 1:**

What are administrators’ perceptions of the current national policies in art education?

The survey instrument sought to determine administrators’ familiarity with and knowledge of the current policy concerning arts education *Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural* (LOEI) as well as the implementation of those regulations and the National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education. There were five missing cases in this section and 470 administrators responded to this question. Of the 470 administrators,
35.7% indicated that they were familiar with the current policy in arts education, whereas the other 64.3% said that they were not familiar with such policy. It was affirming to know that the majority of administrators from schools that offered music were familiar with the policies in arts education. However, there were a large number of administrators both from the overall counting and from schools that did not offer music, who were unfamiliar with the regulations. Table 14 displays descriptive statistics for the number of administrators familiar with policies in arts education for: (1) all of the administrators, (2) administrators that offered music, and (3) administrators that did not offer music.

Table 14 Administrators’ familiarity with national policies in arts education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity (all schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity (with music)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity (without music)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 470 for all schools; n = 115 for schools with music; n = 355 for schools without music

When asked if they were responsible for overseeing the implementation of the national policy for arts education, the majority of administrators believed that they were not responsible. By looking at the responses of administrators that offered music, it was
shown that the majority (55.7%) perceived they were responsible for overseeing the implementation of policies in arts education. However, as with the previous question, the majority of administrators from schools that did not offer music indicated that they were not responsible for overseeing the implementation of the policy. Table 15 shows descriptive statistics for administrators’ perceptions of policy implementation for: (1) all of the administrators, (2) administrators that offered music, and (3) administrators that did not offer music.

Table 15: Administrators’ perceptions of policy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of policy implementation (all schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of policy implementation (with music)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of policy implementation (without music)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 115$ for schools with music; $n = 355$ for schools without music

The last question of section two of the survey instrument was used to determine administrators’ perceptions about their role in the implementation of the National Curriculum in Cultural and Artistic Education. Results indicated that in both, schools
with music (80.9%) and schools without music (61.4%), the majority of administrators believed they were responsible for overseeing the implementation of the curriculum in arts. Table 16 show descriptive statistics for administrators’ perceptions of curriculum implementation for: (1) all of the administrators, (2) administrators that offer music, and (3) administrators that do not offer music.

Table 16 Administrators’ perceptions of curriculum implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of curriculum implementation (all schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of curriculum implementation (with music)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of curriculum implementation (without music)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 470 for all schools; n = 115 for schools with music; n = 355 for schools without music
Results for Research Question 2 and 3:

What are administrators’ perceptions of the current state of the music curriculum?
Is there a difference between administrators’ perceptions of current and ideal states?

In this section, I present an analysis of current and ideal conditions for schools that offered music. Administrators were provided with a list of seven music learning outcomes to indicate to which degree they considered those goals were being met in current conditions. Administrators were also asked to determine to what extent they believed those educational goals should be met in ideal conditions. Administrators who selected the “can’t answer” option were not included in this analysis.

Responses to all these items were generally positive, with all scores above the midpoint. Confidence Intervals were small and stable across the variables ranging from ±0.14 to ±0.19 in current conditions and from ±0.14 to ±0.17 in ideal conditions. The highest mean score \( (M = 2.87) \) and smallest standard deviation \( (SD = 0.69) \) for current conditions was for “developing connections between music and other subjects in the curriculum.” The highest mean score \( (M = 3.29) \) and smallest standard deviation \( (SD = 0.61) \) regarding ideal conditions was “understanding music’s role in society,” for current conditions “understanding music in relation to everyday activities and life outside school” had the smallest mean score \( (M = 2.43) \) and highest standard deviation \( (SD = 0.72) \).

The remaining mean scores were relatively similar to both the highest and lowest means above mentioned. Considering that all mean scores were generally positive, these
results could imply that administrators did not have enough information in relation to the music learning outcomes in order to be more selective in their responses. It was assumed that although administrators were generally positive about the current conditions of music instruction, they believed these conditions could be improved. Table 17 presents means, standard deviations, and Confidence Intervals for the seven music learning outcomes in current and ideal conditions.

Table 17 Means, Standard Deviations, Confidence Intervals, and Rank for music learning outcomes in current and ideal conditions: Schools with music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create/Compose</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>±0.19</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>±0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze music of diverse cultures</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>±0.16</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>±0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to other subjects</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>±0.14</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>±0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to sociocultural context</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>±0.17</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>±0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to other arts &amp; cultures</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>±0.16</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>±0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to everyday activities</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>±0.15</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>±0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to music’s role in society</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>±0.16</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>±0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 76 \).
Only responses regarding ideal conditions were considered from administrators that did not offer music instruction, as these responses would portray what they considered important music learning outcomes in an ideal school music program. Administrators who selected the “can’t answer” option were not included in this analysis. These responses were generally positive and relatively close to each other. Confidence Intervals were small and stable across the variables ranging from $\pm 0.11$ to $\pm 0.13$. The highest mean score and smallest standard deviation ($M = 3.19, SD = 0.65$) was “understand music in relation to everyday activities and life outside of school” and “create/compose music” was the lowest mean score ($M = 3.06, SD = 0.79$). Table 18 presents means, standard deviations, and Confidence Intervals for the seven music learning outcomes in current and ideal conditions.

Table 18 *Means, Standard Deviations, Confidence Intervals, and Rank for music learning outcomes in ideal conditions: Schools Without Music*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$CI$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create/Compose</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze music of diverse cultures</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to other subjects</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to sociocultural context</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to other arts &amp; cultures</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to everyday activities</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to music’s role in society</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 160$
Paired-samples $t$-tests were conducted in order to compare the seven music learning outcomes in current and ideal conditions. Additionally, the magnitude of the differences was calculated and represented as Cohen’s $d$ values, which represent the effect sizes. Results indicated that there were significant differences ($p < .001$) between current and ideal conditions for all of the seven music learning outcomes. Cohen’s $d$ effect sizes were calculated to determine the magnitude of those differences. All variables showed moderate – large effect sizes ($d = 0.35$ to $d = 0.68$). The variables with the largest effect sizes were “relate music to other arts and cultures” ($d = 0.68$) and “create/compose” ($d = 0.66$). The variable with the lowest effect size was “understand music in relation to other subjects in the curriculum” ($d = 0.35$). Table 19 displays descriptive statistics, $t$-tests, and $d$ values.
This research question also examined the differences between current and ideal conditions for 13 broad music learning outcomes. Administrators were asked to determine to what extent they believed those educational goals should be met in ideal conditions. As with the previous section, I present an analysis of current and ideal conditions for schools that offered music. Administrators who selected the “can’t answer” option were not included in this analysis.
Responses to all these items were generally positive, with small and stable Confidence Intervals across the variables and ranging from ±0.10 to ±0.14 in current conditions and from ±0.11 to ±0.13 in ideal conditions. Administrators seemed to perceive that music instruction at their institutions should serve as a means to “developing creativity” as this was the highest mean score and smallest standard deviation for both current ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 0.63$) and ideal conditions ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 0.50$). The lowest mean score ($M = 3.16$) and largest standard deviation ($SD = 0.60$) regarding current conditions was “improve understanding of other subjects.” The lowest mean score ($M = 3.44$) and largest standard deviation ($SD = 0.58$) regarding ideal conditions was “improve understanding of other subjects.”

Although there were differences within the 13 broad educational outcomes in music, the mean scores were relatively close to each other. As with the seven music learning outcomes, these results could imply that the administrators did not have enough information regarding broad educational outcomes in music in order to be more selective in their responses. It was assumed that although administrators were generally positive about the current conditions of music instruction, they believed these conditions should be improved. Table 20 presents means, standard deviations, and Confidence Intervals for the 13 broad educational outcomes in music in both current and ideal conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Learning Outcome in Music</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop creativity</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>±0.14</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmit cultural heritage</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate self-expression</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster critical thinking</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create connections music/other arts</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding other subjects</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>±0.13</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve tolerance, understanding, acceptance other cultures</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding other arts</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop increased sensibility to arts</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>±0.10</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote future involvement in the arts</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect learning experiences to outside-of-school experiences</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop connection music/cultures of origin</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>±0.13</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide students with diversion</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>±0.12</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *n* = 75
Only responses regarding ideal conditions were considered from administrators that did not offer music instruction as these responses would portray what they considered important broad educational outcomes in an ideal school music program. Administrators who selected the “can’t answer” option were not included in this analysis. Responses were generally positive and relatively close to each other. Confidence Intervals were small and stable across the variables (±0.10). The highest mean score and smallest standard deviation ($M = 3.54, SD = 0.62$) was “develop creativity,” whereas “improve understanding of other subjects in the curriculum” ($M = 3.44, SD = 0.66$) and “develop increased sensibility to the arts” ($M = 3.44, SD = 0.65$) had the lowest mean scores. Just like in the previous section, administrators did not seem to be especially selective with their responses as the remaining mean scores were relatively similar and close to each other. Table 21 presents means, standard deviations, and Confidence Intervals for the 13 broad educational outcomes in music regarding ideal conditions.
Table 21 *Means, Standard Deviations, and Rank for Broad Educational Outcomes in Music in Ideal Condition: Schools without music*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop creativity</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmit cultural heritage</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate self-expression</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster critical thinking</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create connections music/other arts</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding other subjects</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve tolerance, understanding, acceptance other cultures</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding other arts</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop increased sensibility to arts</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote future involvement in the arts</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect learning experiences to outside-of-school experiences</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop connection music/cultures of origin</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide students with diversion</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *n* = 156

Paired-samples *t*-tests were conducted in order to compare the 13 broad educational outcomes in music in current and ideal conditions. Additionally, the magnitude of the differences was calculated and represented as Cohen’s *d* values, which represent the effect sizes. Results indicated that there were significant differences (*p* < .001) between current and ideal conditions for all of the 13 educational outcomes.

Cohen’s *d* effect sizes were calculated to determine the magnitude of those differences.
All variables showed moderate effect sizes ($d = 0.27$ to $d = 0.51$). The variable with the largest effect sizes was “improve understanding of other arts” ($d = 0.51$). Three variables “transmit cultural heritage,” “foster critical thinking,” and “improve understanding of other subjects” shared a moderate effect size value ($d = 0.44$). The variable with the lowest effect size was “facilitate self-expression” ($d = 0.27$). Table 22 displays descriptive statistics, $t$-tests, and $d$ values.
Table 22 Paired $t$-tests and Cohen’s $d$ values for broad educational outcomes: Schools with music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Current $M$</th>
<th>Current $SD$</th>
<th>Ideal $M$</th>
<th>Ideal $SD$</th>
<th>95% CI for Mean Difference</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop creativity</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$[-0.34, -0.06]$</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmit cultural heritage</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>$[-0.38, -0.13]$</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate self-expression</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>$[-0.25, -0.02]$</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster critical thinking</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$[-0.38, -0.13]$</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create connections music/other arts</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>$[-0.38, -0.10]$</td>
<td>-3.53</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding other subjects</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>$[-0.38, -0.13]$</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve tolerance, understanding, acceptance other cultures</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>$[-0.26, -0.03]$</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding other arts</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$[-0.37, -0.14]$</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop increased sensibility to arts</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$[-0.28, -0.06]$</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Paired t-test</th>
<th>95% CI for Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote future involvement in the arts</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect learning experiences to outside-of-school experiences</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop connection music/cultures of origin</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide students with diversion</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results for Research Questions 4 and 5:

What are administrators’ perceptions of the degree to which numerous variables impact their music curriculum? What are the obstacles and challenges that administrators’ face in supporting the music curriculum?

With the fourth and fifth research questions I aimed to determine administrators’ perceptions of the impact that 10 factors have on music education and used a Likert-type scale to indicate the level of impact ($Very Positive = 5$, $Positive = 4$, $No Effect = 3$, $Negative = 2$, $Very Negative = 1$).
Negative = 4, and Very Negative = 1). For frequency analyses, the responses will be collapsed into “positive,” “negative,” and “no effect” categories.

Results are displayed as a table of frequencies in order to indicate the proportions between positive, negative, and no effect responses. Results show generally positive responses from the administrators. The National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education (77.8%) was perceived by most as having a positive impact on music. In general, administrators did not show negative or strongly negative responses. However, among the “music teacher,” (20.1%) on the other hand, was perceived to be the most negative impact, which could be due to the generalized lack of music teachers or music instruction in the schools. Table 23 displays frequencies for “positive,” “negative,” and “no effect” responses.

Table 23 Frequencies for impact factors: All schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law of Education</td>
<td>239 (76.1%)</td>
<td>3 (1.0%)</td>
<td>72 (22.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Curriculum</td>
<td>247 (78.7%)</td>
<td>3 (1.0%)</td>
<td>64 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>223 (71.0%)</td>
<td>8 (2.5%)</td>
<td>83 (26.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative system</td>
<td>213 (71.0%)</td>
<td>9 (2.9%)</td>
<td>92 (29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper administration</td>
<td>205 (65.3%)</td>
<td>9 (2.9%)</td>
<td>100 (31.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>130 (41.4%)</td>
<td>55 (17.5%)</td>
<td>129 (41.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>199 (63.4%)</td>
<td>23 (7.3%)</td>
<td>92 (29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocation</td>
<td>176 (56.1%)</td>
<td>37 (11.8%)</td>
<td>101 (32.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teacher</td>
<td>140 (44.6%)</td>
<td>63 (20.1%)</td>
<td>111 (35.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teacher</td>
<td>225 (71.7%)</td>
<td>18 (5.7%)</td>
<td>71 (22.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 314
These results were analyzed further. A chi-square test of goodness of fit was performed to determine if there were differences between two conditions: Positive vs. No Effect. Responses for the condition “negative” were eliminated for the chi-square analyses since there were not enough responses for the condition to be considered in the analysis. Responses for the effect of the factors were generally positive and above the midpoint (50%) for all factors. Significant differences were found for all factors except for “budget” and “music teacher.” It is important to note, however, that “budget” and “music teacher” had the highest percentages, 17.5% and 20.1%, respectively. These percentages as compared to other from “negative” conditions and the “no effect” conditions show that among all factors, those were negatively impacting music programs. Table 24 presents frequencies for “positive” and “no effect” responses as well as chi-square values for each factor.
Table 24 *Frequencies and Chi-square statistics for Positive and Negative factors: All schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law of Education</td>
<td>239 (76.1%)</td>
<td>72 (22.9%)</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Curriculum</td>
<td>247 (78.7%)</td>
<td>64 (20.4%)</td>
<td>79.93</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>223 (71.0%)</td>
<td>83 (26.4%)</td>
<td>51.54</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. System</td>
<td>213 (71.0%)</td>
<td>92 (29.3%)</td>
<td>42.28</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Adm.</td>
<td>205 (65.3%)</td>
<td>100 (31.8%)</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>130 (41.4%)</td>
<td>129 (41.1%)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>199 (63.4%)</td>
<td>92 (29.3%)</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocation</td>
<td>176 (56.1%)</td>
<td>101 (32.2%)</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teacher</td>
<td>140 (44.6%)</td>
<td>111 (35.4%)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teacher</td>
<td>225 (71.7%)</td>
<td>71 (22.6%)</td>
<td>57.54</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $df = 1, N = 218$

Results for schools that offered music show that, as with the previous analysis, the National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education was perceived to have the most positive impact in music instruction. Frequencies for negative responses were generally low. Table 25 displays frequencies for the list of 10 impact factors in schools that offered music.
Table 25 *Frequencies for impact factors: Schools with music*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law of Education</td>
<td>83 (87.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Curriculum</td>
<td>84 (88.4%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>10 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>77 (81.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>16 (16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative system</td>
<td>74 (77.9%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>19 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper administration</td>
<td>67 (70.5%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>27 (28.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>36 (37.9%)</td>
<td>20 (21.1%)</td>
<td>39 (41.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>73 (76.8%)</td>
<td>5 (5.3%)</td>
<td>17 (17.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocation</td>
<td>65 (68.4%)</td>
<td>10 (10.5%)</td>
<td>20 (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teacher</td>
<td>61 (64.2%)</td>
<td>14 (14.7%)</td>
<td>20 (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teacher</td>
<td>73 (76.8%)</td>
<td>5 (5.3%)</td>
<td>17 (17.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 95$

These results were analyzed further. A chi-square test of goodness of fit was performed to determine if there were differences between the two conditions (Positive vs. No Effect). Results showed significant differences between both conditions most factors, except “budget.” Responses were generally positive and above the midpoint (50%) for most of the factors, except for “budget,” which has the highest percentage in the “no effect” condition. Table 26 presents frequencies for “positive” and “no effect” responses as well as chi-square values for each factor in schools that offered music instruction.
Table 26 *Frequencies and Chi-square statistics for Positive and No Effect factors: Schools with music*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law of Education</td>
<td>83 (87.4%)</td>
<td>12 (12.6%)</td>
<td>36.94</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Curriculum</td>
<td>84 (88.4%)</td>
<td>10 (10.5%)</td>
<td>43.22</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>77 (81.1%)</td>
<td>16 (16.8%)</td>
<td>33.99</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. System</td>
<td>74 (77.9%)</td>
<td>19 (20.0%)</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Adm.</td>
<td>67 (70.5%)</td>
<td>27 (28.4%)</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>36 (37.9%)</td>
<td>39 (41.1%)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>73 (76.8%)</td>
<td>17 (17.9%)</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocation</td>
<td>65 (68.4%)</td>
<td>20 (21.1%)</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teacher</td>
<td>61 (64.2%)</td>
<td>20 (21.1%)</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teacher</td>
<td>73 (76.8%)</td>
<td>17 (17.9%)</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $df = 1, n = 95$

Results for schools that did not offer music show that, as with the previous analysis, the National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education was perceived to have the most positive impact in music instruction. Frequencies for negative responses were generally low. Table 27 displays frequencies for the list of 10 impact factors in schools that did not offer music.
Table 27 *Frequencies for impact factors: Schools without music*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law of Education</td>
<td>156 (71.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.4%)</td>
<td>60 (27.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Curriculum</td>
<td>163 (74.4%)</td>
<td>2 (0.9%)</td>
<td>54 (24.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>146 (66.7%)</td>
<td>6 (2.7%)</td>
<td>67 (30.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative system</td>
<td>139 (63.5%)</td>
<td>7 (3.2%)</td>
<td>73 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper administration</td>
<td>138 (63.0%)</td>
<td>8 (3.7%)</td>
<td>73 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>94 (42.9%)</td>
<td>35 (16.0%)</td>
<td>90 (41.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>126 (57.5%)</td>
<td>18 (8.2%)</td>
<td>75 (34.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocation</td>
<td>111 (50.7%)</td>
<td>27 (12.3%)</td>
<td>81 (37.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teacher</td>
<td>79 (36.1%)</td>
<td>49 (22.4%)</td>
<td>91 (41.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teacher</td>
<td>152 (69.4%)</td>
<td>13 (5.9%)</td>
<td>54 (24.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *n = 219*

These results were analyzed further. A chi-square test of goodness of fit was performed to determine if there were differences between the two conditions (Positive vs. No Effect). Results showed significant differences between both conditions in most factors, except “budget” and “music teacher.” Responses were generally positive and above the midpoint (50%) for most of the factors, except for “budget” and “music teacher.” It is important to note that for schools that did not offer music, the frequencies for “no effect” were higher than in the previous analyses. This might be due the administrators’ overall lack of knowledge of and familiarity with curricular implementation in music. Table 28 presents frequencies for “positive” and “no effect” responses as well as chi-square values for each factor in schools that offered music instruction.
Table 28 Frequencies and Chi-square statistics for Positive and Negative factors: Schools without music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>No Effect (%)</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law of Education</td>
<td>156 (71.2%)</td>
<td>60 (27.4%)</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Curriculum</td>
<td>163 (74.4%)</td>
<td>54 (24.7%)</td>
<td>40.79</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>146 (66.7%)</td>
<td>67 (30.6%)</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. System</td>
<td>139 (63.5%)</td>
<td>73 (33.3%)</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Adm.</td>
<td>138 (63.0%)</td>
<td>73 (33.3%)</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>94 (42.9%)</td>
<td>90 (41.1%)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>126 (57.5%)</td>
<td>75 (34.2%)</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocation</td>
<td>111 (50.7%)</td>
<td>81 (37.0%)</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teacher</td>
<td>79 (36.1%)</td>
<td>91 (41.6%)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teacher</td>
<td>152 (69.4%)</td>
<td>54 (24.7%)</td>
<td>34.83</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $df = 1, n = 219$
The results of this section were compared to the last two open-ended questions of the survey instrument in order to determine the greatest challenges administrators face in supporting music instruction at their schools as well as anything that might help them overcome those obstacles. I coded every statement provided by the administrators and created categories that corresponded those statements.

Two hundred and nine three administrators provided responses for the first open-ended question: “Are there any other factors that impact music instruction at your institution?” Many respondents provided multiple answers, resulting in a total of 370 statements, which fell into four different categories, each with different subcategories:

1. **Policy**: curriculum, time allocation, administration, work load,

2. **Resources**: instruments, space, pedagogical resources, professional development,

3. **Budget for music teacher**: lack of music teacher, budget for music teacher;

   and,

4. **Parents and community**.

The coding and analysis of frequency of each statement corroborated the findings of the third research question, in which “budget” and “music teacher” were the least positive factors impacting music instruction. The most frequent statements were “budget for music teachers,” which represented 48.7% of the statements. Another prominent factor was “resources,” which represented 28.9% of the statements. A third obstacle was the effect of the policy in arts education. Some administrators believed that with the new policy, the arts curriculum had become “too broad and without enough time to be implemented in the classroom.” Another administrator said: “we used to have a music
teacher but they [the Ministry] took him away after they implemented the new curriculum.” Others stressed the need of a music teacher because “it used to be good for the students, it makes them be creative.”

The other factor addressed was “parents and community.” Administrators claimed that parents are not supportive of actions in the school and their engagement with the schools’ necessities is almost nonexistent. However, they also stated that it has been difficult to take initiative in hiring a music teacher through the support of the parents because the Ecuadorian Constitution and educational law “does not allow schools to ask parents for money in any case.” Frequencies and percentages for this section are presented in Table 29.

Table 29 Frequencies and percentages for obstacles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget for music teacher</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and community</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N\)(statements) = 370

The second open-ended question “Please describe any actions that might eliminate any obstacles and improve the state of music education at your institution,” generated a total of 383 statements from 293 administrators. Administrators tended to respond to this question as they did the previous question. Moreover, the majority of administrators used this question to extend and emphasize what they said in the previous question. I coded these statements, which fell in the same categories as the last question. The results corroborated the findings from the first open-ended question and as they did with the
third research question. Administrators seemed to perceive that support with an adequate budget for a music teacher would alleviate the obstacles they have in supporting music instruction. This category represented 39.7% of the statements and was followed by the category “policy,” which represented 33.9% of the responses. Administrators tended to respond to this question as they did the previous question. Moreover, the majority of administrators used this question as an extension of the previous question in order to emphasize or express concern about different factors. Table 30 presents frequencies and percentages for each category in the second open-ended question.

Table 30 *Frequencies and percentages for supporting actions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget for music teacher</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and community</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results for Research Question 6:**

**Are there differences by administrative zone in the way administrators implement policies and oversee arts education instruction in their schools?**

The last research question aimed to determine if policy and curriculum administration is different between the different administrative zones of Ecuador. Chi-square tests of independence were performed in order to determine if there were differences by zone in the way administrators understand and implement policies and the
curriculum in arts education. Findings from section two of the survey were compared between the nine different administrative zones.

The first chi-square test of independence aimed to explore administrators’ familiarity with the policy in arts education between the nine administrative zones. The relationship between zones resulted non-significant $\chi^2 (8, N = 470) = 3.47, p < .902$. Likewise, a comparison of administrators’ perception of their responsibility of curricular implementation showed non-significant relationships between the nine administrative zones $\chi^2 (8, N = 470) = 11.78, p < .161$. On the other hand, administrators’ perceptions of their responsibility of policy implementation showed significant differences between the nine administrative zones $\chi^2 (8, N = 470) = 21.16, p < .007$. It seems that administrators’ perceptions of policy implementation were not consistent between the administrative zones.

These relationships were further explored by dividing the data into “schools that offered music” and “schools that did not offer music.” Results for schools that offered music indicated non-significant relationships between all nine administrative zones and the three factors from section two of the survey: (1) familiarity with policies in arts education $\chi^2 (8, N = 115) = 7.30, p < .50$; (2) responsibility for overseeing implementation of policy in arts education $\chi^2 (8, N = 115) = 7.66, p < .47$; and (3) responsibility for overseeing implementation of the national curriculum in cultural and artistic education $\chi^2 (8, N = 115) = 12.33, p < .14$.

Lastly, results for schools that did not offer music indicated non-significant relationships between the administrative zones regarding familiarity with the policy in arts education $\chi^2 (8, N = 355) = 6.80, p < .56$. On the other hand, the relation between the
nine administrative zones regarding administrators’ responsibility for overseeing policy implementation $\chi^2 (8, N = 335) = 19.49, p < .012$, and administrators’ responsibility for overseeing curricular implementation $\chi^2 (8, N = 335) = 23.86, p < .002$ were found to be significant. These relationships show that administrators' perceptions of and overall familiarity with the policies and curriculum in arts education are not consistent between the nine administrative zones of Ecuador.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the state of music education in the Basic General Education public schools of Ecuador by examining the perspectives of school administrators. This study provides a portrait of the status of music education in the Ecuadorian public school system. The findings presented this chapter offer a improved understanding of the nature of music programs, as well as the current challenges that schools, administrators, and teachers face in meetings the national policy demands for arts education in schools. The results of this study can serve as a starting point for discussions surrounding the improvement of music and the arts in Ecuadorian schools.

This chapter will provide analytic and interpretative understandings that resulted from the findings. I will begin with a brief review of the methodology and discuss the limitations. I will then discuss the results of the participants’ demographics, followed by a discussion of each research question. This discussion section will primarily draw on the results of the research but will also link previously reviewed literature. Finally, I will discuss the implications of the study for policymakers nationally and internationally, and offer implications for future research.

Review of Methodology

Using a database provided by the Ministry of Education of Ecuador, the survey questionnaires were sent electronically to a representative sample of school administrators ($N = 1800$) from a population of 13,870 Basic General Education active
public schools that offer full-time in-school education in Ecuador. The database provided by the Ministry of Education contained a list of schools, their representatives, and a list of e-mail addresses. Many of the initial e-mails and follow-up reminders sent to the administrators went through email filters and thus, there is no guarantee that all of the administrators received the link to the questionnaire. The survey questionnaire consisted of 20 items and two additional open-ended questions that aimed to collect information about the administrators, the school, the music program, and the administrators’ perceptions about learning outcomes and obstacles that might impact music instruction as well as factor that would help them overcome those obstacles.

**Limitations**

In total, I analyzed data from 475 school administrators for this study. It should be noted that there were some conditions that might have impacted the survey response rate (27.4%). During the data collection process, I was contacted by a number of teachers, administrators, and former administrators who claimed that many schools from the national database had been combined due to the size of the school and school population. Moreover, many participants worked in single-room schools that did not have administrators or several teachers per grade, which could have created a particular hesitance from the teacher in completing the survey. For example, since the survey was intended to be completed by administrators some may have thought that the survey was not applicable to them. Given the response rate of the survey, it is worth reminding the reader to use caution when generalizing results to the population of Ecuadorian Basic General Education public schools.
Profile of the Schools

In the first section of the survey I collected demographic information about the administrators, the schools, and school music programs. Findings revealed that, although music instruction is currently part of a wider area of cultural and artistic studies, its implementation is not pervasive. Music instruction was not present in three quarters of the schools surveyed. Of the 475 participants, 358 (75.4%) indicated they did not offer music instruction at their institutions. Of the 117 administrators who said they offered music instruction in their schools, 79 (71.2%) believed music to be a required subject in the curriculum. The National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education states that music should be taught in the Basic General Education levels of education. Thus, it is important to note that although the majority of administrators who offered music were aware of that requirement, there was a great number of administrators, particularly those who did not have music, that were not aware of this policy. This situation could imply that the stream of information from the Ministry of Education and Upper Administration entities is not reaching all schools in the country.

It is interesting to note that music education was not part of the Basic General Education curriculum before the educational reform of 2011. Prior 2011, music was included in the broad area of Aesthetic Education, which comprised music, visual arts, dance, and theater. With the curricular transition and the creation of the Ley Orgánica de Educación Cultural (LOEI) (Presidencia de la República del Ecuador, 2011), the area of Aesthetic Education was transformed into the subject of Cultural and Artistic Education and includes music, visual arts, dance and theater, film, and cultural areas such as gastronomy and ancestral languages.
Prior to implementing the survey, I conducted a focus group with 10 Basic General Education classroom teachers in order to gain information that could enrich the survey questionnaire for the school administrators. The focus group revealed that classroom teachers believed in the positive effect of musical activities in their students’ learning process. Although they did not have the responsibility for teaching music because their school had a music specialist, they expressed their concern about the future of music with the new Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education. They believed that since the curriculum places music within a broad field of arts and culture, with only two hours per week, there would not be enough time for students to learn music. Additionally, the teachers felt unsure about the impact of and transition to the new national curriculum in arts and culture, especially in relation to the allocation of time, budget, human and material resources for music, and because the law in education does not require a music specialist.

Corroborating the teachers’ responses from the focus group, many administrators in the survey claimed to struggle providing music instruction, since they perceived that music as a subject was not part of the curriculum as it belonged to a broad area of Cultural and Artistic Education. Given that the present study is the first one to examine music instruction from a national perspective, it is not clear if music instruction was more frequent before this curricular transition. Previously, Montero and colleagues (2014) revealed through a small-scale survey in an Ecuadorian city, that Aesthetic Education was inadequately implemented in both the Basic General Education and High School levels. The researchers did not specify the degree to which music instruction was offered, but mentioned that the majority of arts classes (96%) were taught by a classroom teacher.
Similarly, Bustos (2014) discovered that from 65 schools surveyed in Cuenca, Ecuador, none had a music specialist.

Results of the present study revealed that from the 117 schools that offered music instruction, 22.6% had a music specialist. In 54% of the schools, music was taught by the classroom teacher, and 22% by a general arts teacher. These results are not unexpected since the *Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural* (LOEI) does not require art-specific specialists for the area of Cultural and Artistic Education. Although the percentage of music teachers is still lower than ideal, findings seem to indicate that there are improvements from prior status studies in parts of Ecuador (Montero, Gavilanes, & Cadena, 2014; Bustos, 2014). Consequently, the existence of a music specialist seems to depend on other factors such as budget or the communication between the schools and the upper administration. Although the number of music specialists was small, if specialists teachers in the arts and music were combined the number would be a bit higher (43.6%). In many schools, music instruction was provided by a general arts specialist. This also seems to be an improvement from the past.

Time allocation was variable among schools and ranged from half hour to more than one hour per week. Almost 50% of the administrators indicated that their school offered more than one hour of music per week, whereas around 36% said they offered less than one hour per week. Considering that the National Curriculum for Culture and Arts Education comprises several different areas, it is interesting to note that half of the schools that offered music provide more than one hour of music per week. A number of schools offered instruction in other arts as follows: Forty-three percent indicated they offered visual arts, 78% dance, 41% drama/theater, and 6% film. It is uncertain if every
artistic area had the same time allocation and if schools that offered more than one art assigned more than the two hours of arts and culture instruction stipulated by the LOEI. The majority (88.7%) of the school administrators indicated that music instruction took place during school hours and in a regular classroom, which would seem realistic considering that 50% of music instruction was in the charge of classroom teachers.

Discussion of Research Question 1

What are administrators’ perceptions of the current national policies in art education?

Research question one sought to determine administrators’ familiarity and knowledge of the current policy in arts education, the implementation of such law as well as the National Curriculum in Cultural and Artistic Education. This question corresponded to section two of the survey instrument, which was completed by administrators from both schools that offered music and schools that did not offer music instruction.

The Ecuadorian State has created three main documents directly related to public education: (1) The Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural (LOEI) (2011) refers to the educational policies focused on the actors’ rights and obligations within the educational system as well as the general curriculum and its overall structure; (2) The Reglamento General a la Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural (2012) refers to the regulations and principles governing the LOEI. This document offers a detailed explanation about the different administrative levels in the system of education as well as information regarding curricular implementation; and (3) the National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic
Education refers to a document that contains explicit information about the national curriculum for arts, its content, and organization throughout the school years.

Results of this section of the survey revealed that 36% of administrators were familiar with the policies in arts education, whereas the other 64% were not. I analyzed this question further and split the responses in two categories: (1) Schools that offered music and (2) schools that did not offer music. A greater percentage (71%) of administrators that did not offer music did not feel that they were familiar with the policies governing arts education. On the other hand, approximately 57% of the administrators from schools with music indicated that they were familiar with the policies, whereas 43% said they were not familiar with such policy. These results reveal that if compared, the majority of administrators were unaware of the policies in arts education.

As such, the results of this study reveal that there is a need for improving communication between upper administrators and school administrators. More communication and interaction between administrative entities might improve school administrators’ understanding of the policies and curriculum in arts education, and consequently, their implementation in the school system. This would be especially important given that the educational reform is relatively recent and the official curriculum for arts was created in 2015. Hentschke (2013) argued that any national reform effort is complex and requires time and careful planning.

According to the *Reglamento General a la Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural* (General Regulations to the Organic Law of Education), published in Official Gazette No. 754 in July 26th, 2012, the Ecuadorian State determined that
administrators are responsible for knowing and implementing the policies in education and moreover, they are responsible of overseeing the implementation of the curriculum. As such, the Ministry of Education and the upper administration entities could create forums (face-to-face and online) where all of the legislations regarding the last curricular reform are discussed with school administrators such that they are prepared to implement them as suggested.

Administrators were further asked whether they were responsible for overseeing the implementation of the policies and the curriculum. Over half of the administrators that offered music instruction (55.7%, \( n = 115 \)) indicated they were responsible for the policy implementation; 38.5% (\( n = 335 \)) from schools without music instruction were aware of that responsibility. Regarding curricular implementation, approximately 81% of the administrators from schools with music and approximately 66% of the administrators from schools without music indicated they were responsible for overseeing the implementation of the curriculum. Not surprisingly there was a greater awareness of policies in arts education and curriculum among administrators that offered music instruction at their institutions. It is uncertain whether the administrators were aware of the nuances of the policies in arts education and the impact that those regulations have on curricular implementation. This circumstance necessitates the development of greater systems of communication between upper and lower administrative systems. Currently, there are four levels of administration: (1) Ministry of Education, (2) Zonal Administration, (3) District Administration, and (3) School Administration. Considering that the school administrators’ understanding of the policy regarding arts and its implementation is inconsistent, it would be important to create spaces and opportunities
to clarify and discuss the details and nuances of such policy. These might take the form of periodical meetings, training opportunities, or the use of Internet Technologies (IT), which can allow administrators become acquainted with the policies in arts and the implementation of the curriculum. These development opportunities would not only allow administrators become familiar with the legislation and curriculum regarding arts instruction but would also assist them in becoming efficient in leading the implementation of arts education as well as managing human, material, and pedagogical resources along with classroom and music teachers.

**Discussion for Research Question 2 and 3**

**What are administrators’ perceptions of the current state of the music curriculum?**

**Is there a difference between administrators’ perceptions of current and ideal states?**

The third research question aimed to examine administrators’ perceptions of the current state of music instruction. Furthermore, I examined whether there were differences between what administrators thought was happening in current conditions to what could happen in ideal conditions. Data collected were based on two lists of statements: (1) seven music learning outcomes and (2) thirteen broad music learning outcomes. Both sections were used to examine administrators’ perceptions in both current and ideal conditions. This section was completed by any administrator who responded positively to at least two of the questions in the previous section of the survey questionnaire. Data collected were divided into two categories: (1) Schools that offered music and (2) schools that did not offer music.
Overall, administrators from schools that offered music seemed to believe that as a result of music instruction their students were “developing connections between music and other subjects in the curriculum,” as it was the highest mean score regarding current conditions. However, the overall analysis of mean scores shows that administrators were positive about all of the remaining statements as well as these scores were relatively close to the highest mean. These results might imply that administrators did not have enough insight in order to be more selective in their responses for this section. Mean scores in ideal conditions were generally higher and significantly different, which shows that circumstances should be improved. Overall, administrators showed slightly more preference for learning outcomes associated with the students’ development of social skills, which aligns with the main focus goals of the National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education as well as with prior research in the United States (Abril & Gault, 2006).

Despite this clear link between the administrators’ perceptions and the national curriculum, it is important to note that the tendency of learning music through other subjects or as a means of understanding other subjects has happened in other systems of education. Liora Bresler (1993), Saunders and Baker (1991), and Wiggins and Wiggins (2008) have discovered that when music is taught by a non-specialist, it usually focuses on performance (singing) activities that are usually connected to other subjects in the charge of the classroom teacher. This phenomenon might explain why administrators believed composition and an understanding of other arts were the least developed at their schools, which aligns with prior studies of primary school music programs in the US. Abril and Gault (2006) reported that principals seemed to value music education as a way
of developing the students’ listening and performing skills. Additionally, the researchers revealed that music was considered valuable when it was used to connect with other subjects in the curriculum. While music instruction can be a powerful tool to develop non-musical skills, it is important to understand that music oriented goals should be emphasized in music classes. These findings also support Blackman’s (2015) examination of music education in Trinidad and Tobago, in which music education was considered a path to develop students’ listening and performance skills.

An analysis of the administrators’ responses for music instruction in ideal conditions revealed that music would better serve to develop students’ understanding of the role of music in society and in relation to national and international cultural heritage. The lowest rated statement in ideal conditions was “understand music in relation to everyday activities and life outside of school,” which counters the responses from the analysis of all schools.

Administrators who do not offer music were also provided the set of statements for current conditions, even though there is no provision of music instruction at their institutions. As the system of education underwent reform, it is assumed that many of the schools that currently do not have music instruction offered it at some point. It seemed that for these administrators it would be important for both current and ideal conditions, to create a connection between music to the students’ everyday activities and life outside of school. Again, composition was the lowest rated among the statements provided, which supports the assumption that when classroom teachers are in the charge of music instruction, music learning serves as a means of developing social skills or learning other
subjects. This is similar to a study in the U.S. that found that school administrators valued the interdisciplinary potential of music instruction (Abril & Gault, 2006).

There were significant differences between administrators’ perceptions of music education learning outcomes in actual and ideal conditions. This suggests that they see room for improvements in the learning that can arise from instruction in music. Further analysis produced results of medium to large effect sizes for music learning outcomes. The variables with larger effect sizes were “understand and create music in relation to other arts and cultures of the country and the world,” “create and compose music,” “relate music to the sociocultural context.” These findings are consistent with the findings of prior studies about elementary school principals (Abril & Gault, 2006) and in-service elementary school teachers (Abril & Gault, 2005).

Administrators were provided a set of 13 broad learning outcomes in music in order to examine their perceptions of those statements in current and ideal conditions. Perceptions from administrators that offered music were generally positive, with all scores above the midpoint. It was revealed that regarding both current and ideal conditions music instruction at all schools served as a means to develop creativity. This aligns with what Abril and Gault (2006) discovered in their examination of the state of music education in the United States. Since these were presented as broad educational outcomes in music, creativity should not be aligned with the “create/compose” statement from the seven music learning outcomes in the previous section. Thus, it could be assumed that administrators consider it would be important for students to develop their creative skills through music instruction.
Examining the responses from administrators that do not offer music, it was revealed that they believed that students should develop their creativity as a result of music instruction in ideal circumstances. It is interesting to note that the lowest mean scores were “improve understanding of other subjects in the curriculum” and “develop increased sensibility to the arts.” Again, it seems that administrators value the creative and social aspects of music in the development of their students. The National Curriculum in Cultural and Artistic Education shows different learning blocks in which different arts are taught in relation to and integrated with cultural or other artistic elements, which shows that there is a need for developing an artistic approach to music instruction. However, this could only be possible if classroom teachers, art teachers, and music teachers are qualified and have received training in arts integration instruction.

As with the seven music learning outcomes, a comparison of the mean scores between the current and ideal conditions revealed that there are significant differences, in every case, between how the principals believe the 13 broad music learning outcomes are currently being met and how they should be met in ideal conditions. Further analysis produced results of medium to large effect sizes for music learning outcomes.

According to the National Curriculum in Cultural and Artistic Education, culture and arts play a vital role in the lives of people and, as such, this curriculum aims to promote basic learning experiences for every citizen. Furthermore, it states that arts are an important source for self-discovery, which facilitates students’ learning of a variety that other areas that require either convergent or divergent forms of thought. Findings of research questions two and three showed that school administrators believe in the social and personal impact that music has on the students as the highest ranked statements were
related to social/functional skills whereas the lowest ranked statements were related to arts related instances.

**Discussion for Research Questions 4 and 5**

**What are administrators’ perceptions of the degree to which numerous variables impact their music curriculum? What are the obstacles and challenges that administrators’ face in supporting the music curriculum?**

Research questions four and five aimed to determine administrators’ perceptions of the effect of certain variables on music instruction at their schools. As for the previous section, administrators that responded positively in at least two questions of section two of the survey, were asked to answer this section of the questionnaire. For analysis purposes, responses for this section were collapsed into two levels of impact: positive and not effect.

Administrators’ responses were generally positive for all factors, where the National Curriculum for Culture and Artistic Education was the highest ranked for all cases: (1) all schools, (2) schools that offer music, and (3) schools that do not offer music. Likewise, administrators believed that “budget” was the least positive factor impacting music instruction for all cases. A further analysis through tests for associations, via chi-square goodness of fit analyses, between the two categories within each factor revealed significant differences in all factors, except “music teacher” and “budget” when all schools were considered. It should be noted that these non-significant differences might be because the percentages for negative conditions were higher for these two factors (17.5% and 20.1%, respectively). These results align with what Cajas (2007) found throughout his examination of music education in Guatemala, Honduras, and Costa
Rica, where music education programs were primarily impacted by the lack of funding and music specialists.

Chi square analyses were also performed for schools that offered music and schools that did not offer music. In the case of schools that offered music instruction, the chi-squared analyses showed significant relationships for all factors, except “budget,” which again had the highest percentage in “negative” conditions. Interestingly, the factor “music teacher” showed a significant relationship between “positive” and “no effect” conditions, which could show that administrators tended to be more positive since they had music instruction in their schools.

As with the overall analysis, chi-squared analyses for schools that did not offer music showed significant differences for all factors, except for “budget” and “music teacher,” which also had the highest percentages within the “negative” condition, and the lowest percentages within the “positive” condition (42.9% and 36.1%, respectively). Research has shown that budgetary issues and the lack of music specialists are common factors impacting music programs (Abril & Gault, 2006; Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008). Thus, it is important for upper administrators and national entities to canalize actions that could potentially improve the situation of music education in the school system, particularly for schools that do not offer music instruction.
Discussion for Open-Ended Questions

Are there any other factors that impact music instruction at your institution?

Please, describe any actions that might eliminate any obstacles and improve the state of music education at your institution.

Administrators were asked to indicate other challenges that might impact music at their institutions as well as solutions that might help them overcome those obstacles. A total of 293 administrators provided responses for the first open-ended question. Many respondents provided several answers, resulting in a total of 370 statements. Four categories were created after a coding process:

1. Policy: curriculum, time allocation, administration, work load,
2. Resources: instruments, space, pedagogical resources, professional development
3. Budget for music teacher and,
4. Parents and community.

The coding and analysis of frequency of each statement corroborated the findings of the third research question, in which “budget” and “music teacher” were the least positive factors impacting music instruction. The most frequent statements were “budget for music teachers,” which represented 48.7% of the statements. Many teachers perceived that the upper administration neglected to assign them a music or arts specialists because of the school population. One administrator commented: “We do not have a music teacher because we have very few students.” Some administrators also stated that given that they do not have a music teacher, they always “try to fill in gaps by using every and any resource available… we would use recycled materials and build our own
Another administrator said: “the truth is that we haven’t had a music teacher for a long time because the Ministry took him away from the school… everything was more positive when the music teacher was here.”

Another prominent factor was “resources,” which represented 28.9% of the statements. Administrators commented that the lack of resources such as instruments, pedagogical materials, an adequate space to learn music, and a lack of professional developments have affected the nature of music instruction, or the lack of it. Interestingly, some administrators believed that the lack of human and material resources was tied to the fact that some schools are single-room schools, where one or two teachers would take care of the administrative and academic duties of the school at the same time.

These findings align with Bustos’ (2014) findings, which revealed that a great percentage of classroom teachers have not received professional developments sponsored by the Ministry of Education. Regarding this issue, it is important to note that the Ecuadorian Constitution (2008) established that the Ecuadorian state will provide teachers of all levels and modes, stability, improvement, and continuous professional developments that would contribute to their quality as teachers.

A third obstacle was the effect of the policy in arts education. Some administrators believed that with the new policy, the arts curriculum had become “too broad and without enough time to be implemented in the classroom.” One administrator claimed that the Ministry of Education has neglected to promote arts education by treating it differently than other areas in the curriculum, especially in public schools. The same administrator said: “they [the Ministry] don’t understand that the classroom teacher cannot be in charge
of arts and music instruction, because they do so in a very superficial way, which is bad because this education is essential for the cognitive development of our students.”

Many administrators mentioned the new policies and new curriculum in arts education and its tendency to rely on the classroom teachers or in the best of the cases, art teachers, to instruct music. Interestingly, this circumstance is not unique in Ecuador. Other Latin American countries such as Guatemala have followed a tendency of grouping different arts in one area included in the curriculum. In the case of Guatemala, a broad area called “Artistic Expression” was created when the national curriculum was designed (Cajas, 2007). With this policy, classroom teachers were given the option of focusing on two or three out of six sub-areas such as music, dance, theater, art, Guatemalan cultures, and audiovisual media. One teacher in Cajas’ study expressed the need of standardizing the curriculum because this situation is keeping schools from providing music education.

It seems that administrators are interested in building a stronger link between their actions as educational leaders and the parental community as this was the fourth factor resulting from the open-ended question. Administrators claimed that parents are not supportive of actions in the school and their engagement with the schools’ necessities is almost inexistent. However, it is important to note that the Ecuadorian Constitution (2008) has granted free education for those who attend Basic General Education public schools, which implies that parents are not going to be asked for money or “contributions” for any circumstance that the school might present to them. This has clearly represented an obstacle for administrators that want to gather resources independently from the Ministry of Education so that they can offer music instruction by hiring a music specialist.
Several administrators expressed that it has been difficult to take initiative in hiring a music teacher through the support of the parents because the Ecuadorian Constitution and educational law “does not allow schools to ask parents for money in any case.” Among the possible solutions for overcoming the aforementioned obstacles, administrators indicated the need for the Ministry of Education to assign them a music specialist, or “at least let them auto-manage that issue with the parental community.” Considering the technological advances and development of the 21st Century, these obstacles could potentially be solved by integrating online communities of learning and programs in music and the arts that would reach to small or community schools that have limited access to music teachers.

Generally, administrators used the second open-ended question to expand their thoughts from the first open-ended question. Thus, the same categories were created, where from 383 statements 33.9% corresponded to policy obstacles, 23.2% to resources, 39.7% to budget for music teacher, and 3.1% to parents and community.

Discussion for Research Question 6

Are there differences by administrative zone in the way administrators implement policies and oversee arts education instruction in their schools?

The last research question sought to determine if there existed differences by administrative zone regarding the implementation of policies and arts education in Basic General Education Public Schools. Chi-square tests of independence were conducted to compare the results from section two of the survey to the administrative configuration of the Ecuadorian system of education.
Results from a comparison of administrators’ familiarity with the policies in arts education among the nine administrative zones showed non-significant relationships, which might mean that the administrators’ lack of familiarity with the policies in arts education is homogeneous throughout the country. As it was suggested earlier in this chapter, it would be important for upper administrators and the Ministry of Education to create constant and clear pathways through which they can socialize all legal documents regarding arts education with school administrators. These actions will make administrators understand the actions they need to take in order to support and improve the conditions of music programs in their institutions.

Chi square analyses also showed non-significant differences for administrators’ sense of responsibility in overseeing the implementation of the curriculum in arts education among the nine administrative zones. On the other hand, a comparison of administrators’ sense of responsibility in overseeing the implementation of policies among zones showed significant differences. Interestingly, when analyzed further, these significant differences corresponded to the schools that did not offer music instruction. These results reveal that there is a generalized lack of knowledge related to the administrators’ role in implementing policies in arts education, especially when there is no music instruction provided in school.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn based on the results of the data analysis. Music education practices are inconsistent throughout the Basic General Education system of education in Ecuador. This has been the result of many factors such as: (1) the lack of communication between school administrators and upper administration entities, (2) a
lack of connection between the current educational offerings and resultant professionals with the education that is being offered at schools, and (3) a lack of support from the major entity, the Ministry of Education. It is worthy noticing that in Ecuador, formal music instruction is stable and continually offered at conservatories of music and universities, which offer tertiary education. Graduates from universities, especially in music education, should be expected to teach music at the school system. However, results of this study show that the majority of schools surveyed, lack a music specialist.

Nowadays, policies for improving standards in education are pervasive, and are usually tied to the economical development of countries. International assessment and comparative analysis are commonplace since nations are always striving for competing internationally and finding a place in the economic dynamics of the international community. These attempts are usually linked to the level of productivity that can result from education. Consequently, the upper administration entities governing school budget and hiring processes should consider the economical impact of investing in the education of college students who could struggle to get a job as music educators.

Educational reforms are complex processes that require constant planning in the search of policies that guarantee the best possible opportunities for as many citizens in a nation. As for now, music as an independent subject is not contemplated in the curriculum since with the new reform, music is included in the area of cultural and artistic education. However, as it is known, policies and laws are subject to interpretation and in the case of arts education, one of the interpretations can be that administrators and educational leaders believe that hiring a music specialist is not compulsory or required. As for now, this study has revealed that music instruction is primarily in the hands of a
classroom teacher, and it is unknown if graduates from music education are being hired to instruct music. The results of this study revealed that there is an imperative need for upper administrators to gather school administrators and walk them through the policies and regulations concerning music education. Thus, administrators would have a clearer idea of how they can oversee a proper implementation of the curriculum.

Lastly, the findings of this study revealed that there is a need for providing professional developments to all teachers: classroom teachers, arts teachers, and music teachers. It is important to constantly analyze the nature and requirements of the National Curriculum since it requires arts and culture integration. Thus, professional development for teachers could be created by: (1) integrating comprehensive arts courses in the teacher education system, (2) creating courses or training sessions for classroom and arts teachers that lack knowledge in music education, and (3) providing professional development training and continuing education for those who had already been trained as music instructors.

**Recommendations**

The aforementioned conclusions make clear that all stakeholders or actors in the educational process are interconnected and interdependent. The conclusions also reveal that they constantly face complex situations in the process of implementing music education. Thus, it seems that an effective educational model must focus on all levels of a system, which suggests a synergistic cooperation between stakeholders. Thus, recommendations are offered to the major stakeholders related to this study: (1) Policymakers and upper administrators, (2) school administrators, and (3) classroom teachers and music teachers.
Policymakers and Upper Administration

Findings from this study revealed that a hierarchical governance system is required so that the Ministry of Education, zonal, and district centers of administration take a stronger and more directive control and leadership role in relation to music education. This change would take the form of (1) the delineation of clear pathways of curricular implementation, not only through the development of curricular guides, but also through gatherings and professional developments that help administrators understand the specificities and nuances of the curriculum; and (2) a revision and articulation of the role of music education in the curriculum. Findings revealed that administrators believed music was not part of the curriculum and, as such, it is inconsistent and almost nonexistent in many schools. Through open-ended responses, administrators expressed the need of “having music back in the curriculum” as well as a specialized teacher responsible for music instruction; (3) the channeling of funds and resources through a reorganized funding model; and (4) a restructuration of policies that allow school administrators to auto-fund the acquisition of resources and a music teacher through community and parental contributions.

School Administration

The current rhetoric of the Ecuadorian government has been grounded on the ideal of providing equal opportunities and free education for all citizens that study at public institutions. This perspective has showed its positive side by granting educational access to many people that might have struggled otherwise. However, an absolute standardization of policies and regulations can become detrimental for music programs,
especially when administrators are not trusted and not given some independence to make decisions uniquely applicable to their schools.

The Ecuadorian Ministry of Education has stated the desire of making Ecuador the Finland of Latin America (Ministry of Education, 2014). While, there is a great resemblance with the Scandinavian country, there is one aspect that is considered crucial in the effectiveness of educational reforms. Sahlberg (2009) calls it “a culture of trust,” and claims that one key element in the success of Finnish educational reform has been the trust that the government has put in the schools and the teachers. He states: “The culture of trust simply means that education authorities and political leaders believe that teachers, together with principals, parents and their communities, know how to provide the best possible education for their children and youth” (p. 27).

Inviting administrators and teachers to collaborate with the social and educational development of a nation could positively impact the nature of programs such as music, which by nature is tied to social constructs that have been highlighted by the Ecuadorian government. Furthermore, there is a need for professional developments and training directed to administrators so that their understanding of the laws and curriculum allow them to be efficient in the translation of policies in arts education into practice and curriculum.

Classroom Teachers and Music Teachers

Ecuador is not the only country that relies on classroom or art teachers for music instruction. Prior research (Aicher, 2014; Bresler, 1993, 1995a, 1995b; McCullough, 2005; Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008) has examined music education provided by non-music specialists. They have stated that one of the most striking results of studies analyzing
music instruction in the charge of classroom teachers, was to realize the shape that music classes take when teachers are not prepared to teach it. In ideal conditions, the presence of a music specialist would solve many of the issues created by the absence of one. However, the tendency of grouping the arts and having an arts teacher or the classroom teacher to take charge of the instruction is commonplace in many systems of education, including Ecuador.

Findings of this study revealed that the professional training in music is needed for non-music specialists. As Mills (2009) said:

Class teachers, given appropriate preparation and support, are all capable of teaching music. This way, music takes its place as part of the whole primary curriculum. Teachers make day-to-day links between work in music and other curriculum areas. Class teachers who have traditionally accepted full responsibility for the progress of each pupil in their class will know their pupils’ musical progress at first hand. (p. 3)

Support for classroom teachers can take the form of: (1) the inclusion of music classes for future classroom teachers. These music courses should focus on pedagogical materials for music education as well as the implementation of the objectives stated in the national curriculum; (2) the creation of continuous professional development opportunities sponsored by the Ministry of Education so that classroom teachers have access to updated knowledge of theories and practices in music education; (3) to create a connection between universities that offer music education and the public school system. This would not only facilitate student teaching practices but also would provide
classroom teachers with a specialized model of reference and acquire knowledge to be applicable in their classes.

**Contributions**

Results of this study have contributed to the literature in five major areas:

1. The first contribution is a broad examination of the current state of music education in Ecuador. While there are two small scale studies that examine the practices of music and aesthetic education in Ecuador, this is the first study to do so from a national perspective. This study fills a gap in the literature by helping us to better understand the current situation of music instruction in the Basic General Education public schools in Ecuador and the resulting necessities that would help improve those circumstances.

2. The second is the finding that there is a lack of knowledge about the National Curriculum for Cultural and Artistic Education. Findings of this study reveal a need for improvement in regards to the communication regarding policy and the systems in place to prepare schools to meet the requirements of said policies.

3. The third contribution relates to teacher education policy, nationally and internationally. Resonating with Aicher (2014), the findings highlight the role of a music teacher and the competencies needed in order to be qualified to teach music. There is need for a different structure or course offerings for classroom teachers and non-music specialists so that they acquire the necessary knowledge and skills for music instruction.

4. The fourth contribution addresses the role of the administrators in the school system. The findings revealed the characteristics and qualifications needed from school
administrators regarding the role that they can take in leading the implementation of educational policies and curriculum. In conjunction with Abril and Gault’s (2006, 2008), and Blackman’s (2015), this study contributes to an existing body of literature that focuses on the significant role of administrators in the success of music programs considering that Ecuadorian Basic General Education public schools would greatly benefit from having administrators with more flexibility and independence for managing and supporting music programs.

5. The last contribution addresses the examination of policies in education, the nature of educational reforms, and the impact that those have on music programs. Findings of this study contributed to a discussion of the complexity of educational reforms and the necessary organization and structure of arts in the curriculum as a group of subjects.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Being aware that perceptions from administrators are not absolute truths in the search for describing the state of music education in Ecuador, it would be important to further explore and understand the status of music education in a comprehensive way. Comparative studies on the perceptions and experiences as stated by classroom teachers, music teachers, and students would greatly contribute to a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. These explorations could be done quantitatively and qualitatively so that researchers and policymakers can fully identify factors impeding the successful implementation of music programs and realizing the visions of arts/music policy in schools.
We might also consider ways to address the needs that classroom teachers and music teachers in providing quality music instruction. Research is needed to investigate and assess the connections between general teacher education, music teacher education, and professional development for administrators, classroom teachers, and music teachers. Findings of this study suggest that there is need for improved professional development in music. Researchers might examine the impact of current professional development in music or the impact of online forms of professional development on music and arts instruction. In this regard, research on classroom teachers’ current competence and knowledge of music is necessary in order to delineate professional developments applicable to the teachers’ needs.

Lastly, researchers might investigate the role of upper administrators to better understand the rationales behind policies in education and the impact that those have on music instruction. Moreover, comparative studies in international music education would provide information about centralized and decentralized policies and their effect on schools and music education programs. Research on the ways school administrators employ independence and autonomy is necessary in an effort to understand the role of both policies and administrators in the success of school music programs.
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APPENDIX A

Focus Group Questionnaire

(1) Purpose and Philosophy of Music Education
- What is the role of music in the school?
- What is music used for?
- Do classroom teachers teach music?
- What are their reasons to teach music?
  - Is it a personal decision or something influenced by educational policies?
- What are the teachers’ thoughts on music as one of the core subjects in school?
- Do they think music is an important part of the learning process? If so, why?
- Why do they decide to use music in their classrooms?
- To what ends do they use music in their classrooms?

(2) Music Teaching Practices
- What types of music or songs do the teachers like or feel comfortable with for classroom usage?
- What kind of musical experiences are planned for and/or provided in the classroom?
- In what type of settings do teachers teach music?
- How confident do teachers feel about teaching music?
- What is it taught in regards to music education?
- How is it taught?
- What is it learned?
- How is it learned?
- How do teachers plan the music activities?
- What types of methods do they use?
- What previous experiences do teachers draw on when teaching music?
- How are those activities being assessed?

(3) Professional Support and Development
- What types of training, support, or guidance have teachers received to teach the music curriculum?
- Who has given the teachers that support?
- What types of support do teachers need in order to feel prepared to teach music?
- What types of resources have teachers been provided with to teach music?

(4) Policy
- How has policy impacted your curriculum and instruction?
- How has policy impacted the music curriculum and instruction?
- How has the inclusion of music and/or the arts impacted your classroom practices?
- How do current educational policies inform your curricular planning and teaching practices in music?
- What are your opinions about the national curriculum?
• What are your opinions about a national curriculum in music?
• In what ways do you think having a national music curriculum would be positive or negative for you and your students?
APPENDIX B

Survey Questionnaire: English version

El Estado de la Educación Musical en la Educación General Básica Pública del Ecuador

*** Dear Administrator: You are being asked to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to gain information about the state of music education in Ecuador. It is hoped that the information obtained might help improve the state of music education in the general school system of Ecuador. This brief survey will only take a few minutes of your time but will provide valuable information for the field of Music Education, nationally and internationally. It is important that the information you provide is accurate and responds to your views. No risks or direct benefits are expected for your voluntary participation.

To continue with this survey, we need you to consent that you give us permission to use the information provided for the final research report. Be assured that this information will remain confidential and will not be used to evaluate your school or music program at any point. Your name, the name of your school, and all responses will remain anonymous.

If you authorize the use of the information, please, select 'Yes' and continue with the survey; otherwise, please, select 'No'.

Thank you for sharing your thoughts and time with us.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the University of Miami at hsro@med.miami.edu or 305-243-3195.

Sincerely,

Johanna E. Abril,
University of Miami
3720 Ponce de Leon Blvd., Coral Gables, FL 33134
(561) 360-8927
e-mail: j.abril1@umiami.edu

Under the supervision of:

Dr. Carlos Abril,
University of Miami
5400 San Amaro Drive, PLF North 310, Coral Gables, FL 33146
(305) 284 - 6978
e-mail: c.abril@miami.edu

☑ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)
*** Instructions: 1. Read each question and statement carefully; 2. Select the response that best represents your answer.

Q1 How long have you been a General Basic Education school assistant principal?
☐ Under 1 year (1)
☐ 1 to under 5 years (2)
☐ 5 to under 10 years (3)
☐ 10 or more years (4)

Q2 How would you characterize the socio-economic status of most students at your school?
☐ Low (1)
☐ Medium (2)
☐ High (3)

Q3 Is any music instruction offered at your school?
☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Q4 Is music instruction required for students at your school?
☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Q5 Who is primarily responsible for providing music instruction at your school?
☐ Music Specialist (1)
☐ Classroom Teacher (2)
☐ Arts Teacher (3)
☐ Other (4)

Q6 Please, explain:
Q7 How much time is allotted to music instruction per classroom in General Basic Education?
- Under 1/2 hour per week (1)
- 1/2 hour to under 1 hour per week (2)
- 1 hour or more per week (3)
- Other (4)

Q18 Please, explain:

Q13 When is music taught?
- During school hours (1)
- After school hours (2)
- All of the above (3)

Q14 Where is music primarily taught?
- In a regular classroom (1)
- In a designated music classroom (2)

Q15 Select all that apply
Which of the following areas are taught at your school?:
- Visual arts (1)
- Dance (2)
- Drama/Theater (3)
- Film (4)
ABOUT YOUR ROLE AS ADMINISTRATOR

Q16 I am familiar with the current policy in arts education
☑ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Q17 I am responsible for overseeing the implementation of this policy
☑ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Q18a I am responsible for supervising arts instruction and curriculum in my school
☑ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Q18b I am responsible for supervising arts instruction and curriculum in my school
☑ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)
Q19 As a result of music instruction, the students at my institution are CURRENTLY able to meet the following music learning outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Can't Answer (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create/Compose music (1)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Analyze and describe music of diverse cultures verbally and orally (2)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Understand music in relation to other subjects in the curriculum (3)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Understand and create music in relation to the sociocultural context of the school (4)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Understand and create music in relation to other arts and cultures of the country and the world (5)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Understand music in relation to everyday activities and life outside of school (6)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Understand music's role in society in relation to national and international cultural heritage (7)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q20 As a result of music instruction, it is IMPORTANT for students to meet the following music learning outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Can't Answer (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Create/Compose music (1)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Analyze and describe music of diverse cultures verbally and orally (2)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Understand music in relation to other subjects in the curriculum (3)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Understand and create music in relation to the sociocultural context of the school (4)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Understand and create music in relation to other arts and cultures of the country and the world (5)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Understand music in relation to everyday activities and life outside of school (6)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Understand music's role in society in relation to national and international cultural heritage (7)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q21 The study of music at my institution serves to meet the following BROAD learning outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Can't Answer (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop creativity (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Transmit cultural heritage (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Facilitate self-expression (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Foster critical thinking (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create connections between music and the other areas (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Improve understanding of other subjects (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Improve tolerance, understanding, and acceptance of other cultures (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Improve understanding of other arts (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Develop increased sensibility to the arts (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Promote future involvement in the arts (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Connect students' learning experiences to their living experiences outside of school (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Develop connection between music learning and the students' cultures of origin (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Provide students with a pleasant diversion during the school day (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q22 It would be IMPORTANT for the students at my institution to meet the following BROAD learning outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Can't Answer (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop creativity (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Transmit cultural heritage (2)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Facilitate self-expression (3)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Foster critical thinking (4)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create connections between music and other areas (5)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Improve understanding of other subjects (6)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Improve tolerance, understanding, and acceptance of other cultures (7)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Improve understanding of other arts (8)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Develop increased sensibility to the arts (9)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Promote future involvement in the arts (10)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Connect students' learning experiences to their living experiences outside of school (11)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Develop connection between music learning and the students' cultures of origin (12)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Provide students with a pleasant diversion during the school day (13)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q23 Please, indicate the type of overall effect the following factors have on the music instruction and curriculum at your institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Strongly Positive (1)</th>
<th>Positive (2)</th>
<th>No Effect (3)</th>
<th>Negative (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Negative (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The Policy Framework of the LOEI (1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The National Curriculum in Cultural and Artistic Education (2)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Governing Authority: The Ministry of Education (3)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The Political Division of the Administrative System of Education (4)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. School Board/Upper Administration (5)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Budget/Finance (6)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Scheduling (7)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Time Allocation for Music Classes (8)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Music Teacher (9)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Classroom Teachers (10)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q24 Are there any other factors that impact music instruction at your institution? Please, explain:

Q25 Please, describe any actions that might eliminate any obstacles and improve the state of music education at your institution:
APPENDIX C

Survey Questionnaire: Spanish Version

Estimado(a) Administrador(a):  Usted ha sido invitado a participar en este trabajo de investigación. El propósito de este estudio es adquirir información sobre el estado de la educación musical en Ecuador. Se espera que la información obtenida por medio de este estudio refuerce y mejore el estado de la educación musical en el sistema de educación general ecuatoriano. Este corto cuestionario tomará unos cuantos minutos de su tiempo, pero proveerá información muy valiosa para el área de Educación Musical en el ámbito nacional e internacional. Es muy importante que la información que Ud. provea sea precisa y responda a su perspectiva personal. Este estudio no involucra ningún riesgo o beneficios directos por su participación voluntaria.

Para continuar con el cuestionario, necesitamos que Ud. autorice la utilización de la información provista para la generación de todos los reportes de investigación finales. Tenga la seguridad de que toda la información permanecerá confidencial y no será utilizada para evaluar su programa de música o a su institución educativa de ninguna manera y en ningún momento. Tanto sus nombres, el nombre de su Institución Educativa y todas las respuestas al cuestionario permanecerán anónimas.

Si Ud. consiente y autoriza la utilización de este cuestionario, seleccione 'Sí' y continúe con la encuesta; caso contrario, seleccione 'No'.

Muchas gracias por compartir sus pensamientos y tiempo con nosotros.

Si tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como participante en el estudio, puede contactar a la Universidad de Miami al e-mail hsro@med.miami.edu o al (001) 305-243-3195.

Sinceramente,

Johanna E. Abril,
University of Miami
3720 Ponce de Leon Blvd., Coral Gables, FL 33134
(001) 561-360-8927
e-mail: j.abril1@umiami.edu

Bajo la supervisión de:

Dr. Carlos Abril,
University of Miami
5400 San Amaro Drive, PLF North 310, Coral Gables, FL 33146
(001) 305-284-6978 e-mail: c.abril@miami.edu
☐ Sí (1)
☐ No (2)
*** Instrucciones: Lea cuidadosamente cada pregunta y estado;

Seleccione la respuesta que mejor represente su perspectiva

Q1 ¿Por cuánto tiempo ha sido vicerrector(a) de una institución de Educación General Básica?
- Menos de un año (1)
- De 1 a menos de 5 años (2)
- De 5 a menos de 10 años (3)
- 10 o más años (4)

Q2 ¿Cómo caracterizaría la situación socioeconómica de la mayoría de los estudiantes en su Institución Educativa?
- Baja (1)
- Media (2)
- Alta (3)

Q3 ¿Se ofrece algún tipo de instrucción musical en su Institución Educativa?
- Sí (1)
- No (2)

Q4 ¿Es la instrucción musical requerida para los estudiantes de su Institución Educativa?
- Sí (1)
- No (2)

Q5 ¿Quién es el principal responsable de proporcionar instrucción musical en su Institución Educativa?
- Especialista Musical (1)
- Profesor(a) de aula (2)
- Profesor(a) de Artes (3)
- Otro (4)

Q6 Por favor, explique:
Q7 ¿Cuánto tiempo se asigna a la instrucción musical por aula en la Educación General Básica?
- Menos de 1/2 hora por semana (1)
- De 1/2 hora a menos de 1 hora por semana (2)
- 1 hora o más por semana (3)
- Otro (4)

Q13 ¿Cuándo se enseña música?
- Durante el horario regular de clases (1)
- Después del horario regular de clases (2)
- Todas las de arriba (3)

Q14 ¿Dónde se enseña música primordialmente?
- En un aula regular de clase (1)
- En un aula designada para música (2)

Q15 Por favor, seleccione todas las opciones que apliquen.
- De las siguientes opciones, ¿Cuáles áreas son enseñadas en su Institución Educativa?
  - Artes Visuales (1)
  - Danza (2)
  - Drama/Teatro (3)
  - Cine (4)
SOBRE SU ROL COMO ADMINISTRADOR/A

Q16 Estoy familiarizado con las leyes y políticas para la Educación Artística
   ☐ Sí (1)
   ☐ No (2)

Q17 Soy el/la responsable de supervisar la implementación de éstas leyes y políticas
   ☐ Sí (1)
   ☐ No (2)

Q18a Soy el/la responsable de supervisar la instrucción y currículo en artes en mi Institución Educativa
   ☐ Sí (1)
   ☐ No (2)

Q18b Soy el/la responsable de supervisar la instrucción y currículo en artes en mi Institución Educativa
   ☐ Sí (1)
   ☐ No (2)
Q19 Como resultado de la instrucción musical, los estudiantes de mi Institución Educativa son ACTUALMENTE capaces de cumplir los siguientes resultados de aprendizaje en música:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resultado de Aprendizaje en Música</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo (1)</th>
<th>De acuerdo (2)</th>
<th>En desacuerdo (3)</th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo (4)</th>
<th>No puedo responder (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Crear/Componer música (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Analizar y describir la música de diversas culturas verbal y oralmente (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Comprender la música en relación a otras materias en el currículo (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Comprender y crear música en relación al contexto sociocultural de la Institución Educativa (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Comprender y crear música en relación a otras artes y culturas del país y del mundo (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Comprender la música en relación a actividades cotidianas y a la vida fuera de la Institución Educativa (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comprender el rol de la música en la sociedad en relación al patrimonio cultural nacional e internacional (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q20 Como resultado de la instrucción musical, CONSIDERO QUE ES IMPORTANTE que los estudiantes de mi Institución Educativa cumplan los siguientes resultados de aprendizaje en música:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo (1)</th>
<th>De acuerdo (2)</th>
<th>En desacuerdo (3)</th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo (4)</th>
<th>No puedo responder (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Crear/Componer música</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Analizar y describir la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>música de diversas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturas verbal y oralmente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Comprender la música</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en relación a otras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materias en el currículo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Comprender y crear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>música en relación al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contexto sociocultural de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la Institución Educativa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Comprender y crear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>música en relación a otras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artes y culturas del país y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del mundo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Comprender la música</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en relación a actividades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cotidianas y a la vida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuera de la Institución</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educativa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comprender el rol de la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>música en la sociedad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en relación al patrimonio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural nacional e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internacional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q21 El estudio de música en mi Institución Educativa ACTUALMENTE sirve para cumplir los siguientes resultados de aprendizaje GENERALES en música:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo (1)</th>
<th>De acuerdo (2)</th>
<th>En desacuerdo (3)</th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo (4)</th>
<th>No puedo responder (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Totalmente de acuerdo (1)</td>
<td>De acuerdo (2)</td>
<td>En desacuerdo (3)</td>
<td>Totalmente en desacuerdo (4)</td>
<td>No puedo responder (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Transmitir el patrimonio cultural (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Facilitar la autoexpresión (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Promover el pensamiento crítico (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Crear conexiones entre la música y otras áreas de aprendizaje (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Mejorar la comprensión de otras materias (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Mejorar la tolerancia, comprensión y aceptación de otras culturas (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Mejorar la comprensión de otras artes (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Desarrollar una mayor sensibilidad hacia las artes (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Promover su participación futura en las artes (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Conectar las experiencias de aprendizaje de los alumnos con sus experiencias de vida fuera de la Institución Educativa (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Desarrollar conexiones entre el aprendizaje musical y las culturas de origen de los estudiantes (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Ofrecer a los estudiantes experiencias agradables y momentos de diversión durante el día escolar (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q22 Sería IMPORTANTE que los estudiantes de mi Institución Educativa cumplieran los siguientes resultados de aprendizaje GENERALES en música:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo (1)</th>
<th>De acuerdo (2)</th>
<th>En desacuerdo (3)</th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo (4)</th>
<th>No puedo responder (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Desarrollar la creatividad (1)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Transmitir el patrimonio cultural (2)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Facilitar la autoexpresión (3)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Promover el pensamiento crítico (4)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Crear conexiones entre la música y otras áreas de aprendizaje (5)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Mejorar la comprensión de otras materias (6)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Mejorar la tolerancia, comprensión y aceptación de otras culturas (7)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Mejorar la comprensión de otras artes (8)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Desarrollar una mayor sensibilidad hacia las artes (9)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Promover su participación futura en las artes (10)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Conectar las experiencias de aprendizaje de los alumnos con sus experiencias de vida fuera de la Institución Educativa (11)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Desarrollar conexiones entre el aprendizaje musical y las culturas de origen de los estudiantes (12)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Ofrecer a los estudiantes experiencias agradables y momentos de diversión durante el día escolar (13)</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q23 Por favor, indique el tipo de efecto general de los siguientes factores sobre la instrucción y currículo musical en su Institución Educativa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Muy positivo (1)</th>
<th>Positivo (2)</th>
<th>Sin efecto (3)</th>
<th>Negativo (4)</th>
<th>Muy negativo (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. El marco político de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. El Currículo Nacional en Educación Cultural y Artística (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. La Autoridad Administrativa: Ministerio de Educación (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. La división político-administrativa del Sistema de Educación (zonas administrativas) (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Los Distritos Administrativos/Juntas Escolares (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Presupuestos/Finanzas (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Horarios (7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Tiempo asignado para la instrucción musical (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Profesor(a) de música (9)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Profesor(a) de aula (10)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q24 ¿Existe algún otro factor que afecte la instrucción musical en su Institución Educativa? Por favor, explique:

Q25 Por favor, describa cualquier acción que eliminaría cualquier obstáculo y que mejoraría el estado de la instrucción musical en su Institución Educativa:
APPENDIX D

Letter of Authorization from the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education

Dirección Nacional de Investigación Educativa

CARTA COMPROMISO

Comparecen por una parte el Ministerio de Educación del Ecuador a través de la Dirección Nacional de Investigación Educativa - DNEIE, en su calidad de Director Nacional de Investigación Educativa, Daniel Alejandro Cárdenas Calderón, a quien en adelante para efecto de este documento legal se le denominará como “MINEDUC”; y, por otra parte Johanna Elizabeth Abril Zamora, conforme documento legal que se adjunta para su legalidad, a quien en adelante para efecto de este documento legal se le denominará “Investigadora”, a quienes podrá llamarse también de forma conjunta como las “Partes” o “Comparecientes”.

Los comparecientes son legalmente capaces para obligarse y contratar las calidades invocadas, quienes manifiestan su voluntad de otorgar y suscribir la presente Carta Compromiso, al tenor de las siguientes cláusulas:

PRIMERA.- ANTECEDENTES:

1.1. La Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural (LOEI), en el artículo 6, literal m) referente a las obligaciones del Estado respecto del derecho a la educación, establece: “Propiciar la investigación científica, tecnológica y la innovación, la creación artística, la práctica del deporte, la protección y conservación del patrimonio cultural, natural y del medio ambiente, y la diversidad cultural y lingüística”;

1.2. El Artículo 2 de la LOEI, el derecho de las personas a: “una educación de calidad y calidez, pertinente, adecuada, contextualizada, actualizada y articulada en todo el proceso educativo [...]”;

1.3. En el cuerpo legal anteriormente citado, artículo 22, literal f) referente a la autoridad educativa nacional, se establece como competencia: “Desarrollar y estimular la investigación científica, pedagógica, tecnológica y de conocimientos ancestrales, en coordinación con otros organismos del Estado”;

1.4. La Dirección Nacional de Investigación Educativa, tiene la misión de “Ejecutar y fomentar la investigación con el fin de identificar, diagnosticar y proponer alternativas a la problemática del Sistema Educativo Nacional [...]”, la cual se cumple conforme a las atribuciones y responsabilidades establecidas en el Estatuto Orgánico de Gestión Organizacional por Procesos del MINEDUC del Acuerdo No. 020-12, entre las cuales se encuentra proponer normas, criterios y estándares para
la investigación educativa en Ecuador, a fin de incentivar la participación de sectores externos, para que en forma individual o corporativa se propongan y ejecuten investigaciones, en temas que interesan a la educación y cuyos resultados permitan reorientar, definir y proponer nuevos planes de desarrollo y políticas educativas que concreten el derecho de los ciudadanos a una educación permanente con calidad y calidez, mediante metodologías adecuadas según el tipo de estudio.

La Magíster, Johanna Elizabeth Abril Zamora, estudiante de la Universidad "University of Miami", solicitó autorización con fecha 04/01/2017 para aplicar instrumentos técnicos que le permitan recolectar datos en 1800 establecimientos educativos fiscales, con referencia al estudio sobre "The State of Music Education in Basic General Public Schools of Ecuador: The Administrator Perspective" ("El Estado de la Educación Musical en las Escuelas Públicas Generales de Ecuador: Perspectiva del Administrador"), la investigación se realizará en varias instituciones educativas, las mismas que pertenecen a las siguientes zonas y distritos:

Zona 1 distritos: 04D01, 04D02, 04D03, 08D01, 08D02, 08D03, 08D04, 08D05, 08D06, 10D01, 10D02, 10D03, 21D01, 21D02, 21D03 y 21D04.

Zona 2 distritos: 15D01, 15D02, 17D10, 17D11, 17D12, 22D01, 22D02, 22D03.

Zona 3 distritos: 05D01, 05D02, 05D03, 05D04, 05D05, 05D06, 06D01, 06D02, 06D03, 06D04, 06D05, 16D01, 16D02, 18D01, 18D02, 18D03, 18D04, 18D05 y 18D06.

Zona 4 distritos: 13D01, 13D02, 13D03, 13D04, 13D05, 13D06, 13D07, 13D08, 13D09, 13D10, 13D11, 13D12, 23D01 y 23D02.

Zona 5 distritos: 02D01, 02D02, 02D03, 02D04, 09D11, 09D12, 09D13, 09D14, 09D15, 09D16, 09D17, 09D18, 09D19, 09D20, 09D21, 09D22, 12D01, 12D02, 12D03, 12D04, 12D05, 12D06, 24D01 y 24D02.

Zona 6 distritos: 01D01, 01D02, 01D03, 01D04, 01D05, 01D06, 01D07, 01D08, 03D01, 03D02, 03D03, 14D01, 14D02, 14D03, 14D04, 14D05 y 14D06.

Zona 7 distritos: 07D01, 07D02, 07D03, 07D04, 07D05, 07D06, 11D01, 11D02, 11D03, 11D04, 11D05, 11D06, 11D07, 11D08, 11D09, 19D01, 19D02, 19D03, 19D04.

Zona 8 distritos: 09D01, 09D02, 09D03, 09D04, 09D05, 09D06, 09D07, 09D08, 09D09, 09D10, 09D23 y 09D24.
Zona 9: distritos: 17D01, 17D02, 17D03, 17D04, 17D05, 17D06, 17D07, 17D08 y 17D09.

En ejercicio de sus atribuciones, la Dirección Nacional Investigación Educativa realizó la revisión y análisis de la solicitud de investigación y sus documentos de respaldo: cartas de respaldo de la investigación e investigadores, instrumentos a aplicar, nómina de instituciones educativas con que se contará, formulario de solicitud completo, concluyendo que la investigadora cumple con los requerimientos exigidos para el efecto.

SEGUNDA.-OBJETO DE LA CARTA DE COMPROMISO:

El objeto de la presente es establecer las condiciones y requerimientos aprobados por la Dirección Nacional Investigación Educativa, de manera que la investigadora Magíster Johanna Elizabeth Abril Zamora, se compromete a:

2.1. Realizar el trabajo de investigación conforme lo especificado en el Formulario de solicitud de autorización presentado a esta Dirección.

2.2. La aplicación de los instrumentos se realizará en el período comprendido desde 1 de febrero de 2017 a 30 de mayo de 2017.

2.3. Aplicar la investigación en las instituciones educativas autorizadas por esta Dirección, los mismos que se detallan en archivos adjuntos en el Quipux de autorización de la investigación.

TERCERA.- OBLIGACIONES

3.1. DEL INVESTIGADOR

3.1.1. Iniciar la aplicación de los instrumentos, a partir del 01/02/2017 hasta el 30/05/2017, con horario ajustado al de cada institución educativa parte de la muestra. Los instrumentos se aplicarán a 1800 Administradores/ as vicerrectores de los establecimientos educativos según listados que se enviará en archivo adjunto a la aprobación de la presente carta compromiso.

3.1.2. La aplicación de la investigación se realizará en los planteles fiscales y fiscomisionales que cuentan con el consentimiento informado conforme al listado adjunto.

3.1.3. La investigadora y las autoridades de las instituciones educativas informarán con oportunidad a los distritos y a la Dirección Nacional Investigación Educativa, sobre cambios que fueran necesario para el desarrollo del trabajo de investigación.

3.1.4. Proporcionar un informe referente a los resultados de la investigación, el mismo que formará parte del repositorio de investigaciones educativas y serán publicadas.
Dirección Nacional de Investigación Educativa

en el catálogo pertinente. El informe hará referencia a los principales hallazgos, recomendaciones y conclusiones de la investigación.

3.1.5. Mantener el tratamiento de los datos producto del trabajo aplicado en los planteles educativos conforme lo consignado en el formulario de solicitud.

3.1.6. Tratar con sigilo la información obtenida y no utilizarla con fines de lucro.

3.1.7. Desarrollar la investigación en base a los siguientes principios éticos:
   a) Respetar la dignidad humana, la identidad, la diversidad, la libertad, el derecho a la autodeterminación informativa, la confidencialidad y la privacidad de las personas involucradas en el proceso de investigación.
   b) Actuar con responsabilidad en relación con la pertinencia, los alcances y las repercusiones de la investigación, tanto a nivel individual e institucional como social.
   c) Actuar con rigor científico asegurando la validez, la fiabilidad y credibilidad de sus métodos, fuentes y datos.

3.2. DE LA DIRECCIÓN NACIONAL DE INVESTIGACIÓN EDUCATIVA

3.2.1. Coordinar con los directores zonales y distritales, conforme a la ubicación de planteles, a fin de organizar el ingreso del investigador, y la aplicación de instrumentos, mediante el Sistema Documental de Gestión Quipux.

3.2.2. Respetar los derechos de propiedad intelectual, objeto del trabajo efectuado por el investigador/a.

CUARTA.- SEGUIMIENTO:

El cumplimiento de este documento quedará bajo vigilancia y responsabilidad, por parte del MINEDUC a cargo del Director Nacional de Investigación o su delegado. En caso de incumplimiento de lo contemplado en la presente acta, la DNIE, procederá con la terminación de la autorización para realizar la investigación en las instituciones educativas.

QUINTA.- TERMINACIÓN:

1. Por mutuo acuerdo de las partes.

2. Fuerza mayor o caso fortuito, debidamente justificados, que haga imposible el cumplimiento de su objeto o este se vuelva inejecutable.

3. Por incumplimiento de las obligaciones determinadas en la Cláusula Tercera.

SEXTA.- DOCUMENTOS HABILITANTES:

Forman parte de la Carta de Compromiso los documentos que acreditan la capacidad de los comparecientes:
a. Formulario Solicitud de investigación en Instituciones públicas.
b. Listados de las 1800 Instituciones Educativas.
c. Título de la SENESCYT, Magister en pedagogía e investigación musical.
d. Formulario de consentimiento.
e. cuestionario de preguntas_Survey-InstrumentSpanish
f. Formato_cuestionario_Estado_Educación_Musical_E.G.B_Pública_Ecuador(spanish)
   -1
g. Carta Confirmando U.M es una universidad de investigación Prado (Letter-
   Confirming UM is a research university Prado).
h. Carta de apoyo y aprobación de tesis del tutor.
i. Copia de la cédula de ciudadanía.

SÉPTIMA- DOMICILIO:

Para todos los efectos de este compromiso, las partes convienen en señalar su domicilio en
la ciudad de Quito, Distrito Metropolitano.

Para estos efectos, las partes fijan las siguientes direcciones.

a) MINISTERIO DE EDUCACIÓN:

Dirección: Av. Amazonas N34-451 entre Av. Atahualpa y Juan
          Pablo Sanz
          Quito DM -Ecuador.

Teléfonos: (593) 2396-1371
Correo electrónico: @educacion.gob.ec [representante MINEDU]
Página WEB: www.educacion.gob.ec

b) DEL INVESTIGADOR

Dirección: 3720 Ponce de Leon Blvd
           Coral Gables, Florida 33134
           United States
           Map It
Teléfonos: 5613608927
Correo electrónico: jubri11@uni.miami.edu
OCTAVA- ACEPTACIÓN Y RATIFICACIÓN:
Las partes aceptan y ratifican el contenido de todas y cada una de las cláusulas de la presente Carta Compromiso. Para constancia suscriben en dos (2) ejemplares de igual tenor, en el Distrito Metropolitano de Quito, a los 01 días del mes de febrero de 2017.

Daniel Alejandro Cárdenas Calderón
DIRECTOR NACIONAL DE INVESTIGACIÓN EDUCATIVA

Johanna Elizabeth Abril Zamora
INVESTIGADORA
## APPROVAL

February 15, 2017

Carlos Abril
1552 Brescia
305-284-6978
c.abril@miami.edu

Dear Dr. Carlos Abril:

On 2/15/2017, the IRB reviewed the following submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review:</th>
<th>Initial Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of Study:</td>
<td>The State of Music Education in Basic General Public Schools of Ecuador: The Administrator’s Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator:</td>
<td>Carlos Abril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB ID:</td>
<td>20161219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Documents Reviewed: | *Autorizacion de investigacion Johanna Abril 108132056.pdf*  
*IRB PROTOCOL REVISIONS.docx*  
*Testament.pdf* |

The IRB approved the study on 2/15/2017.

**NOTE:** Translations of IRB approved study documents, including informed consent documents, into languages other than English must be submitted to HSRO for approval prior to use.

In conducting this study, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103), which can be found by navigating to the IRB Library within the IRB system.

Should you have any questions, please contact: Vivienne Carrasco, Sr. IRB Regulatory Analyst, (phone: 305-243-6713; email: vcarrasco@med.miami.edu)

Sincerely,
Khemraj (Raj) Hirani, MPharm, Ph.D., CPH, RPh, CCRP, CIP, RAC, MBA
Associate Vice Provost for Human Subject Research